

growing on the property of an inspector of noxious weeds. This incident, while forming an argument in favour of inspection, showed that certain lands would in any case be neglected, and from them the seeds would spread throughout the country. For three years farmers had been obliged to clear their properties of weeds; yet we were told that no progress had been made, and that some years must pass before the stinkwort could be eradicated. The loss caused by this pest was stated by Dr. Jameson to be enormous; and in reply to representations from Kojonup Dr. Jameson had promised he would not enforce the inspection in that district in view of the practical impossibility of eradicating the weed. The old camping grounds at Kojonup were the sources of all the trouble.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: The farmers' representatives had asked the Government to introduce this Bill, but with one exception did not seem to care whether they assisted to pass it. Representing a large agricultural district, he (Mr. Thomson) recognised the right of the farmers to be protected one against the other; but the Government were not prepared to ask the general taxpayer to bear the expense of eradicating noxious weeds on all Crown lands. To do so would be most unfair to the taxpayer. Some members said that farmers should not be obliged to eradicate weeds on the roads fronting their properties; but how could those weeds be on the roads unless they came from the adjacent lands? The Government were going as far as they had a right to go in protecting the farmers in this instance. They were prepared to see that all railway reserves and stock routes were cleared of noxious weeds. If members would take a fair view of the question they would agree that the Government were proposing to do all that they could be expected to do in the direction of protecting the farmers one against the other.

Amendment (Dr. Hackett's) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	8
Majority for	3

AYES.
 Hon. W. G. Brookman
 Hon. A. Dempster
 Hon. C. E. Dempster
 Hon. J. W. Hackett
 Hon. W. Mailey
 Hon. E. McLarty
 Hon. C. A. Piesse
 Hon. G. Randell
 Hon. G. Sommers
 Hon. J. W. Wright
 Hon. B. C. O'Brien
 (Teller).

NOES.
 Hon. E. M. Clarke
 Hon. J. D. Connolly
 Hon. J. T. Glawrey
 Hon. W. Kingsmill
 Hon. R. Laurie
 Hon. W. T. Laton
 Hon. Sir George Shenton
 Hon. J. A. Thomson
 (Teller).

Amendment thus passed.

On motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

ELECTORAL BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 5.53 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 16th September, 1903.

	PAGE
Questions: Timber Loading at Busselton, Railway Rates	1030
Liquor Laws Amendment	1030
Truck Act, Enforcement	1030
Bills: Electoral, third reading	1030
Trans-Australian Railway Enabling, second reading resumed, concluded; in Committee, reported	1030
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, first reading	1079

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Annual Report of proceedings under Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Annual Report on Fisheries. Annual Report on Trades Unions. Annual Report of Commissioner of Police.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

**QUESTION—TIMBER LOADING AT
BUSSELTON, RAILWAY RATES.**

MR. YELVERTON asked the Premier: Whether in view of the large number of ships now in the Bunbury harbour, and the consequent serious block in shipping matters there, the Government will offer such a small reduction in the railway freights on timber to Busselton from stations along the Bunbury-Bridgetown railway as will assimilate them to those from the same stations to Bunbury, thus affording shippers and shipmasters an inducement to use the jetty at Busselton.

THE PREMIER replied: If any serious block of shipping exists at Bunbury, the remedy is to a great extent in the hands of shippers themselves, who can charter from other ports or with greater regularity. No reduction in freight could be made to Busselton without corresponding general reductions, which the Government is not at present prepared to undertake.

**QUESTION—LIQUOR LAWS AMEND-
MENT.**

MR. ILLINGWORTH (for Mr. Foulkes) asked the Premier: Whether he proposed introducing a Bill this session amending the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act, or a Bill dealing with the sale of intoxicating liquor.

THE PREMIER replied: The matter was under consideration, and no decision had yet been arrived at.

**QUESTION—TRUCK ACT, ENFORCE-
MENT.**

MR. PIGOTT asked the Attorney General: 1, Whether the Truck Act was being rigidly enforced. If not, why not. 2, Whether the Government would make an official inquiry into the complaints that were being made with regard to the violation of the Truck Act. 3, Whether the Government would inquire whether Clause 5 of the Truck Act was being observed. 4, Whose duty it was to see that the Truck Act was enforced.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, All cases under the Act brought before the Courts have, no doubt, been dealt with. The Act contemplates that all charges shall be laid by the person aggrieved. 2, All cases brought under the notice of the Government are receiving considera-

tion. 3, If Section 5 is not being observed, the remedy is given in the section itself to the persons aggrieved. 4, The Act is administered by the Colonial Secretary.

ELECTORAL BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

**TRANS-AUSTRALIAN RAILWAY
ENABLING BILL.**

SECOND READING.

Resumed from 10th September.

MR. C. HARPER (Beverley): We are much indebted to the Premier for the exhaustive speech he gave us on this Bill; but there are many things in it which I think deserve our most careful consideration before we give an unqualified assent to it. It is a Bill fraught with so much consequence to this State that I think we should examine it with eyes wide open, and not take another "leap in the dark." We have before us in the development of this State an immense amount of work to be done, if we wish to keep a steady flow of industrious people helping us in the development of our resources; and we have to watch very carefully that anything which may be done does not prejudice our interests. The Bill provides for a loan of something like two millions to this State; that is, we may be called upon any day to be prepared to construct the line between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, constructed to run express trains, therefore we must be prepared to have to find a sufficient sum to do it; and I cannot see how a lesser sum than two millions can be estimated, bearing in mind that our railways of 3ft. 6in. gauge, designed for low speed, cost this State something approaching £25,000 a mile, and that we are to have the grades for this line reduced to 1 in 80, which I believe expert opinion says they must be reduced to. If we are to have the road necessary for these trains, it means a much more expensive line than any we have at present. Therefore I think I am well within the mark when I say we must be prepared for an outlay of two millions at least for the construction of that line, which under this Bill we may

be called upon by the Federal Parliament to find at any time. The works which I consider we have before us at the present time and for the early future are the Port Hedland to Marble Bar Railway, the Leonora extension Railway, the Collie to Pingelly Railway or to some other place on the Great Southern, the Busselton to Warren Railway, the Midland Railway settlement, freezing works at Wyndham, and blockade of the rabbits. These are all extremely important for the development of this State. [MR. CONNOR: Dock at Fremantle.] Yes; I had that noted. All these are of extreme importance to the State, and it appears to me that if we are to pledge our credit to the amount of two million pounds to assist in the Trans-Australian Railway construction, we shall be striking a dangerous blow at the progress of this State. The Premier did not inform us, when explaining the Bill to the House, how he proposed to deal with the matter of finance. I think it is a matter which should have been carefully entered into, and the House should have been given an opportunity of considering the methods by which the Government propose to finance the undertaking. The matter was entirely ignored by the Premier, and I must congratulate him upon the skilful manner in which he disguised the disappointment which has been experienced and spoke of the hopeful future. The Premier told us truly that the leading men of Eastern Australia had urged the probability or almost certainty of the immediate construction of this railway as being good grounds for this State joining Federation. I think he himself impressed that very strongly upon the people of this State in urging them to adopt Federation, and he has no hesitation in telling us that those promises had very much to do with its acceptance in this State. The one thing that neither he nor the other leading men seemed to realise was that the Federal Constitution Bill provided for a condition which shows, as results have proved, that the leading men of Australia are leading only in the sense that the horses of a coach are leading, being guided by other power. That noble federal spirit which we were told would insure to us faith being kept in regard to all those things which were

urged upon us as desirable, is a spirit that appears to have vanished into thin air. The only federal spirit I recognise is the federal spirit of the Labour unions; for they seem to manage and control the conduct of the Federal Parliament in a great degree, and there is no reason to doubt that the Labour party in the Federal Parliament under the present Constitution have a very powerful if not a dominant voice. That is the experience so far. The Premier was, I think, frequently warned at the time he was urging Federation on the people of this State that there was nothing to bind the Federal Parliament to the fulfilment of the promises made on their behalf; and I think that is amply demonstrated. We have seen it in a small way in our own House. Many people have said we were not bound, for instance, to the sliding scale of duties, although as far as possible it was made a promise on the hustings; and within this House and outside many persons have urged that it was not a binding contract at all. The same thing applies to the Federal Parliament. That Parliament does not consider it is bound to construct the Transcontinental Railway. That Parliament was not responsible for the assurances given to electors in this State, and it does not feel bound by those assurances. One other very important point impressed upon us in asking us to adopt Federation was that we could be quite sure of borrowing money when we wanted it at a lower rate of interest than hitherto, and that this would be a great saving to this State. The Premier seems by this Bill to have abandoned that idea, because he proposes that this State should raise the funds to build one section of the railway. I think that is departing entirely from the understanding; and I fail to see, from any words of the Premier in moving the second reading, why this federal work of uniting the whole of the States by a railway should not be done with funds supplied by the Federal Parliament. I think that is a matter on which the Premier should have informed this House. At any rate it is departing from the understanding upon which we were induced to accept Federation. We were also informed that this railway would not only be constructed by the Federal Parliament, but that it would be done at once. One would have

supposed it would be almost one of the first measures dealt with by the Federal Parliament, after the machinery Bills for the Parliament itself. But I find the Premier has so little confidence in the Federal Parliament dealing with it, that he gives about 13 years from the start for the Federal Parliament to commence the work. That, I think, expresses a want of confidence in what he had pressed upon us previously as being a work of importance, and that it would be early dealt with. What I do not like in the Bill is that from the start there is a tone of supplication. It is not that we are demanding rights, that we are demanding the fulfilment of pledges; but it is that we pray the Federal Parliament will look upon our necessities with a kindly eye. It is very much the tone of a heiress asking for the settlement to be signed three years after the wedding. We have joined the union, we have been promised certain things, we have not got them, and now we are asking for them at this late stage, although we accepted pledges as being a guarantee. In the preamble of the Bill there is one expression which I hope this House will see fit to delete when it comes before us in Committee. I understand the preamble to be as it were a citation of the conditions which were understood to be the forerunner of the result of our union, that these were the pledges on which we joined. The Premier almost expressed that in words. The Federal Parliament has been so slow in moving in this direction that I believe our representative in the Federal Ministry has almost expressed his weariness or his loss of faith because of the slackness with which this question has been treated by the Federal Ministry. The preamble says:—

Whereas the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, and Western Australia, being desirous of securing closer union and the benefits of mutual protection and defence, and being desirous also of enjoying the advantages of freedom of trade, commerce, and reciprocal intercourse, have by the Commonwealth Constitution Act formed one federal and indissoluble Commonwealth.

I think we should strike out that word "indissoluble." We ought to tell the Federal Parliament plainly that if the pledges are not fulfilled, we do not feel the obligation of maintaining the position.

THE PREMIER: A revolutionary sentiment!

MR. HARPER: Is it revolutionary when you see pledges unfulfilled? What are the grounds for having joined, if the conditions are not fulfilled?

THE PREMIER: You should not blame the Ministry for the time being for those shortcomings.

MR. HARPER: We want to inform the Federal Parliament that we are not going to be supplicants always. One of the very important features in the Federal Parliament, so far as it has proceeded, is that the power which is to shape its course, the Labour party, is at present in a sort of chrysalis state. We see that it does not hesitate to strike a blow at any single State, as long as it agrees with the platform adopted by the party. We do not know to what degree it may go, but we see the danger with regard to our position at Fremantle, a danger which the Premier has more than once strongly brought to the notice of the public. From the words dropped occasionally by Mr. Kingston, and from the action he has taken, it would appear that this party desires to rule the whole of the Commonwealth and to injure any State to any extent that suits its purpose. I consider that the action of Mr. Kingston throughout the latter portion of his administration, and since he has left the administration, means that he is fighting for Adelaide at the expense of Fremantle, and it appears that in this he is supported by the Labour party and by the owners of the coastal boats. If this is going to proceed, as is indicated, it is extremely important that we should take timely action to see that it is checkmated in our interests as a State. The very action, only a few days ago, of attempting to extend the powers of the Commonwealth over the States to the detriment of the States, is a warning we should be careful to note. The Premier was inclined to be merry just now when I suggested we should say that we were not bound to be for ever in the Commonwealth, if we should be injured by so doing.

THE PREMIER: I object to your exception to the preamble, which states a historical fact.

MR. HARPER: I say we still desire to be in the union; but the action of

the Federal Parliament ignores that desire.

THE PREMIER: It does not affect the Constitution.

MR. HARPER: I say we should strike out the word "indissoluble" as an indication of our intention not to be bound if we are not treated properly. The dissolution of a tie like this is a question we might fairly consider later on. The question of marriage is often cited in connection with Federation; and I think certain leading men of the Eastern States have taught us at any rate and the world in general that they do not consider the tie binding if it be uncomfortable. There may be methods of easily removing the union. I consider, with regards to the funds required for the Trans-Australian Railway, if it is going to be constructed at all, that they should be found entirely by the Commonwealth, as was understood; and farthermore I consider that, for any public works we require, funds should also be found by the Commonwealth. We stand in a perfectly different position from any of the States. Our loans are provided for. We do not ask the Federal Parliament to take over our indebtedness. We have that provided for. It was pointed out by the member for Cue that the time was coming when the Federal Parliament would be enabled to take from this State an enormous sum of money over and above what it will be enabled to take from any other State. He put it at something like £300,000, which this State would have to pay to the Commonwealth if revenue was divided on a population basis. That £300,000 a year would pay the interest on something like seven or eight millions, and that would be the power we should be losing by remaining in the union. So we have a fair and reasonable claim on the Federal Parliament, that the funds we require in future should be raised on the Commonwealth security, and not on the State security. No other State in the Commonwealth is in this position, and I consider we should maintain this right as a simple act of justice. Another matter of extreme importance in connection with this railway, and one upon which the Premier expresses his opinion, is the matter of gauge. The Premier said that it would be 4ft. 8½in., which I believe is

the recommendation of the experts who reported on the matter.

THE PREMIER: I was simply repeating their opinion.

MR. HARPER: I think the hon. member coincided with that view. It appears that if this section were constructed on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, there would be a break at Port Augusta, another break at Terowie, another at Albury, and another on the border between New South Wales and Queensland. That would be the federal line uniting the whole of the States; so that, unless the Federal Parliament has decided the question of what the ruling gauge should be right through, we should be running into a possible noose if we constructed any of our portion on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge. The certainty is that, before a single gauge is agreed to right throughout the States, there will be a long and bitter fight. South Australia and Victoria are not going to agree to pulling up their 5ft. 3in. gauge and putting down a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, without a considerable struggle. We have not only to think of the through rail. We must think of the lateral trade, which is most important. We shall upset the whole of our internal traffic without knowing what is going to be the ruling gauge throughout the States, and that is an extremely dangerous thing to do. Our North and South and North-East traffic would be disjointed directly it came to the Trans-Australian line. I am always inclined to be a little sceptical about professional opinion on these matters. One set of professionals will tell you one thing is absolutely certain, and another set will be just as strong the other way. One thing I contend has never been satisfactorily decided yet, and I have asked a good many engineers the same question. All admit that nowhere yet has the value of a 3ft. 6in. railway been thoroughly tested. All the lines laid down here have been laid on light roads with more or less light rails.

MR. MORAN: They are running at a big speed in New Zealand on narrow gauge.

MR. HARPER: We have the fastest speed in the world on the 3ft. 6in. gauge on a comparatively light rail. The great speeds throughout the world are done on very heavy rails and on very heavy roads.

neither of which has been tested with a 3ft. 6in. gauge. Therefore, before we decide to disjoint the whole of our local trade, we should be perfectly satisfied that good, safe, and fairly fast service cannot be accomplished on 3ft. 6in. gauge with a heavy enough road. We should provide in this Bill that this matter should be thoroughly threshed out and decided, before we give our adhesion to the acceptance of the 4ft. 8½in. gauge. I hope, when the Bill goes into Committee, that the important points with regard to the financing of the line and securing our interests all along the line will be thoroughly laid out, and that we will not leave it to the Federal Parliament to put upon this State onerous burdens upon which we have not first been thoroughly consulted. I hope the points will be put in this Bill so that there can be no possibility of any hardship being put on the State, because we have no evidence before us that we shall get that treatment which we anticipated we should get. I hope the Premier will consent to such amendment to the Bill as will insure this State some greater security in the future than the Commonwealth Bill has proved to have given in the past.

MR. S. C. PIGOTT (West Kimberley): I think that when we consider this Bill it is our duty to a great extent to look at it absolutely from a State point of view, and leave the federal aspect to the federal authorities. If we consider the Bill in this way, there are two aspects which deserve full consideration. The first is the aspect of desirability, which may to a great extent be the sentimental aspect; and secondly the economical aspect, which really is the matter of cost that this State will have to provide for the construction of the line. From the first point of view I agree to a great extent with the speech of the Premier, for I think we can fairly be satisfied that we are taking the opinion of the people of Western Australia when we say that by the construction of this Transcontinental Railway we may expect to bring about that greater and closer union between the States which we have been looking for so long, that freer intercourse of trade, and that friendlier feeling which must necessarily follow on the building of the line by bringing into closer relations in every way the people of Western

Australia with the rest of the people of the Commonwealth. But we shall only be voicing the opinion of all the people in this State when we say that before we bind the State down to any definite policy with regard to this Bill we should fully take into consideration the cost that will be laid upon the State. It appears to me, from the points made by my friend the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper), that there are many items of cost which have not been taken into consideration. The chief matter in my opinion is to find the money to build our portion of the line, that is if we are to retain control, and I take it that everybody considers this State ought to retain control of the portion of the line built between Kalgoorlie and Fremantle. It is said that this cost may be anything between one and a-half and two millions of money. As already pointed out, we have not been told where this money is to come from. It is a fine thing to say, "We will build a line that is going to cost a couple of millions," and not to go into the question of finding the money. I think it has been proved very forcibly in late years that money is not to be got in the present day in the same easy way as we used to obtain it a few years ago. And if we are to pledge our future loans to the extent of two millions for the building of this section of the Transcontinental Railway, I say we shall be doing a wrong action, because we are not pledging our credit with the object of carrying out works that are most vital to the interests of this State. I think there are many works that must be brought before us and are absolutely necessary if we wish the progress of this State to continue, and which are far more important to the welfare of this State than is the Transcontinental line. But, as the member for Beverley has pointed out, there is a way by which this money may be found, and no doubt it will be found if the people in the Commonwealth have what they profess to have—that true federal spirit. There can be no objection whatever to the Federal Government finding the money for Western Australia and lending that money to us in order that we may build that section, as long as we are prepared to pay the interest on that loan. We are all agreed that the Federal Government can borrow the money at a lower

rate than we are able to borrow it at, and I think it is in our province to demand that this should be done. Then we have to take into consideration, as the member for Beverley also stated, the question of the necessity of building that portion of the line from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle. It has not been proved, as far as I can ascertain, that a 4ft. 8½in. gauge would be a better gauge—except in the one way of giving a little more comfort to passengers—than a 3ft. 6in. gauge.

MR. BATH : Increase of speed also.

MR. PIGOTT : With all due deference to the hon. member, I have not been able to find any authority that has gone to prove that the speed cannot be equalised with a 3ft. 6in. gauge to what it may be with a 4ft. 8½in. gauge.

MR. BATH : It is a well known fact that it cannot be.

MR. PIGOTT : The hon. member says it is a well known fact, but there has been a great discussion in India, where they have many 3ft. 6in. gauge lines, and the authorities in that country differ. So far as we have gone a 3ft. 6in. gauge line has always been laid in what may be called a light manner—a light road and a light rail.

MR. BATH : We have heavy rails on the Eastern line.

MR. PIGOTT : What weight of rail?

MR. BATH : Sixty pounds.

MR. PIGOTT : Why not try 70lbs. or 90lbs. ? I say that until this matter has been definitely decided upon by the highest authorities in the world we should not bind ourselves to take up that 3ft. 6in. gauge, and say it is useless to us, and pledge ourselves to build a line with a 4ft. 8½in. gauge. I am entirely in sympathy with the principle of this Transcontinental line, and although I know there are many people in some portions of this State who do not agree with that idea, I feel quite confident that the majority of the people in Western Australia believe the Transcontinental line would be a good thing for this State. But is this railway, if built, to bring a benefit to Western Australia and Western Australia only ? In my opinion, just as much, if not more, benefit will be derived by our Eastern friends from the building of this railway as will be derived by this State, and if this is the case I think the Premier took up the wrong tone when he

made his speech in introducing the Bill, because he undoubtedly, throughout the whole of his speech, used a tone of supplication, and said that we should ask the Commonwealth to do this, whereas we think it is our right. I do not agree with that tone at all. I say that we should demand that this railway should be built by the Commonwealth, and that it should be built in a very short time ; and if the Commonwealth powers will not comply with our demands, then it should be for us to consider whether we shall build it or not. There can be no doubt whatever that when Western Australia joined this Federation there was a clear understanding, a clear promise given, and the promise should have been considered just as binding as if a section had been placed in the Commonwealth Constitution Act that this railway was to be built if Western Australia joined the Federation.

MR. TAYLOR : I think you are going a bit too far.

MR. PIGOTT : I do not think I am going a bit too far. I know that the men who preached Federation throughout Western Australia preached that very thing, and always held this Transcontinental line up as an inducement for joining.

MR. BATH : It was not the case on the Eastern Goldfields. That was no consideration whatever.

MR. PIGOTT : Do not the Eastern Goldfields want the line ?

MR. BATH : Certainly they want the line, but that was not the consideration.

MR. PIGOTT : What did Sir John Forrest preach ?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS : He did not preach up there at all.

MR. PIGOTT : We had plenty of other federationists going there—the Federal League, I think they called themselves. They gave a promise that if Western Australia would join the union, this line would be built by the Federal Government at the earliest possible date.

MR. MORAN : Our grievance is against them.

MR. PIGOTT : I say our grievance is against the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth ought to have made a movement in the matter beforehand.

MR. MORAN : Our grievance is also against the federal leaders here.

MR. PIGOTT: That is another question. I say the Commonwealth ought to have made a start in this matter before to-day, and that if we are to seriously consider it necessary to build the line even if the Commonwealth do not agree to build it for the Commonwealth, they should provide us with money, if necessary, for the whole line from Fremantle to the border. As I said, I did not like the tone taken by the Premier, but I think that can be changed by one small alteration. If we show to the other States that we put a value on this State, there is not the slightest doubt they will give us greater consideration than they will do if we go to them cap-in-hand begging favours. With regard to the finding of the money, as I have said I think it should be found by the Federal Government; and another reason is that we have many works in this State demanding attention. It would be useless for me to go into details of those works at the present moment, but if we wish to send this State ahead at the rate it has been going in the past few years, we shall require all the capital we can find; therefore I think it will be a wrong action on the part of this Parliament to pledge the State to retain at call practically something like two million pounds to be spent on this one particular line.

MR. MORAN: We are not likely to be rushed here.

MR. PIGOTT: We are not likely to be rushed for the money, I quite agree. Then there is the other point, and that is with regard to the time limit. The Premier asks this House to give the Commonwealth the right to build this line, which practically gives them the power to refuse us the right to build the line for the next 10 years. If this Bill passes, we can take no future steps in this matter for another 10 years, and then if the Commonwealth refuse to build the line we shall just be in the same position as we are in to-day. I think we ought to make an alteration in this Bill, and limit the time we give to the Commonwealth Government—[MR. ILLINGWORTH: Hear, hear]—and make the period not exceeding the term of the next Parliament, assuming of course that the Parliament will last three years; that will be practically four years from this

date. I think that by giving them four years to consider this matter we are giving them quite long enough time, and if the Commonwealth do not see fit to build that line within four years, then this Parliament will have power to build the line itself if it think fit.

MR. MORAN: Build it where?

MR. PIGOTT: Build it from here to the border. The position will be that if we pass the Bill, even if South Australia and Western Australia agreed to do the work, they would not be in a position to build the railway, because the power would have been handed over to the Commonwealth Government. But if we see that the Commonwealth do intend to take this work in hand and make an early start, and are not able to do it within four years, the Parliament of this State will still have power to extend the time if necessary. Are we in this Parliament to set ourselves up as being the only wise people in this State, and to say that a Parliament four years hence will not have as much wisdom as is to be found in this House to-day? I do not see that there is any occasion to oppose the second reading of the Bill, because the principle is approved by everybody in this State; but I do think that when a Bill of this kind comes forward, it should be more in the shape of a demand than in the shape of a supplication.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND (South Fremantle): I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, reserving to myself the right with other members to consider amendments in Committee. It appears to me that the necessity for this work is being made clearer every day. The anticipated trouble in shipping circles seems to emphasise the necessity of pushing on with this work by every means in our power, so that it may be an accomplished fact as quickly as possible. There is no doubt that with the Trans-continental Railway, Fremantle will rapidly become one of the greatest ports in Australia; that not only will the mails all come to Fremantle, but mails and passengers will practically all go overland; not only mails and passengers, but valuable cargo that is of great value and of comparatively small weight and bulk will go from Fremantle to Adelaide and the other States, such as silks, satins, ribbons, lace, jewellery, plate, and other

such goods which will bear a fairly heavy rate of freight but will not bear a long time in transit. Also in the future, if these restrictions that are threatened in regard to the coastal shipping are carried into effect, a great deal of inter-State cargo will be transferred to steamers at Fremantle for the other States. I am sorry to see that the member for Beverley has not yet got over his objections to Federation. I think we ought to have made a better bargain, and that a better bargain could have been made at the time; but the fact remains that the bargain has been made, and we as a party to it must stick to the bargain. He would be a courageous man who would preach anything like separation in any State of Australia at the present time. [Interjection.] I am sure he would have a very short shrift if he attempted it.

MR. JACOBY: You will hear it pretty soon if they do not build the Transcontinental Railway.

MR. DIAMOND: With reference to the cost of the first section to Kalgoorlie, it appears to be a large sum of money, and the trouble with some members is as to the possibility of our being able to borrow the money at a reasonable rate. I think the hostile combination which has been made against this and other Australian States in the London money market will collapse very soon of its own weight, and that the time is not far distant when we shall be able, for reproductive public works such as this, to borrow money at a rate of interest equal to that which has prevailed before. This combination or worse—for it might be called a plot amongst certain of the so-called financial newspapers and certain manipulators of capital in London—cannot continue, though at present it suits the book of those persons and their financial organs, because most of us know that nearly everyone of those financial organs has got its price, for which it can be induced to write up or write down this or that mine or company or undertaking. This sort of thing cannot last. Genuine investors, the men who want to invest their savings in a safe and profitable way, such as the country gentleman landowner, the shopkeeper who has been successful in business, the manufacturer who is able to take money out of

his business, the successful professional man, and the thousand and one others who are making more or less money, must have some means of investing their capital to earn a fair interest; and at the present time if Australia is shut to them, they are driven to a large extent to intrust their money to foreign countries, such as the South American States and certain other States whose financial soundness cannot be relied on. The time has come when the British public will see that the Australian States absolutely provide the best security in the world for the investment of money in reproductive works; and it must be evident to the British people that the assets of these States could at any time be sold for sufficient money to pay the national debt, and that this is the only country of which the same can be said. Surely therefore the common sense of the British people will soon lead them to see that they are being grossly misled by the manipulators of capital and by some so-called financial newspapers in London. I believe the time will soon arrive when we shall again be able to borrow money at reasonable rates for reproductive works; and as to the low price of British Consols at the present time, as one member interjects, that is the easiest thing to occur; for at any period during the last half century similar instances may be found when wars or rumours of wars have caused British Consols to go down. At the present time there is a serious disturbance in the East, which is the hotbed of political disturbances, and that alone is sufficient to cause a drop in the value of British Consols. I do not think money was ever more plentiful than it is at present; but the serious disturbance in the East of Europe is causing a temporary difficulty in the money market. Reference has been made to the 3ft. 6in. railway gauge, and I agree to a large extent with the remarks of the member for Beverley. The Broken Hill express to Terowie travels at the rate of 30 miles an hour including stoppages, and consequently we may infer that it is possible to get on a 3ft. 6in. gauge a much higher rate of speed than we get on the railways in this State.

MR. PURKISS: The engineers who reported on this Trans-Australian Railway did so on a basis of 60 miles an hour.

MR. DIAMOND: There is no railway in the world on which a speed of 60 miles an hour is made including stoppages. With reference to the breaks of gauge, the member for Beverley has pointed out that it would be a serious drawback, as there will be a break at Port Augusta, a break at Terowie, a break at Albury, and a break on the Queensland border of New South Wales. The cost of the 3ft. 6in. railway being so much cheaper than the 4ft. 8½in. gauge, I agree that it would be a great advantage if we could, by means of heavier rails and a heavier track, get a speed sufficient for all purposes on the narrow gauge existing in this State. Along the route between Eucla and Port Augusta there is a large extent of country practically level, and consequently a much greater rate of speed can be obtained at a minimum of risk over that stretch of country. The express between Adelaide and Melbourne runs across a desert which is to a large extent on a dead level, and trains run at a greater pace than on any other line in Australia, because there are no curves and there is a great stretch of level country. One thing I would like to point out is that we must make up our minds that this line will have to go to Adelaide, and that the through line will not go direct from Port Augusta to Broken Hill. We are all human, and we must not expect the South Australian people to give up certain privileges. If the South Australian Parliament passes a Bill to authorise the construction of the railway, it will probably stipulate that the railway shall not go in a straight line towards Sydney. I do not believe the people in Adelaide will consent to be shut out from certain privileges to which they think they are entitled, although the time must come when there will be a direct line to Sydney—not, I think, as a part of this work. Reference has been made to the promises given by federal advocates in regard to the construction of a Trans-Australian Railway by way of a sop to induce people here to vote for Federation. Those promises cannot bind the Federal Parliament, and those promises were before Federation was an accomplished fact. Sir John Forrest made certain promises and was very emphatic on this subject; but not being then a member of the Federal Parliament, his promises

cannot bind that Parliament, though I must say that whatever promises he made he has nobly tried to carry out, and it is only in justice to him that we should back him up on this question. I am sorry to say he is not backed up as well as he should be by some of the West Australian representatives in the Federal Parliament; but we will reckon with them later on. As I have said, I will vote for the second reading of the Bill, and will assist those who wish to make reasonable amendments in Committee.

MR. J. M. FERGUSON (North Fremantle): I hardly see how any person believing in the future of the State can fail to support this Bill, with the exception of Clause 6, which allows the Federal Parliament ten years to commence the construction of the railway. I would have that time altered to five years. Federation without this railway means nothing but a name to Western Australia. There has been very keen disappointment all over Australia with federal legislation so far as it has gone, and it has been the fashion for twelve months past to decry Federation. I venture to say that, if Federation were voted for again, it would be carried again in Australia. Of course it is a matter of opinion, but looking at the fact that the States had to be bound together and at their very varied interests, was it likely that legislation would run at once in smooth grooves? So far as the railway is concerned, there has been no great delay by the Federal Parliament up to the present in undertaking a work of this sort. If we can get them to undertake this line any time inside five years from now, I think we shall not have much to complain of. With regard to the expense of making the line, even if this State was saddled with the interest on the five millions which it is likely to cost, and with its 16th share of the £86,000 loss per annum, we would pay approximately £15,000 a year. Surely the benefit to this State would be worth £15,000 a year? Without the line we shall not progress in any way towards bringing about the federal or kindly spirit between ourselves and the people of the other States who know so little of this State. The ignorance in the Eastern States with regard to this State is something astonishing; but with this line and with the traffic

it would induce, and with the increased facilities for communication it will provide, I think this State would very soon become better known, and we should reap many advantages from the line and many advantages in trade. As a nation of shopkeepers, as we were characterised some hundred years ago by Napoleon, trade and commerce are our great objects. The more facilities we give to trade, the easier we can make it prosper, and the more facilities we can give for inter-State communication the more will our trade increase and prosper. With regard to Clause 4, in which the Bill proposes to pledge the State to make the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie of the same gauge as the Trans-Australian line, I think that we do not pledge ourselves to a 4ft. 8½in. gauge. We only pledge ourselves to make the gauge the same as the Commonwealth gauge.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: South Australia makes its gauge 3ft. 6in.

MR. FERGUSON: South Australia is already cursed with two gauges. It would be a great pity to see this State make two gauges. Whatever gauge is made, if it is an alteration of the present gauge it will pay the State to have the whole of the lines of the one gauge, rather than have a break. To have a break of gauge is the curse of any country.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Make it 3ft. 6in.

MR. FERGUSON: That may be a good gauge, but I am not engineer enough to say it is. However, I think it is laid down in most countries that 4ft. 8½in. is the gauge that gives the greatest speed and the greatest economy of working. When you get beyond 4ft. 8½in., rolling-stock, rails, and permanent way all increase very rapidly in cost. I think 4ft. 8½in. has been laid down as the best standard gauge. The Commonwealth Government may not decide to make the Trans-Australian Railway gauge 4ft. 8½in. They may decide to make it 3ft. 6in., although personally I think it would be a great mistake. If we have to undertake the laying of a 4ft. 8½in. line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, there is no doubt we will have to undertake more than the actual cost of that line; and even if it did cost two millions, we should probably be able to

raise that money at three per cent., because we would borrow under the auspices of the Commonwealth Government. That would mean £6,000 a year interest, and I venture to say the Trans-Australian railway would be worth more than that to us, and that if we meet the Commonwealth Government by making our line to Kalgoorlie dovetailing in with theirs, it will be showing to the other States that we believe this line will be one which will pay. We may also thereby keep the traffic of this line for the benefit of the State. If the Commonwealth undertake the line right through, they will probably want the proceeds from the traffic. I understand the line pays at present, and, if it is likely to pay in the future, surely it would be better to retain the proceeds of the traffic for this State rather than hand them over to the Commonwealth. I do not propose to discuss this matter at any farther length. With regard to the time given to the Commonwealth to begin the line, I would reduce it to five years, and with that alteration I think the Bill should be supported.

MR. C. J. MORAN (West Perth): The debate recalls memories of what occurred in this Chamber and in the country a little time ago. I hope the Premier will not leave his place. I wish to discuss this matter with him in a friendly way, and to remind him of what we reminded him when the great question of Federation was before the country, now that we are face to face with the mighty subject again. I hope Parliament will give the Bill more care than we gave to the great question of Federation. Members who were not in Parliament when Federation was discussed in 1889 and 1900 have not the faintest idea of the methods by which the liberties of this country were slaughtered by those who led us into Federation without any due provision for the splendid independence and prosperity we gave up. One will not find a parallel in the history of any country of how cheaply Western Australia sold its independence without a single guarantee that the pledges would be carried out after Federation.

THE PREMIER: Whose fault was it?

MR. MORAN: It was the fault of the leaders who led the unthinking majority who followed. It would be useless to

recall the past except as a guide to the future, and surely I am not going outside my province when I ask Parliament to give this matter the greatest consideration. It is a proposition involving five millions of money, and involving the greatest work Australia or any part of it has yet had in hand. It would not be out of place to recall what was said about this Trans-Australian line. We are told that Australia is bound hand and foot by the promises given to this State by the federal leaders. The Federal leaders are bound, and the majority who followed them, but Australia is bound only inasmuch as the great leaders at the time bound themselves to the federal leaders in Western Australia. So far as the State of Queensland is concerned, they did not know of any compacts touching upon this matter; and I found throughout my travels in the Northern State that this question had not been realised by them. I found in Victoria a feeling of indifference. There they are more concerned over the dispute about the federal capital and about protection and free-trade. I found in Sydney a great many genuine friends of this question, headed by Mr. O'Sullivan, the Minister for Public Works, the champion of Western Australia's rights, and particularly of the Trans-Australian Railway publicly and privately. In Adelaide I made it my business to talk about the question through the city, not with the Premier of South Australia, nor with public men there, but with men I could trust, men living there who belonged to Western Australia, and whose lives belonged to both places. I was assured the dominant note in Adelaide was one of entire indifference. It must not be assumed to mean that they will look carelessly on what Parliament does. I was assured they do not look upon it as being within the range of practical politics at all, and they thought the time had not come to regard the agitation for the line as a serious matter.

MR. DIAMOND: Because they are hung up by the Port Darwin line.

MR. MORAN: I suppose that is the fact. This State was warned before going into Federation more particularly upon this question than upon any other. May I be allowed to verify that statement? Every phase of the movement

that had developed so far was clearly indicated in this Chamber and on the platform when we were addressing the country. Every historical reference that could be brought to bear was brought to bear before in this Chamber—the example of British Columbia, the example of Nova Scotia, the example I think of Prince Edward's Island, and Newfoundland. The parallel case of British Columbia ought to have guided any man with a claim to statesmanship, and have given the cue as to the procedure of Western Australia before going into Federation. That was all clearly laid down in this Chamber; I think more clearly by myself than by any other member. I made a special matter of it. I challenged the federal leaders to discuss the matter in Parliament, and I was met repeatedly by the present member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) and Mr. Leake (who we all regret is now gone), with the cry, "You want to stifle the cry 'The Bill to the people'; you will not discuss it." I said, "Let us discuss it at the Town Hall or anywhere you like." They would never discuss the question. It was "The Bill to the people." It was tied up with party politics, with the one object of putting down the Forrest Government at the time, unfortunately for Western Australia. Supposing I quote one or two little extracts. I made use of references and quoted the Canadian history. I said:—

I think the case of Western Australia would have ended as successfully as that of British Columbia and Prince Edward's Island, if there had been greater unanimity.

I was arguing that we should not go in for Federation unless we had provision made in the Bill as was the case in the Canadian Bill, which provided that Canada should build the railway line. It was said by the federal leaders in this Chamber, "We have what is just as good. We have the promise that South Australia will not block the railway line." Here is what I said in reply to them:—

We have asked for a railway to connect us with the Eastern States of Australia, but what have we got? We have got an assurance from a Premier; an assurance which seems to have satisfied the Government here, but is not enough to satisfy me.

I also said:—

Promises given by the head of a Ministry may hold good while the Parliament or the Ministry lasts; but who is to guarantee the

fulfilment of any such promise after a new Ministry comes in? If this question comes up again, the people of South Australia may find it more convenient not to allow commerce to pass Adelaide and come to Perth.

I am pointing this out in order that there should be more caution in this matter. We were the true champions of Western Australia. I do not want to rush headlong into the question and see this State going cap-in-hand, as has been said, to the Eastern States. I want that we shall have due consideration given to our recommendations at the present time. We established our case then, and history is proving that we were right. I want to point out that we could not have two instances more parallel than those of British Columbia and Western Australia. Before British Columbia consented to be included in the Canadian Dominion she got the concession of a railway, and there was an Imperial guarantee in the Act itself. I wish the Minister for Lands would not talk so loudly. [Interjection by the PREMIER.] I want to state at the present moment I have only one object in view, and that is loyalty to Western Australia first, and I do not want this country to be led in a hurry by the same men who led it before, to make mistakes again and prejudice this State again. We are the champions for that railway still. We intend—I do, and those who think with me—to respectfully but firmly ask the Commonwealth that she shall do her duty, and I want to point out to the Premier that he missed entirely the principal plea in favour of this railway line. I ask whether any federal union in the world was ever formed that had not as its basic principle one of defence? Take America. Defence, and defence only, led to the federal union. If you take Germany, the necessity for defence against strong neighbours alone led to union. Switzerland has defence, and defence only; strength within. If you go to the Canadian Union, we know positively that the strongest argument used by Sir John Macdonald, the champion of Federation, was this: "It is not so much Federation for anything else as union against our powerful neighbour." Defence and defence only has always been the guiding motive which has led to Federation. There is no exception on the part of Australia. The

federal leaders of Australia used this as their principal argument—defence. The federal leaders for Western Australia, the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) and the Premier, used as the principal argument, defence of the union, and that union consummated by a Transcontinental Railway. I have very high authority for stating that without a Transcontinental Railway the union is of no avail whatever; and who is our authority? It is only a week old. It is none other than the Premier of Western Australia, who made it abundantly clear in his speech the other day that without a Transcontinental Railway the federation was a name to Western Australia. Unfortunately, it is a name only as far as the privileges of it go, but it is a very serious reality as far as the disabilities go. The time for the Premier to take that stand was before we bound ourselves hand and foot. He ought to have said, "No disrespect to the Eastern States: we are not prepared to say we will not trust you, but as a business man going into a federal union for the purpose of defence, the railway is a condition, and I demand that the railway shall be put in." Take it from another standpoint. If I am met with the argument—I do not think I shall be, although I heard it in former days—that there is no occasion for defence because the British Navy will defend us, I ask, what occasion is there for the union? If without defence and a railway federation is but a name, and if the present defence is sufficient, why should we barter our liberties? Why should we give them away? If the British Navy is all supreme and all powerful, I say again, drop the argument of the railway for defence purposes, and if we do drop that argument we shall drop the strongest possible grounds for that railway. There is no continent in the world to-day, bar Africa—and that will not be long—which has no transcontinental lines. It is the duty of Australia as a whole to combine these two portions together. It is not our duty to build this railway. It is not our duty to guarantee anybody's interest. We are being badly led by the Premier in this matter. He is giving the whole case away. Allow me to put it to the House in this way. When I was in Queensland I saw in a paper a statement from West-

ern Australia—and it was about the only one I saw for a long time—that the Premier of Western Australia had given an undertaking that if South Australia would consent to this railway line he would take all her obligations and his own too. When I was discussing this with public men, they said "You must be very keen for this railway, as you are not only going to take your own share of the burden, but I see your Premier wants to guarantee South Australia from all loss." What will be the meaning of that? What will be the sense of putting in a special provision about what we should do at Kalgoorlie? There is no sense in saying that we shall be compelled to build a broad-gauge railway line. There is no sense in prestatating the case as to what we shall do. What is the result of this? If there be enemies of the Transcontinental line, and there are many, it will be human nature all over again. If I am keen after a thing and want to buy it, if I go rushing to the owner and say "I will give you £50 for that," if afterwards I say "I will give you £100," and time after time I say I will give more and more, of course the other party to the proposed bargain will sit tight and get as much as he can. The Premier is prejudicing the case before Australia by this statement before the matter is in court, before we sit down to deal with the details. He is showing his hand and will not have a trump card to finish the game with. He will be played out of anything that would remain to clinch the bargain when we come to give effect to the matter. Why should we tell South Australia that we will take her share of the burden? She gave a promise through her Premier that she would consent to the line being built, and why should they come along and say, "You guarantee us against all loss, and we will do it." Why should we do that? It is absolutely beyond the question altogether. The position in reference to this railway line is this. We are taking a firm stand in unison, both federal and anti-federal. Now that we are united, we take a firm stand, and rest our case on the ground that no Federation is perfect which cannot defend its members; it is a sham: they cannot defend Western Australia without a railway. If the

first line of defence were broken, how in the name of common sense could the Eastern States send us any help here? They have not a gunboat that would live five minutes before a third-class cruiser; but they could give us defence, effective defence, by a railway that could bring citizen troops from the East into the West, and likewise from the West into the East. As I said in an interview with a representative of a paper at Adelaide, and I say it again and will repeat it everywhere I go: if the Federal Commonwealth are not prepared to defend Western Australia, morally and legally, Western Australia is bound to get out of the union. [MEMBER: Hear, hear.] She must defend herself if they will not defend her, and she cannot defend herself until she gets her military force back into her own hands. We take our stand firmly on the ground that the Commonwealth should defend us, or give us the power to defend ourselves. I do not care which it is. I heard somebody just now say what an awful thing it was to mention the word "separation!" what a horrible thing! Would my friend read the history of three of those States in the Canadian Dominion? Would he read of the open rebellion which almost led to secession under Sir John Howe in Nova Scotia? Are these unions indissoluble? Nova Scotia threatened to break out of the union, and to stop her from going out the Imperial Parliament intervened, and the Government of Nova Scotia got better terms. The whole contract was reviewed, and reviewed in her favour. But I do not speak of Nova Scotia alone. I refer to New Brunswick, which after the union was consummated, and not before, when she found the financial position was crushing her, declared that she would go out of the union or have better terms; and through the assistance of the great Canadian, Mr. McGee, who was then I believe Attorney General of the Dominion and took up the case in the Ministry, what was known as the better-terms arrangement was made between New Brunswick and the Canadian Parliament. The whole terms of the union were then reviewed in favour of that province. And now when we suggest "separation" in Western Australia, there is nothing so awfully tragic in saying that this State

should stand up for her rights. As a member of the Commonwealth, West Australia is entitled to be defended and is entitled to have railway communication. Has she got either? History, common sense, statesmanship, all demand that we shall be in a position to help ourselves. That is our strongest and our best ground, and that is the ground on which I should be prepared to go to a referendum to-morrow. During my recent visit to the other States I was interviewed in various places in reference to this and other questions, and in my own State (Queensland) I made many new friends by the views I expressed on this question. I should be prepared to go to any of those States and put the case to the people there as I am putting it now, and I would abide by their decision. Let us not lead the people of the East to think we are rushing them, that we are a rich State with plenty of wealth and eager to guarantee South Australia against loss on this work, and even to guarantee the whole undertaking against loss. To talk in that way is begging the question entirely. Is South Australia going to pass an Enabling Bill or is she not? If that State means not to pass such a Bill, we here are only damaging our cause by offering to guarantee this railway through South Australian territory, offering to guarantee this, that, or the other. Let South Australia show whether she means to stand in the way of this Trans-Australian Railway or not. She must speak sooner or later, and when she speaks we shall know her mind. She will speak in her own State Parliament, and she will give her reasons for blocking this railway. Then we can ask Mr. Kingston, through our Premier, what he thinks of his own State's action in the matter; and in saying this, I am informed on good authority that he will not go back on his word, that as far as the State of South Australia is concerned he thinks she is firmly pledged, and that he is pledged also. When that comes about it will be proposed, perhaps by Mr. Jacobs, to pass the enabling Bill; and we shall see then whether the politicians there think they are going to win or lose, whether they expect to gain something by the work, and then Western Australia can make her terms. Perhaps South Australia may say, "We are a poor State, and for

several years this work will bear heavily on us." If that is said, we can then consider whether we will give way on the last point. But by the action our Premier has taken, we are throwing away the game at the beginning. If the Premier were playing a game of cards, would he show his hand to his opponent? Is he in the habit of showing all his cards to the other side? We have had that kind of generalship; but would it be the part of a good general to disclose his whole plan of campaign to the enemy? I say, no. It is not therefore the part of Western Australia now to make assertions, wild assertions, as to what she will do in regard to guaranteeing this railway. When South Australia puts forth her objections, let us meet them calmly and deliberately, one by one; and let us bear in mind this great factor on which I feel strongly: I do not want this State to set herself so much on this railway that if she does not get it she may fear she will be ruined. She built herself up on her own internal natural riches and wealth, and she commands the respect of Australia to-day because those States cannot treat her otherwise. She is powerful because of her own wise government in the past, and she will continue powerful only through her own strength and individuality. She will increase the weight of argument in favour of the connection; but we must not teach this State that she will be ruined if she does not get the Transcontinental Railway. The financial question has to be considered. The world at present is in a state of turmoil about finance. The Federal Parliament does not look like pursuing a very vigorous line of policy in regard to public works. Western Australia is unable at present to build this railway herself, or else the protests of the present Government are not sincere. Ministers are discussing the construction of a Port Hedland Railway, discussing the building of a dock, discussing the laying of heavier rails for carrying the increasing traffic over our railways, discussing large questions of public works, and discussing how to make the Goldfields Water Scheme pay. So as a State we would not be able at present to build this line on fair terms; and if we take on ourselves to guarantee the interest on the whole expenditure, is not that building

the railway? I think it is wisdom now to stand firmly and demand that the federal compact shall be carried out to the letter, that the pledge given by some of the great Australian leaders in the East, no doubt given for what it was worth, shall be adhered to; that national honour shall not go unobserved; and above all things that South Australia shall be reminded that her responsible Government made a definite pledge; and although at the time that pledge did not satisfy me, still national honour is held high in the estimation of British communities, and a pledge of this kind given and brought before an Imperial commission, such as inquired into the Nova Scotia grievance against the Canadian Parliament, would make our position unimpeachable. It is said we should not mention "separation." But supposing we quietly sat down and said to the Federal Parliament, "You have broken the bargain: good day." What force would then make us observe our part of the compact? [MEMBER: The police force.] The police force is our own. The only force of compulsion for holding together the Australian union against a recalcitrant State is the Imperial force of the Empire. Nothing else will do it. I can imagine the Federal Government ordering round the Commonwealth gunboats and some soldiers to look for us here, and compel us to do something we are not willing to do—compel us with their vast armaments and their tin cannon! If it seem to us that these contingencies are remote, still what has occurred in Canada in the early years of that federation may occur here. The Commonwealth Government endeavoured to rob us of our customs, and have in addition kept us out of our promised railway. Those letters of South Australian Premiers, if put before an English statesman or before any Parliament, would show that we have a strong case, and there would be no doubt whatever as to the decision on that case. Our only immediate trouble is to get South Australia's consent to the construction of this railway.

THE PREMIER: Suppose you object to South Australia not giving her consent, how would that affect the Commonwealth? Surely the Commonwealth Parliament are not responsible for that?

MR. MORAN: I take this stand, that the Commonwealth are firstly responsible for South Australia's refusal as a part of the Federation, and Australia as a Federation has the power to make South Australia consent. Does the Premier dispute that fact? If the Premier disputes it, I say Australia as a whole has the power to make South Australia as a State consent. Every term in that malleable Constitution can be altered, if the great force behind it insists on altering the terms. If South Australia persistently refuses consent, I maintain that when a State Government refuses the use of its railways for defence purposes, the Commonwealth Government can go into that State and build its strategic railway without the consent of that State. If the Premier denies that, I ask him on what grounds he denies it. Any obstacle which stands in the way of that first duty being carried out, the duty of the Commonwealth to defend itself and all its members, must be and would be overcome by the Commonwealth if the crisis arose. They might repeal that section of the Commonwealth Act, but I hope there will be no occasion to do so; for up to the present South Australia has not said she will not give her consent, although the exhibition given by Mr. Darling when visiting Western Australia, and by Mr. Jacobs since then, is a sorry exhibition indeed. Here I have a South Australian newspaper commenting on the topic, the *Port Augusta Despatch*, and we should not despise a newspaper which has a large circulation and represents a large and important town—[MR. DIAMOND: It has a great influence]—and exercises a great influence. It reprints from an Adelaide paper the report of an interview with me while I was passing through Adelaide, in which I spoke freely on this question. Commenting on that in a leading article, the *Despatch* speaks strongly in favour of the view I had put forward, and it calls upon the Parliament of South Australia to take this railway question into consideration at the earliest possible date. This opinion of a newspaper only shows that we here are wrong in begging the question and rushing it at the present time. When we come to details as to the gauge for a through railway, the

terms of working it, and the hundred and one other points that may arise, I regard all these as infinitesimal in comparison with the great question, shall the Federal Parliament undertake the work? If they do, we shall soon fix up the terms, after that is decided.

At 6:30, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7:30, Chair resumed.

MR. MORAN (continuing): I should advise the House to pass the Bill in plain and simple language, giving plain authority to the Federal Parliament to construct the line if they will. That is our plain duty, our first duty, and our only duty at the present time. I should not relax the efforts that have hitherto characterised our legislation to develop our own resources, and not for one moment place too great hopes on a grand inrush of prosperity following the line. Hope deferred makes the heart sick. The country is prosperous, and our resources are looking well. Western Australia to-day has reason to be proud of the position she holds, because of her own inherent wealth and richness, and because of wise government, taking it as it is. During the last ten years she has beaten the world in the development of her resources. Nothing in America can equal it. No country has made more marvellous strides. Western Australia outpaces everything of which we have political knowledge. By her inherent wealth and by her constant endeavours she has raised her head higher than any other State, in spite of the envy of the Eastern States, and more often in spite of their indifference. That indifference still exists. That envy is not often absent. She will continue to hold her head high in spite of opposition, and in spite of obstacles to the deterioration of our shipping, and in spite of the loss of the Trans-Australian Railway. I want to inculcate that doctrine. We are not going to pine away and die if we cannot have our rights. This State will raise her head, proudly crowned as the golden State with the gems of the gold-mining industry, the timber, the agricultural, the pastoral, the pearling industries. It is our duty not to endanger any efforts of this Parliament or any wish it may have to foster these industries. We cannot at the present time afford to get

on more sail in the way of indebtedness and big obligations. We have ahead of us a big public works policy, and if we are in earnest, and if we are not fooling with the country, we should construct the railway from Collie to the goldfields, and the almost promised line to Pilbarra, the line to Jandakot, and the big graving dock at Fremantle, these bringing us almost as much advantage as the Trans-Australian Railway. We are crowding on as much sail as we can carry. I believe it is the duty of the Federal Government to build this line. If it be a paying concern, all the better for them. There are two big parties in the Federal Parliament. The leader of one great party says that he will build the line. The leader of the other says he will consider it next session. Meanwhile they both await the determination of South Australia. I said Mr. Kingston would be found, if his advice were sought, to stand firm to the compact. Unfortunately, but luckily for him, he is out of State power. My opinion of him is that he is a statesman who has never gone back on his word. The policy he pursued with regard to the Navigation Bill and the Arbitration Bill happens to be in direct line with the policy of his lifetime, that is all. It happens at the same time that it might hurt Fremantle, but we cannot blame him for following the star of his politics. I have no doubt whatever he does not think it unfortunate that his policy for years past may be the means of injuring Fremantle and benefiting Adelaide. Human nature is human nature; but the time may come when he will have to speak on the subject, and he will not go against this State. I have read the opinion of a leading paper in South Australia, having a wide circulation, on the route of the railway. It goes strongly and determinedly for this line. The article reviewed an interview I gave the papers, and said that every word I had said was right. Our plain duty is not to raise disputes about a clause that we should build a 4ft. 8½ in. gauge sometime in the future. I believe there ought to be a broad gauge line to Kalgoorlie; but since I have heard the speech of the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper), I think possibly we may be able to get a greater range of speed out of the present gauge—perhaps 45 miles

an hour. It is a serious matter for us to build a 4ft. 8½in. railway in a few years' time. Look at the junctions there would be: a junction for the Bunbury line, a junction at Midland Junction for the railway to the North, the junction of the Great Southern Railway, and the junction of the Goomalling railway; and at every one of these places you will have stopping places and have to unload trucks. It is a serious proposition, to be sure. It may happen, when we do this work, experts may suggest the putting down of a third rail to Kalgoorlie.

MR. JACOBY: You would want another set of sleepers.

MR. WALLACE: What about points and crossings?

MR. MORAN: We know all about the difficulties. It may be practicable to leave the narrow gauge and build a broad gauge line alongside; or it may be wise to take the Trans-Australian line along the valley of the Avon up to Northam. All these things can be considered in the future. It is for us here to develop our own State, depending upon our own work and our own resources to command the respect we shall ultimately have in the Commonwealth. We have in our hands a powerful and dreadful weapon as against the Eastern States. We have enormous power here in Western Australia, and I never knew how great that power was until I went to the other States. If the Government of this State chose, they could rob the Eastern States in one month of hundreds of their best settlers. When I was in Queensland and was discussing the question of Western Australia, being asked to speak about it, I could have encouraged an influx of several hundreds of young Queenslanders to this State. Despite the fact that I did not encourage anyone to come, I am in receipt daily of communications from those people, and they are good men; bushmen, farmers' sons, men used to station work; the very class of men we want. We can hold our own, and there is nothing to prevent us from sending lecturers throughout the Eastern States and drawing thousands of the finest inhabitants of those States. We have the land to put them on, and the Government would receive support in paying their passage and in clearing the land. We have the land; we have the gold;

we have the pastoral area—we have the finest unused pastoral area in Kimberley. Say a word to give encouragement, and we shall have dozens of squatters from New South Wales looking after our land. Up to date we have not done any special advertising in the Eastern States, but I am aware of what tremendous power we have. They cannot draw our population away; but all the young men there are looking with longing eyes to Western Australia. Give them encouragement, give them half a chance; and if we were to provide money to put them on the land and guarantee them a living for 12 months, we should have a large population. We have no need to go cap-in-hand to the Eastern States. Our destiny is in our own hands. As I said, and I will conclude with it, Western Australia will continue to rise in pride and glory, the glory of her own resources, the glory of her liberal government, the glory of her land laws the most liberal in the world, the glory of her mining laws the finest in Australia, of her pastoral laws the best we know of, of her timber laws the best in Australia; she will rise the more as we get settlement from the Eastern States. Every man who comes here has his mother and father and sisters and brothers in the East, and they will want to come to see their friends here. I would guarantee in my own district every man and woman to be in favour of the Transcontinental Railway. I know hundreds of women who will not brave the passage across the Bight, and when the time comes for there to be a battle royal they will go in for being able to get to their relatives in Western Australia. One sees how little is known on the subject in the East. That brings me to a compliment which I wish to pay to the Premier, and with which I desire to conclude. I desire to say that the pamphlet he has published is the finest epitome of the case I have yet read. The pamphlet does honour and credit to the Parliament and to the Premier. It is much better than these contentious clauses in this Bill. I will be only too glad to distribute 500 copies of that pamphlet to-morrow, if the Premier will give them to me, to men who will read them in the Eastern States. It is a splendid statement of the case; it is one which shows the proud position we are

in; it is a manly and straightforward utterance, and I indorse it on behalf of the people I represent. I wish the Premier to understand that in my opinion it would be wise on our part to eliminate those contentious clauses, and put a plain straightforward clause before this House. Let the Government sit down and wait a few months and see what South Australia does. Let them watch carefully the trend of events, and pledge our men in the Federal Parliament to assist in the work and in increasing the credit and resources of this State, upon which, after all, our prosperity depends. (General applause.)

THE PREMIER (in reply as mover): I have to thank members as a whole for the manner in which they have received this Bill. I do so with a full appreciation of the fact that, whatever may be our opinions as to the details of the Bill, all of us are unitedly of the opinion and we hold firmly to the belief that for the future development of this State the construction of this line is an absolute necessity. As I have followed the discussion which has taken place, certainly not a lengthy one, I have noticed that, if I may say so without giving offence, those who in days gone by opposed Federation are the ones who indicate a doubt as to the wisdom of the Bill now before the House. I am not prepared to quarrel with those members, because I appreciate the fact that this line itself will be a consummation of Federation to us here in Western Australia. It will be the sign and the guarantee of the indissoluble union into which we entered two years ago. We must expect, in dealing with a question like this, and in dealing with any question where we are called upon to consider any action or inaction of the Federal Government, that we shall find those old forces of disunion still strong. Those of us who urged upon the people of this State to enter upon Federation appreciated the fact that there would follow on the wave of enthusiasm which secured the adoption of Federation a period of reaction which is inseparable. That has been proved in every part of the world where Federation has become an accomplished fact owing to the united energies and united efforts of people who, sinking all narrow and parochial matters, realised that if they

wanted to attain real union they must have some generous trust in the wisdom and integrity of those with whom they would federate. We realised that a time would come in Australia as elsewhere very shortly after Federation when there would be this reaction, and we knew well enough that those who then were opposing Federation would subsequently come before us and point out this reaction and ask those of us who supported Federation what we thought of our work. For myself I have no misgivings. I say the wisest thing we ever did was to join the Commonwealth, and whatever may be the temporary shortcomings, those are shortcomings not due to the principle of the union, not due to any defects in the Constitution, but if they be defects at all they are due to the inevitable shortcomings of a Parliament or a Ministry. I should be sorry indeed to judge this great question by the efforts of two or three years. We cannot expect the enormous difficulties that faced those who formed the first Commonwealth Parliament, and those who as Federal Ministers were called upon to control the deliberations of that Parliament, to be overcome in the course of a few years. The fiscal question alone took up the whole of one session of unprecedented length, and during the course of this session neither the Government nor the Opposition, nor any other party in that Parliament, has had any opportunity of carrying out any particular or defined policy. I am not disappointed. There may be some acts which I do not approve of, but I claim to be able to speak with the strongest voice in opposition to those acts because I am a federalist. It is the anti-federalist who says that these particular and temporary manifestations prove the evil spirit which lies at the root of Federation. There is a great number of matters on which we may hold for ourselves personal and individual opinions, even as federalists. None of us, I hope, are so vain as to imagine that the actions of the Federal Parliament will commend themselves always to every one of us. The Federal Parliament have to face problems, and are in most cases in a better position to deal with them than we are ourselves. Although I claim the right, as we all have the right,

to express my dissent from any particular action of theirs, or to support it, let us above all things remember that we have entered this union, and the duty even of an anti-federalist is to be loyal to the union until the clearest possible case has been made out to justify action in opposition to the union. I view with some apprehension these light suggestions of rebellion. The union we have entered into is an indissoluble union, and I hope the time will never come when we federalists shall have occasion in this State of Western Australia, or in any other State of the Commonwealth, to express regret for the past so vehemently as to stand up and preach open rebellion in any House of Parliament, or on any public platform in the State. Our duty certainly in these early days of the federal union is on the contrary to sink these differences and hold high aloft before all people that great principle of union upon which federation rests. Whatever may be the initial difficulties, whatever may be the initial obstacles, depend upon it that if we regard the future history of this State and the future destiny of every State in the Commonwealth, our greatest hope of success lies in binding ourselves closer and closer in that indissoluble union, from the existence of which will spring the greatest development in every State in the Commonwealth. When one passes away from the opposition of those who have dealt with this question more for the purpose of airing their views as anti-federalists than to deal with the principle of this Bill, what does one find? But before I deal with that I should like to say a few words as giving a practical illustration of what I have previously stated about the risk we run of judging too hastily and too harshly the immediate action of the Federal Parliament. I have said, and I believe every federalist holds it as true now as he did three years ago—perhaps I hold it more truly and more firmly because we find this opposition which exists—that throughout the Commonwealth of Australia all we need is knowledge. If we know our neighbours better we shall judge them more fairly. I am sometimes inclined to think that in this House we show a want of knowledge of them in the fact that we judge them so harshly. If they know us,

they will judge us fairly. The converse also is true. Here in Western Australia what cause of complaint have we? What right at all events have we to say that our interests are being so entirely ignored that there is no powerful voice raised in the Federal Parliament to protect those interests which we hold to be so valuable, and so dear to us. Take the Navigation Bill. We believe that a great injury will be worked to Western Australia if that is extended in the way proposed; but in that connection we find the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, in answer to a question, stating that he proposes to take into consideration the claims of Western Australia for special treatment. He recognises that we have these special claims. On the first question which crops up and affects us in Western Australia particularly closely, we find the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth taking up that broad stand which we should expect him to take up, and by his expressions showing that he realises that whatever may be the powers of the Federal Parliament, whatever may be the party lines in the Commonwealth Parliament, above all things there is cast upon it the duty, the obligation, to see that no injustice is done to any particular State. Then again, take this railway question itself. We have no cause of complaint when one bears in mind the difficulties that had to be overcome during the course of the first session of the Federal Parliament, and find that we have had a conference of engineers to deal with this question, and that it now rests with us by the passage of this Bill to secure for us a vote enabling a survey of this railway to be carried through. Is there a man in this House, is there a man in this State, federalist or anti-federalist, who can say that the Federal Parliament has not displayed a fair interest and a just interest towards those particular matters which so closely affect us here in Western Australia? Can we seriously complain that the Federal Parliament has been neglectful of the special interests which we believe we have in this Western State? But, after all, those matters do not affect the main issue; and I have referred to them because I notice that those who spoke the most strongly against this Bill have been inclined to

base their opposition rather on the fact that in days gone by they opposed Federation than because they are opposed to the Bill itself. Those who have spoken most strongly have been anxious during the whole course of their speeches to refer to what they said two or three years ago; to justify themselves before the country; to show how wise they were then in urging the people of this State not to enter the Federation. I say that has nothing whatever to do with this Bill; but because the matter has been referred to, I wish to repeat what I have often said—that I have stood and still stand as an unqualified supporter of union, and an unqualified supporter of the existing Commonwealth. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) has referred, as one would expect him to refer, to the method of negotiation with South Australia. After all, that is a question on which each man must judge for himself. There are two or three methods by which negotiations could be conducted; but I appreciate the fact that the people of South Australia are entitled to hold their own views while we hold ours. Moreover, I appreciate the fact that here in Western Australia I see such evidence of intolerance towards other States and towards the Federation, that I cannot think South Australia has the monopoly of such intolerance. I fully believe that there are people in South Australia who are able, in dealing with this question, to justify their opposition, or who think they can justify their opposition to this line, in the same way as I have heard members here attempt to justify their opposition to Federation. What, after all, is the difference between the man who stands up in the Parliament of South Australia, and in what we call an unfederal spirit opposes the construction of this line, and the attitude of the man who in this House attempts to justify his opposition to and who preaches open rebellion against Federation? It is because I realise that there are two sides to every question that I thought our wisest method was to approach the people and the Parliament of South Australia with argument. I do not think it advisable to approach them in a spirit of truculent bluster. It is no use talking about mailed fists, about calling on the Commonwealth to

insist on South Australia's consent being given to the construction of the line. We cannot convince people by arguments of that nature; they are apt to think we are suffering from swollen head; and in too many cases they think that the swelling is not due to brains but to wind. We wish to avoid that, and to point out to the people of South Australia that their interests in this connection are common interests with ours. I have no action to regret, in connection with the correspondence between the Premier of South Australia and myself. Certain observations have been urged in opposition to Clause 4 of the Bill. Now Clause 4 is one which, as I previously pointed out, is a guarantee of our *bona fides*; and it is also a test of the good faith of every member of this House in the future of the State. We hear members tell us that the Government are lacking in faith in the State; we hear them say: "Build a railway at Pilbarra; from Magnet to Leonora; build a railway in the North; build one in the South. Do all these works for the purpose of showing your faith." Now here is an opportunity for those members to show their faith by works and not by words, by voting for this Bill. By voting for it they can give practical evidence of their faith in the State, and not by talking of what they will do to-morrow.

MR. MORAN: Yes; but this will merely be your policy 10 years hence.

THE PREMIER: There are many men who, like the member for West Perth, wish to bring their policy into force 10 years hence. They urge us not to begin the works proposed, the commencement of which would prove their faith in the State; but to begin them to-morrow. I ask whether by this clause we are not committing ourselves in the fairest possible way to our belief in the future destiny and progress of this country? If the country progresses, this line will be abundantly justified. If the country progresses at a rate which will justify the construction of the works we are called upon to do, why should we not to-day give this practical evidence of our faith in the country's future? Why do we follow those men who are always talking about doing something to-morrow and will never do it to-day? We have in this Bill a clause asking this House and

this Parliament to show their faith in the State. Are they or are they not prepared to show it? Are they prepared to say that they have no faith at all in the State, or that they wish to carry out some other works? We call upon the Federal Parliament to build this line, and I think we are justified in calling on them. But none of us would urge the construction of the line unless we were confident that the future has more in store for Western Australia, greater developments and greater prosperity, than we have witnessed during the past ten years. We believe we shall become the greatest State in the whole Commonwealth; and it is because we are inspired with that confident feeling that we appeal to the Federal Parliament to assist us by the construction of this line, for the full development of the western shores of the continent. Now, are we to say that when travellers arrive at Kalgoorlie by the Transcontinental line—this line which we urge the Commonwealth to build because of the future destinies of Western Australia—they are to be called on by a porter to “Change here for Perth”? Fancy men who believe in the future of Western Australia looking forward with equanimity to that state of affairs. Fancy their contemplating the possibility of our having, 400 miles in the interior of the State, the terminus of this Transcontinental Railway where passengers would be called on to change for the capital. Should that be the ambition of members who have faith in this State? Is that the idea which should control men who are so fond of talking about a progressive loan and works policy? I believe that our own developments in this State will justify, will render imperative, the construction of a broad-gauge line from Perth to Kalgoorlie in the course of a few years; the construction of that line will be the best possible method of developing our Eastern Goldfields, on which our past prosperity so largely depended and on which our future prosperity will equally depend.

MR. JACOBY: And the Federal Government are opposing the project.

THE PREMIER: They may or they may not. I do not think they are. We ask by this Bill that when the Federal Parliament construct their section of the line, we shall be authorised to construct our

section. Let me point out that we do not by this Bill commit ourselves to any particular gauge. The settlement of the gauge rests entirely with the federal engineers and the Federal Parliament. As was pointed out by a previous speaker, that question will have to be discussed in the South Australian Parliament as well as in the Federal Parliament; and I submit with the utmost respect to the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) that the engineers who are called in to settle this question will be quite capable of judging whether a 3ft. 6in. gauge is or is not sufficient for the work. It may be that a 3ft. 6in. gauge will do the work with heavier rails and a heavier road. On that point I do not express an opinion. I may think differently; but one must be guided in these matters by the opinions of engineers. [MR. HARPER: They differ.] I hardly think they differ on such a question as this. Anyhow, it will be for the engineers to decide. If the Federal Government do not build the 4ft. 8½in. line, but a 3ft. 6in., then our railway communication with Kalgoorlie will be of the same gauge as theirs, and there will be one continuous line. But if they do build to a 4ft. 8½in. gauge—if they think that the traffic between the two States will be so heavy and so important as to justify the construction of the line on the broad gauge—are we in Western Australia to have so little confidence in the future of the State as to say that this traffic, brought across the continent from the Eastern States on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge line, is to be choked at Kalgoorlie and passed on to a 3ft. 6in. line? That is all that I ask for in this Bill, that if the Federal Parliament, after taking competent advice, build that line on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, seeing that in their opinion the traffic and the needs of the two States justify a wider line, we in Western Australia will do our share of the work, and make the line continuous from its starting-point in the Eastern States until it arrives at Fremantle. The member for Beverley asks who is to find the money for the Fremantle-Kalgoorlie line. That is essentially a State work; and the State should find the money. I am not one of those who contemplate the idea of the Federal Government building the line from Fremantle to the Eastern Goldfields.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If they do they will insist on owning it.

THE PREMIER: Of course they will. This Bill does not contemplate giving that consent, but authorises them to construct the line to Kalgoorlie merely; I wish to ask members of this House and the representatives of this State if they are prepared to call on the Federal Parliament to construct a line to Kalgoorlie on a gauge to be approved after consultation with competent authorities, and if so then are they prepared to let a 4ft. 8½in. line be laid from South Australia to Kalgoorlie, and to pass on the traffic for Perth to a 3ft. 6in. line? How can people who are afraid of taking the responsibility of building a broad gauge line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie say that they have faith in the State of Western Australia? There can be no better test of their faith. Members may laugh, but the fact remains. Those who say this line will pay, those who say it is needed in the interests of South Australia and Western Australia, will support me when I ask in this Bill that we shall give practical illustration of our faith in the future of the State. If we are to have a Transcontinental Railway, it should be one in reality and not in name only; and so far as lies in our power, we should clear the way of obstacles and of difficulties. It does not assist the matter to point out to us that there are differences of gauge in the Eastern States railways. We cannot always wait for them; we have the power to overcome difficulties inside our own borders; and all I ask is that by the Bill we shall as far as possible overcome those difficulties.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The line can go 1,000 miles anyhow without a break of gauge.

THE PREMIER: Undoubtedly. We call upon the Federal Parliament to construct this line. The Eastern States can point out with some force that the line will run through two comparatively sparsely populated States. Judged by the standard of population they are the two smaller States. In building the line through these two small States the bulk of expenditure will fall on the more populous centres, the larger States. Are we to place ourselves in this position, to be open to the accusation that we want the line built because the others will be

called on to pay for it? Or shall we not on the face of the Bill give direct proof of our faith in the construction of the line and of its financial success by passing Clause 4 of the Bill and thereby undertake the construction of our portion as soon as the Federal Parliament construct their part. That is the only clause of the Bill which is a guarantee of our good faith; it is the only method by which we can prove our good faith. It is idle to say we want this railway built; that it is necessary in the interests of the Commonwealth, and to leave the larger States to pay. It is no good using an argument of that nature. The other States would say: "You will get all the benefit, while we build the line." We avoid any contention of that nature by taking on ourselves a burden and responsibility, which may cost us a million and a half to two millions of money.

MR. JACOBY: You also proposed a guarantee against loss.

THE PREMIER: Let us deal with the Bill now as drafted. I desire, as far as possible, to keep the discussion to the Bill. I have previously pointed out that I do not want to urge Clause 4 as a farther step to the development of the State. A great many arguments could be used on that. The time may not be far distant when we may have to duplicate the line to Kalgoorlie. I cast that argument aside, however, as being a local one. Let us look at Clause 4 as being the best possible evidence of our good faith to the Commonwealth, and I ask members to pass the clause with that object. Members agree with the whole of it practically except Clause 4; and I say again that if we have faith in this State of Western Australia, if we believe that there is in store for us a future so bright and glowing as members have described, if we believe we can carry out in this State a public works policy so extensive as has been suggested—I do not want to go farther by expressing my views on that point—if we have these grounds of belief, Clause 4 gives the best possible proof of the belief we hold. It is there on the face of the Bill as an undertaking of our faith in our future. It is no idle clause, and I decline to believe that this Parliament now or under any guidance, after passing a Bill like that holding out these terms to the Common-

wealth, will turn round and repudiate the terms contained in the clause. We pass the clause and show by it we have faith in our cause; and I ask members to pass this measure with a strong majority and show to the Eastern States that when we ask them to construct the railway we ask them to do so not only because in our belief it is necessary to carry out the federal union, to stimulate and quicken the federal spirit, but because we earnestly believe that the construction of the line is justified as a financial proposition and will prove itself a success. I hope the House will pass the second reading, and that the Bill will emerge from Committee substantially as it enters.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

MR. HARPER in the Chair; the PREMIER in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—The State to construct railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle:

MR. PIGOTT: This was the main cause of dissension in the Bill. We could agree to a great extent with the remarks of the Premier when he said that by inserting the clause we were showing our *bona fides*; at the same time it would be wise for the Committee to take this matter into full consideration and see if our *bona fides* could not be shown just as plainly and clearly to the Federal Government without pledging the State to remain in a certain position for a number of years, without being able to withdraw from that position in case of necessity. If we gave this power to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government did not think fit to act on the power, the time might arrive, any time within ten years, perhaps within five years, when the State Parliament would think fit, and know it was absolutely necessary, that we should construct this line ourselves with the help of South Australia, and complete the Transcontinental Railway at our own expense.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was to be hoped that would be so.

MR. PIGOTT said he would be very glad to see that time come within the next 12 months, when we should have such great development in the State to

give good reason to fully justify us in building the line at our own expense without any hesitation. There was not much time to go into Clause 4 to see how he could best move an amendment in order to make some provision to safeguard the interests of the State. By the Premier asking members to go into Committee to-night, he was taking a very rash action, which was likely to bind the State to a course which within a very short time we might be anxious to withdraw from.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Clause 6 would remedy that.

MR. PIGOTT: Clauses 4 and 6 went together to a very great extent.

MR. MOBAN: Where was the necessity for amending it? If the hon. member did not believe in it, strike it out.

MR. PIGOTT: It was not necessary to strike out the clause. By Clause 4 we were committing ourselves to putting by a certain amount of our credit for a particular purpose, and the work for which the money was set aside might never arise. By passing the clause as it stood we were committing our credit to the extent of two million pounds, to be laid aside for a certain term of years whether we were going to carry out the work or not.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We were not going to get the money now.

MR. PIGOTT: By passing the clause we pledged our credit, and we might just as well raise the money and put it in the bank. We were pledging ourselves to find the money to construct the line, and events might come about by which we might have to turn our forces financially in another direction. We had in Western Australia, the largest State of the Commonwealth, a State of enormous possibilities, and we would be doing wrong under the present state of the money market to say we would pledge our first call on the money market for two millions to build this line.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If the possibility arose we could find the money.

MR. PIGOTT: That might be true and it might not. He only said that the clause required farther consideration, and he hoped members would give their opinion upon it, and by the time he heard the remarks of others he might be able to put forward an amendment.

MR. MORAN: Having heard the heated speech of the leader of the Government, which one could expect, for no person liked to have his prophecies held up in all their falseness at the present time, he must say that had the people been led, as the people of Canada were, by men loyal to their own State first, and by being loyal to their own State were loyal to the Commonwealth, we would not be going cap-in-hand now with a clause like this one, binding a future Parliament, goodness knew how far ahead, to two millions of money. In the first place it was presumptuous on our part to take responsibilities.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The House had voted two million pounds in one night.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member was probably talking about the introduction of a Loan Bill for works Parliament had approved of. There was no such proposal before this Parliament. It was simply an idle pledge in an idle clause to do some good to someone outside the State. Parliament was not being bound by means of a Loan Bill for work Parliament had approved of. Who would say that the people of Western Australia in eight or nine years would approve of the railway?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Who had said that the people would approve of the Coolgardie Water Scheme?

MR. MORAN: The country had approved of it by keeping the men who advocated it in power so long, and by keeping those opposed to it out for so long.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Those who were out had to find the money.

MR. MORAN: It was a legacy left to the Government. The work had to go on. Who would say that Western Australia in a few years, when the railway would be started, would find two millions to build a broad gauge line to Kalgoorlie? The line should be one gauge throughout; and it would be a magnificent thing for Western Australia. The broader the gauge the better the line would be. Did the Premier think that in four or five years' time there would not be men in Parliament equally as wise as himself? Why should we introduce a clause like this into the Enabling Bill asking Western Australia to do something, if she

liked to do it, in eight or nine years? A future Parliament could not be bound to the line. In the case of the Coolgardie Water Scheme, the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth), if the work had not been started, would have gone back on the promise made. Why should he be able to go back on that, and yet deny to a future Parliament the right to do what it liked? One would think, to hear the heroics of the Premier, that he was the only man who had confidence in Western Australia, when he had opposed every single work that blessed Western Australia to-day. The Premier talked about having confidence in the country, and showing it by putting a clause in the Bill providing that in eight years' time somebody else would do certain works, and he asked why confidence was not shown in the country by voting for the clause. Confidence in the State was shown by carrying out a public works policy. The present Parliament was following in the footsteps of Sir John Forrest, and not varying one iota from his public works policy. The clause in the Enabling Bill meant nothing at the present time. It imposed no obligation for anybody to observe.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member said it meant nothing. It was an astonishing amount of talk about nothing.

MR. MORAN: It was necessary to show the country what a sham some people were who pretended to be something, and to show the people that it would be wrong to beg the question. It would be well to ask the Premier for an explanation regarding his wild whoop, when he recently wired all over the States that Western Australia would take the burden of the line on its own shoulders. Would the Parliament indorse the Premier's action in taking South Australia's burden? These matters must be mentioned. Was the Premier to pledge the country in this way? He (Mr. Moran) repudiated that suggestion entirely, and was not prepared to indorse it. Nor was he prepared to indorse the Premier's statement that Western Australia would take the burden of the whole of the railway. Why should the State take the burden of other States upon its shoulders? The clause did nothing, but in the future when negotiations were entered upon with South Australia, the statement that we

would sustain the burden of the loss would form a compact with that State, and Parliament should express an opinion on the point. The Premier had not expressed anybody's opinion, and was not speaking with a due sense of responsibility as leader of the Government when he caused it to be circulated through the other States that he would take over the burden of South Australia's interest. No harm would be done by passing the clause, because it was merely an idle waste of words, except that those viewing the State's financial position from afar off might mark it down as an obligation against our credit. If the line was to be finished inside six years, Western Australia would have to spend two more millions of money. Otherwise the Premier would break faith himself. The member for Cue knew well that, besides the State's present obligations, we could not justly pledge it to spend two millions within the next two years.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The State could do so.

MR. MORAN: The State could not do that. It was not wise to put the clause in the Bill. At the same time he thoroughly understood and hoped that when the line was built there would be a uniform gauge throughout Western Australia. He did not wish to see loading and unloading at Kalgoorlie; but it was not right to pledge the Parliament of the future. The clause would not aid the passage of the Bill in South Australia. The question would only come forward when the necessity to carry out the line arose, and probably it would then take the form of an agreement by negotiation. There would need to be an agreement as to rates, otherwise the Commonwealth might carry passengers from Kalgoorlie to Adelaide for five shillings per head, and few goldfields people would be seen in Perth. This aspect had not occurred to the Premier. The line would for a while take more people out of Western Australia than into it. It would not do to have a rate that would act disadvantageously against Western Australia. The Premier assumed an impertinent monopoly of the word "federalist" when he said that he was the only federalist, and that those who had urged the inclusion of a clause in the Constitution Bill

guaranteeing the Trans-Australian line were not federalists. Those people were the true federalists, and the Premier was the fumbler, who should not hug to his bosom the hope that he was the only federalist. Those who sought to have a guarantee of the Trans-Australian Railway line were right, and showed a little more wisdom than the Premier, and they were entitled to be listened to. The Committee should strike out the clause, and leave the Parliament of the future to make arrangements that must be made when negotiations were arranged for the building of the line. The matter, however, could be discussed to leave a record for the future. It should then either be dropped or a division taken. He was anxious above all things to see the Bill go through the Committee as soon as possible—to-night if possible. If the leader of the Opposition would move an amendment he would vote for it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Committee should deal with the question in the way that seemed best. He would support the clause, because he was very strongly disposed to the ownership of the railways in the State by the State itself. If the line was to be of a through gauge, somebody must make it. If the State were to make the line itself, there was no harm in stating in the Bill that it should be a through gauge. If it were proposed to ask the Federal Government to make the line, he objected, because altering the gauge of the line would confer ownership, which he hoped would not become the property of the Federal Government. At any rate the State should control the finished portion of the line. He was inclined to think that the direct effect would be that 3ft. 6in. would be the gauge fixed upon, and, if that were the case, all that would be required would be a heavier rail and a better form of road. South Australia had a large territory and comparatively small population, and would have to take up the responsibility of their portion of the line. Therefore they would be almost certain to insist upon a 3ft. 6in. gauge, because the bulk of their lines were of that gauge. If the engineers could show that, with a heavy rail and a good road the object of speed could be attained fairly satisfactory on the 3ft. 6in. gauge, South Australia

would certainly go in for that gauge. If that were the case a 3ft. 6in. gauge with heavier rails and a better road would be all that would be required from Kalgoorlie to Perth. No matter whether there was a Trans-Australian Railway or not, that road must be made. A most urgent necessity in the Railway Department was the construction of a more effective and heavier road from Kalgoorlie to Perth. If we could get an indication from South Australia of what gauge they were prepared to support, that would guide us as to what improvement we intended to make to our own line between here and Kalgoorlie.

MR. MORAN: What had that to do with South Australia?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The South Australian Bill had to be passed. We were dealing with an Enabling Bill at this stage to enable the Federal Parliament to build the line. Before they could build that line South Australia would have to pass a similar Bill, and it was quite possible that South Australia might decide that the gauge should be 3ft. 6in. and might insert it in their Bill. If that were done and approved by the engineers of the Federal Parliament, we should know what we were required to do before the railway was begun. The Premier had placed this matter in its proper light. We wanted to show the Federal Government and the whole of the Commonwealth that we were quite prepared to bear a reasonable proportion of the cost of this Trans-Australian Railway. The right proportion for us to bear would be the cost of the line under our own control, the part between here and Kalgoorlie. If we were really prepared, practically for the purposes of the Federal Government, to build at our own cost 500 miles of this Trans-Australian Railway, the least we could do was to ask them to build the other 1,000 miles. That would be the very best guarantee we could give, not only to the Federal Government but to the Commonwealth as a whole, that we looked upon this as a real practical scheme, as a financial scheme worthy of attention, and as a great trans-continental scheme which would benefit others as well as ourselves. The whole Commonwealth was involved. If there was one State which was going to benefit more than another,

it was South Australia. Consequently he had every confidence in urging that we should ask South Australia to construct her portion of the line and ask the Commonwealth to construct its portion, and in order that we might deal with this in a practical way we pledged ourselves to construct 500 miles which we ourselves would own; and, supposing there was never a federal railway, still that line had to be built.

MR. MORAN: If the Federal Parliament wanted to take over the whole of it, the hon. member would not, he supposed, build it?

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he would not give his vote for the Federal Parliament to take over the railways of the State. If the Federal Government proposed to take over the lines of the Commonwealth, the State that would suffer most was Western Australia.

MR. MORAN: What about this particular line?

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he had given his reasons for supporting the clause. He hoped the Committee, whether they approved of the clause or not, would go on with the Bill, and let us come to a determination.

MR. JACOBY doubted very much whether there was any strong desire on the part of the people of this State for this line. The hon. member who had just sat down had done his best, with the help of some other gentlemen, to arouse a little feeling in regard to this Trans-Australian Railway, but he (Mr. Jacoby) believed that at all the meetings they had held on the goldfields and in Perth and other places they had had a total of not more than a hundred persons present. There was absolutely no strong desire on the part of the people of this State to commit themselves to a very heavy expenditure, he felt sure, and he should regret very much indeed if we committed ourselves to a contingent expenditure of nearly two millions to build this line without the constituencies being consulted. This was a question that should be fought at election time on the hustings. We should then have to consider whether we should pledge ourselves to a very heavy public expenditure, or whether we should go on with the development of our own resources. If he might be allowed to look at this

question apart from the flappedoodle of the Premier—flappedoodle that had beguiled this State into a stupid contract in connection with Federation. Looking on it in an ordinary business light he would say that if the line was going to fulfil the first object a line of that description should do, that of providing adequate defence throughout the whole of Australia, that result would be adequately obtained even if there were a break of gauge at Kalgoorlie. One reason why we entered into Federation was to give us a union for the purpose of defence. We had handed over the whole of our defence to the Commonwealth, and were not in a position under the Commonwealth law to employ a single soldier. They were the only people who had the right to do so; and as we had not that right we wanted the Federal Parliament to give to those soldiers means of access to our State. The Premier had continually kept in mind the idea that it was absolutely necessary we should go in for a broad gauge railway, and he held out as his chief reason that it would sound very disagreeable indeed to globe-trotters and other people to have to be asked to "Change here for Perth" at Kalgoorlie. That was a very poor reason, and particularly as they would have to change in the other States. If we were going to prevent inconvenience to travellers by this line, we should do so by the building of a narrow gauge line, for in all probability a narrow gauge line would be built.

THE PREMIER : One would still have all the stoppages.

MR. JACOBY : No.

THE PREMIER : Yes; more stoppages.

MR. JACOBY : At the present time he doubted whether South Australia was in a position to do anything towards expenditure.

THE TREASURER : One would have to change at Terowie.

MR. JACOBY : If there were a narrow gauge it would be necessary to change between Adelaide and Kalgoorlie. [Interjection by the TREASURER.] No; he would be sorry to support the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) in connection with Federation, and he thought the hon. member was very sorry for the action he had taken. There was a very large

number of most important works absolutely necessary for this country, and this broad gauge line from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle was not absolutely necessary. The line now existing would serve our purposes for the present, even if we had a break of gauge at Kalgoorlie. It would be far wiser on our part to see what sort of success was made of that line before committing ourselves to such an enormous expenditure as was proposed in this Bill. To pass the Bill in one sitting was unfair. Better report progress.

THE PREMIER : This was the only contentious clause in the Bill.

MR. JACOBY : It involved two millions of money. For the last two sessions the Government preached "No more expenditure till we get rid of our present loan obligations and public works policy;" yet new works of great magnitude had been foreshadowed, and now another was mooted.

HON. F. H. PIESSE : The only matter which need now be dealt with was that embodied in the Bill, the authorisation of the Transcontinental line. Clause 4 might be struck out of the Bill, the usefulness of which would not be thus impaired. Guarantee to the Federal Parliament authority to construct the railway, and the question of gauge could be settled later. No doubt when the Federal Parliament seriously considered a railway from Port Augusta to this State, they would also consider the establishment of a uniform gauge throughout Australia, this being necessary for defence purposes. The Commonwealth might at a time nearer than many expected take over, as they could do, the whole of the Australian railway systems, in view of increase of population or of necessity for defence.

THE PREMIER : The clause was necessary to give the Commonwealth Parliament proof of our practical interest in the Transcontinental line.

HON. F. H. PIESSE : There was no present necessity to pledge the country to duplicating the Fremantle-Kalgoorlie line. There might be many changes before the question assumed a practical aspect. True, if the Commonwealth agreed to construct the railway to Kalgoorlie, we should be acting much against our interests did we refuse to continue it on the same gauge to Fremantle. But if

the South Australian portion were to be abroad-gauge line, probably the Commonwealth would make overtures to us as to the construction of the remaining portion, and these might meet with the approval of our Parliament. He would support an amendment to strike out the clause.

MR. PIGOTT: Full justification for his objections to the clause would be found in the speeches of the Premier and the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth). The latter said that the Fremantle-Kalgoorlie duplication must be built whether or not there was a Transcontinental line; and the Premier, in his second-reading speech, said we could not successfully overcome traffic difficulties until the line was duplicated. If so, were we to pass a clause which committed us to building the duplicate line on an unspecified gauge, to be decided by the Federal Government at any time within 10 years from now?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We could ascertain the gauge as soon as the survey was completed.

MR. PIGOTT: No; not until the contract was let. The clause would commit us to building the Fremantle-Kalgoorlie duplication on the gauge of the Transcontinental line. But all admitted that the present line to Kalgoorlie was insufficient and needed alteration. We must relay it on a 3ft. 6in. or a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, or duplicate it. If we passed the clause, we could not safely undertake any such work; for we might afterwards be obliged to complete the Transcontinental line from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle on a 5ft. 3in. gauge. Thus the clause would do great injustice to the State, and any work done on that line in the interim would be absolute waste of money.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: On the second reading he objected to the term "ten years," and wished to reduce it to five or at most to seven. The arguments of the last speaker supported his contention. It was certain we must do something with our Fremantle-Kalgoorlie line, but before touching it the final data for the Transcontinental line must be available, as the gauge between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie should be uniform with that between Kalgoorlie and South Australia. If the Bill were not passed so as to forward the Transcontinental project, we should not be able to discover the gauge

of the Commonwealth line; for the Commonwealth Government would not proceed with the survey till this Bill was passed.

MR. PIGOTT: What guarantee was there that they would proceed then?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The statement of the Prime Minister. The survey would occupy from two to three years or longer, and must decide the question of gauge; indeed, the gauge must be settled before the survey was undertaken. Once we knew the gauge we should have data for the necessary alterations in the Fremantle-Kalgoorlie line. If there was no other reason for the clause, we wanted it so as to find out for ourselves what gauge the Transcontinental Railway was to be built on if it was to be built at all; but the clause was to show our earnestness by a guarantee, and that guarantee consisted in doing a piece of work in our State which required to be done, and the nature of that work was to be decided by the question of gauge, which would be known when the survey of the Transcontinental line was started. A survey would not be started before the gauge was known. The State ought to know at the earliest possible moment what was the probable gauge of the Transcontinental line, for the reason that we must do something with the Perth-Kalgoorlie Railway, and if we knew what gauge the Transcontinental line was to be, the work in this State could be carried out according to that gauge. The only question in dispute was whether we should or should not give such a condition as would support our desire by a guarantee, and by giving the guarantee we were not losing much or involving ourselves in unnecessary expense, because we would have to go to considerable expense whether the Transcontinental Railway were built or not.

MR. GORDON: The chief objection taken by members was the liability to be thrown on the State. If the Federal Parliament said, "If we are prepared to build the Transcontinental line will you complete your portion to Fremantle?" we would at once agree to do that. In the face of the shipping interests and the other interests of the State, any Legislature in Western Australia would not dare say they would not undertake the work; therefore the retention of the

clause was necessary. Such a liability any Parliament would take on its shoulders. The member for West Perth in the course of "wild and woolly" statements had said that the matter of rate should be taken into consideration, for the Federal Parliament might consider it desirable to carry passengers from Kalgoorlie to South Australia or to Queensland for 5s., therefore we would lose our population. But the hon. member forgot that a few moments previously he had said that he could go to Queensland or any other part of Australia and induce settlers to come here. If that expedient would encourage settlement, then a 5s. rate would not take the people away from this country.

MR. PIGOTT: The member for Cue had ridiculed the idea which had been put forward on the difficulty of the question of gauge. That member stated that as soon as the survey was started we would know with an absolute certainty on what gauge the Transcontinental line was to be built? Was that member in a position to say that if the Federal Government authorised the survey of the line, that survey would be accepted for the route? There was some danger about that. He would support a Bill to-day for Western Australia to build the railway if the Commonwealth would join us on the other side.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Hear, hear.

MR. PIGOTT: There would be no difficulty in getting the money, and the country could pay for it. The Premier had stated that we should take into serious consideration immediately the necessity for altering or improving the present line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. If that was the case, when we passed the clause we were committing ourselves to build a line from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle on a gauge that was to be fixed by the Commonwealth and not by Western Australia. In that case the State might be committed to a double expenditure. If we passed the clause we could not improve or duplicate the present line, not knowing what gauge the Transcontinental line was to be.

THE PREMIER: Supposing the Federal Government decided to build the Trans-Australian line with a 4ft. 8½ in. gauge, would the hon. member let the 3ft. 6 in. gauge connect at Kalgoorlie?

MR. PIGOTT: Whatever the gauge was to be, it should go right through. We had a hard job to get money, and the Premier was committing the country to find money without any notice at all. If we raised a loan of two million pounds we should have to say to ourselves that the whole of the money might be required for the continuation of the Transcontinental line at any moment. He would agree to the clause if the Premier would allow him to add the following words: "Provided that the Commonwealth Parliament shall provide by loan for the State of Western Australia, if requested so to do by that State, a sum equal to the cost of the railway." When it came to raising the money it would be found that both the Commonwealth Government and the State of Western Australia were applying to the money market at the same time.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That would raise the rate a half per cent.

MR. PIGOTT: Who would pay the extra half per cent.?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Those who got the money.

MR. PIGOTT: What objection was there to saying that the money should be raised by the Federal Government? If Western Australia only built portion of the line, the Commonwealth would be competing with the State in the money market. We should get money through the Federal Government.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: All the loan money would come through them some day.

MR. PIGOTT: That day should come soon, when all the debts of the States would be taken over by the Federal Parliament. He would not move his amendment, because he saw it would have no chance. He would vote against the clause.

MR. NANSON: The Premier had followed the same line of argument when moving the second reading of the Bill. On that occasion his argument in favour of the clause was that it was necessary to show the State's sincerity; and so pleased was the Premier with the phrase that he had repeated it more than once. His sole argument was that it was necessary to show the State was in earnest with regard to the Trans-Australian Railway Bill, and he led the House to believe that we should not succeed in showing we were in earnest unless we

passed the clause. Surely it was incumbent on the Premier to give some indication as to why he had arrived at the conclusion that the people in the Eastern States or the Federal Parliament or Federal Government believed the people in Western Australia were not all united and not all desirous of having the railway. In the Federal Government there was Sir John Forrest working with might and main to persuade the people of the Eastern States that the railway should be built, and there were the State's representatives in the Federal Parliament speaking with one mind and with one voice on the subject. Again we knew the Press of the State and every member of the House declared that the railway must be built. It was now lamented on every platform in the State and in every newspaper that, when the State entered into Federation, there was no guarantee that, as a condition, the railway should be built. Why then should the Premier contend that it was necessary to incur an expenditure of two millions to show that we were sincere?

THE PREMIER: It was necessary because he did not judge people by words, as the hon. member did.

MR. NANSON: On one notable occasion the Premier had judged by words. When the State was being persuaded to enter into Federation, no man was more content to judge by the most empty form of words than the Premier. It might be for this reason the hon. gentleman was now somewhat sceptical as to words, and believed our anxiety in regard to this matter was so much doubted by the people of the other States that it was necessary to lay down a deposit of two millions sterling to show we were in earnest. The Premier kept to the same argument but varied the form of his words in supporting the clause, and said that unless we showed our sincerity we would not be taken seriously by the people of the Eastern States. What justification was there for that view? Speaking in Sydney several months ago the Premier had referred to the matter at a public dinner in a somewhat humorous manner. Surely the Premier, speaking in that way at a function of that sort, did not take the reception his remarks obtained as an indication that the people of the Eastern States were not

fully aware that the railway was the most cherished object of the people of this State? Did it not strike hon. members that, if we committed ourselves to an expenditure of two millions many years in advance of the time when it would be necessary, at the same time giving the Commonwealth Parliament 10 years to make the line, there might be a possibility that the Eastern States, instead of taking it seriously, might refuse to look upon the Assembly as a business Assembly in any sense of the word? If it were true, as the Premier seemed to suppose, that we were not taken seriously in the Eastern States, he could only conclude that the reason was that when the federal campaign was being waged in this State the Premier and those who stood on the same platform did not adopt the very ordinary and very common sense business precaution of seeing that before we entered the compact we made the bargain to get this railway in order to make Federation a reality instead of a sham, in order to make it a useful thing to us instead of something which was of very little use, and might possibly be injurious. Another aspect of the question was whether this expiring Parliament was justified in pledging the country to an expenditure of two millions. The clause at the present juncture was unnecessary. Supposing that within a few years the Trans-Australian Railway were built, did anyone imagine that after Australia had expended something like five millions sterling on that railway, we in Western Australia whom that railway was in great part intended to benefit would hesitate, so far as lay in our power, to expend such farther sum as might be necessary in order to make the rest of the Trans-Australian Railway as effective as possible. If it were decided to build the line on a broad gauge and that broad gauge ceased at Kalgoorlie, we should have to devise some means by which we could overcome the difficulty of a break of gauge. It might be possible to overcome that only by building a broad gauge railway; but if the line was not to be built until some 10 years had elapsed, would it be wise, when we considered the progress of inventions, to lay it down at this juncture that it was absolutely essential that there should be no break of gauge at Kalgoorlie? Another point was

that our financial resources and our credit had a limit. There were a number of other works which it was necessary to have constructed. There was the railway to connect Collie with the Eastern Goldfields; there was also the Pilbarra Railway; and there was the question of the purchase of the Midland Railway. There we had three works of magnitude, each of which would absorb a very large amount of money, and there were also a number of minor works. We should not be asked to pledge the State so far in advance in regard to this Trans-Australian Railway, and thus possibly block works which might be more important to the development of this State. There was one other feature of the case. It had been reported by the engineers who examined the route of the proposed Trans-Australian Railway that to build a line from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie would cost something like five millions. He believed that amount had been reduced by later estimates, but in round numbers the great bulk of the people in Australia thought, he believed, the railway was going to cost five millions. He did not believe that one per cent. of the people in Eastern Australia or the members of the Commonwealth Parliament had grasped the fact which was so plainly set forth in Clause 4 of this Bill, that if this railway was to be made effective, instead of costing five millions it would cost something like double that amount. To build a railway from Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta would cost, in round numbers, five millions, and in order to make that railway fully effective at our end we should, it was claimed by the Government, have to spend another one and a half millions to bring the broad gauge right down to the sea coast. We had to add that one and a half millions to the five millions, and that brought the amount to six and a half millions. Then we had to find additional rolling-stock, but we would put that out of consideration altogether. To make the railway effective at our end we had to spend one and a half million on the railway, and for the line to be effective at the other end it would be necessary to build a broad gauge railway from Port Augusta to Terowie to connect with the broad gauge system in South Australia, and bring the railway down on the broad gauge

system all the way from Port Adelaide, and it was very doubtful whether the Eastern States would be prepared to allow the railway to go in that direction, whether they would not wish it to go on the broad gauge right through the continent to Sydney. If that were done the cost of this railway was not going to be merely five millions, but the probability was, by the time we had rolling-stock and had made these farther broad gauge connections, it would be nearer ten millions than five millions, or at any rate very much more than five millions. When that was brought home to the people in the Eastern States and the Commonwealth Parliament, as it was likely it would be if this remained in the Bill, was it likely to help us in any way in pushing on with the line? It was equally reasonable to argue that when the great cost of this railway was illustrated to the people of the Eastern States they would use the clause not as an argument in favour of pushing on with the line, but as an argument for farther delaying it. The duty of the Committee at this stage was to affirm the one great principle that we wished railway connection between Eastern Australia and Western Australia, and we could not affirm that in a more satisfactory or emphatic manner than by simply passing this Enabling Bill and leaving the details to be dealt with at another stage. If we put Clause 4 in the Bill at this stage we were, so to speak, burning our boats, we were crossing the Rubicon, we would have gone forward and cut off our line of retreat; but if we refused at this stage to put the clause in the Bill it would always be open for us to reconsider our action. If we found that because this clause was left out the chances of the railway would be imperilled, there would not be very much delay, and it would be possible to bring in a Bill in the next session guaranteeing that we were prepared to spend money on the construction of a broad gauge railway to Kalgoorlie.

[MR. ILLINGWORTH took the Chair.]

THE TREASURER: The member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) paid a poor compliment indeed to certain members when he tried by a side-wind to draw them into a drag net and get

them to strike out this particular clause. There had been a great deal of talk on this Transcontinental Railway. We ourselves had not been satisfied that the Commonwealth Parliament were taking it up with all earnestness. Some members were and some were not. Wherever this State could give an evidence of that earnestness we were justified in doing so. Was there a member in this House or of this community who, if that line were authorised to-morrow, would not say that whatever gauge of line the Commonwealth constructed to Kalgoorlie, it would be necessary to complete that gauge to Fremantle? He did not think there was a member of the community who would oppose that argument. Such being the case we were practically only putting in this Bill what we ourselves would be prepared to do to-morrow, if the opportunity occurred. As to the promise of the South Australian Government to give permission for the line to be constructed through their territory, if we passed this clause that promise would in his opinion be absolutely binding, and would not be the idle word which the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) would try to lead this Committee to believe it to be. The clause was an honest pledge to do this work as soon as the Commonwealth began the Transcontinental line. Surely the majority of members wished to have the same gauge throughout. Let us by passing the clause show our belief in a venture which would benefit the whole of Australia. The member for the Swan (Mr. Jacoby) talked of a line for defence purposes only; but others saw a much better use for the line. It would bring us into closer contact with the rest of Australia. The member for West Perth talked of the rates which might be charged; but the Commonwealth Constitution Act provided for an inter-State commission to regulate rates; so there need be no dread on that score. True, the clause would commit the State to expenditure; but it was manifestly unfair to talk of two millions of money as if we had actually to float a loan at once. That sum might or might not be necessary. If the gauge selected by the Commonwealth were uniform with ours, there would be no expenditure. If it were desired to convince the rest of Australia that we were in earnest, we must undertake this

liability in the event of the Transcontinental gauge being different from that of our railways. He hoped members would not consider whether the Bill would affect other lines which they required, but would look at the question from a national point of view. It was said the Transcontinental line should have been made one of the conditions of Federation; but probably no constitution was ever framed containing such an unfederal clause as that granting Western Australia the sliding scale, thus enabling us to tax the products of the sister States through our customs.

MR. MORAN: What about British Columbia, which had ten years' fiscal freedom as well as a transcontinental railway?

THE TREASURER: Such a provision, no matter in what constitution, was conceived in an unfederal spirit.

MR. MORAN: And the capital was conceded to New South Wales.

THE TREASURER: The capital had to be somewhere, and New South Wales had not yet got it. By the clause the State would enter into a bond involving some responsibility, and would thus have a better standing with the people whom we wished to interest, notably those of South Australia. As to duplicating the Kalgoorlie line, it would not be likely that we should without grave consideration have two classes of rolling-stock in this State. But even did we duplicate the line and the Transcontinental Railway was subsequently constructed, then to receive the full benefit of that railway it would be necessary to alter the gauge of the State line, so that federal traffic could come through to Fremantle without break of gauge. Let members sink minor considerations and pass the clause.

MR. CONNOR: One or two points had been overlooked. He was of opinion when the Bill was first foreshadowed by the Premier, it was to be simply an Enabling Bill for a railway from Kalgoorlie to South Australia. Why depart from that intention, which would be respected by people in other States? Why should the Premier abuse everyone who differed from him in his attempts to cover up his mistakes in connection with the federal movement? He (Mr. Connor) would support the Bill if one or two alterations were made. He would

vote for striking out the clause. The country could not afford to pay at any future time one and a half millions; and this Government of all others should be opposed to such a promise—the Government which preached retrenchment and no more works expenditure, and tried unduly to cut down the civil service. Yet here was a little scheme to gratify the Premier's own vanity, and involving a vote of one and a half millions. The people most affected by the Transcontinental Railway would not be those on the coast, but the goldfields people. Were the latter asking for the railway? The Minister for Lands said yes; but there was no clamour on the goldfields for the line, but rather opposition to it. By travelling on the goldfields and reading the goldfields newspapers he (Mr. Connor) knew that the goldfields people wanted the Esperance line and not the Transcontinental. No doubt they must ultimately get the Esperance Railway; but were we to charge ourselves with the responsibility involved in the clause, so that we should not be able to build any other railway in the State? By the Transcontinental line the goldfields people only would benefit. As soon as the line was built, the present traffic between the coast and the fields or the bulk of it would go straight from Kalgoorlie to South Australia. Suppose what was known as the "common rule" came into force, as it probably would, the State would lose its shipping trade at Fremantle. What would then be done with the broad-gauge line to Kalgoorlie? Why, we should then be almost justified in pulling up the present line. Yet members talked of spending $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions. He favoured the railway from Kalgoorlie to the South Australian border, to be built by the Commonwealth, or later by ourselves if we could afford it; but nothing was now necessary but to pass an Enabling Bill for that railway, and let the Commonwealth build it if they choose. Much had been said of breaks of gauge, and the impossibility of a Transcontinental line without a uniform gauge from South Australia to Fremantle. Most members had travelled from Adelaide to Brisbane, and knew that there was a break of gauge before reaching Sydney, and another at the Queensland border. Well, if changes of gauge were good enough for people travelling through such important States

as those, with ten times our traffic, why should we growl at a break of gauge at Kalgoorlie? Too much sentiment had been introduced into the discussion. He appealed to members not to tie themselves down to the hard and fast lines of the Bill, but to vote for an enabling measure to build the railway with no other clause in it.

MR. MORGANS: A great deal of outside matter had been introduced into this discussion. The Committee had to consider whether or not Clause 4 was necessary to the Bill. He was a very strong supporter of the construction of the Trans-Australian Railway, and as far as he was concerned his views on the question were so pronounced that he would be prepared to pledge the Government to the expenditure of two millions or a million and a half in order to get this important work carried successfully through. The object of the clause was to impress upon the people of the other States that we were in earnest over the construction of the railway. If that was so, the Committee had to consider whether the clause was necessary for the purpose. Was it necessary that we should prove by the clause that we were in earnest, or was any farther proof of our earnestness necessary than that given at the present time. Rather than see the railway placed in jeopardy, he would be prepared to vote for the clause; at the same time the remarks of the leader of the Opposition and the member for the Murchison were very weighty, and deserved consideration. There were many points in the question of the alteration of gauge on our railway from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. The country was agreed that some change would have to be made within a short date in the running of that railway. Supposing the Commonwealth Government decided to construct a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, then we should have to abandon the 3ft. 6in. gauge as well as the whole of the rolling-stock on our system. That was a very serious matter for consideration. Owing to the uncertainty when this gauge to be adopted by the Commonwealth Government would be known, the hands of this country would be tied in any alteration we might wish to make. There was another way to get over the difficulty. A third rail might be laid down for the use of the Commonwealth

railway; that was the system that had been adopted in many parts of the world, and he remembered very well that for a long time a section of one of the largest railways in England—the Great Western railway—was run on two gauges. When the line was constructed under the supervision and advice of Mr. Brunell, the great engineer, he adopted a 7ft. gauge. After that the standard gauge became more common in England. The Great Western Company was competing with other railways in England which were built on the 4ft. 8½in. gauge, which was then known in England as the narrow gauge, and in order to compete successfully a third rail was laid down, and for many years the traffic on that railway, from Faddington to the West of England, was worked on two gauges. There was an escape from this difficulty. Suppose the Commonwealth Government decided to put down the broader gauge, and in the meantime it was found necessary to duplicate the 3ft. 6in. gauge, the difficulty could be overcome by laying down a third rail, and in that case the expense would not be so great for the Government to face; so that after all in discussing this point those who were against the clause in the Bill rather exaggerated the difficulties that might result from the adoption of the clause. Having tried to put fairly the two views on the question before the House, he would ask, was it absolutely necessary for the success of the Bill that the clause should remain in its present form? Was it absolutely necessary for the Government to stand on this clause and to create dissension in the Committee as to its merits? If the Government could see their way to make some alteration in the clause in order to emphasise what they desired to prove, our good faith in the matter and the desire to have the railway built, the clause might be altered in some way. Where the clause said “the construction of the first-mentioned railway the State of Western Australia”—instead of saying “will commence the construction of the railway,” strike out the word “commence” and insert the following—“will at once take into consideration with a view to the immediate construction of a railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle.” That was a slight alteration which he suggested would entirely

remove the difficulty raised to-night. It would not alter the force which the Government desired to give to the clause, the force of proving our good faith to the people of the other States. If this were adopted, then the change could be made, and any farther discussion on the clause would cease. That, he thought, would give satisfaction to both sides. If the Government were prepared to give consideration to the proposal he would move the amendment. There were many points raised by members which the Government should take into consideration. We did not want to tie our hands too far ahead. The question of gauge was going to cause serious difficulty, not only here but in the other States, for the reason that the Queensland gauge was 3ft. 6in., the New South Wales gauge was 4ft. 8½in., the Victorian and South Australian gauge was 5ft. 3in., and our gauge was 3ft. 6in. Supposing the Commonwealth Government decided to adopt the standard gauge of 4ft. 8½in., there would be strong opposition on the part of Victoria and South Australia to an alteration of their gauge, and they would have the same difficulty that we had. When the question came within the sphere of practical politics it would cause an immense amount of discussion and debate, and a great many difficulties would arise. In view of that, if the Government could see their way to make this slight alteration, we could get over the difficulty. It was very unfortunate to the cause of this great national work that any serious discussion should take place in regard to it. We should be unanimous, and he hoped that before the Committee decided on the question we should make up our minds to assist the Government in every possible way to carry the Enabling Bill through. By that means we could give proof to the other States of our great desire for the railway. He sincerely hoped no question of party or opposition, or any other question, would intervene in the discussion to-night, because we were dealing with one of the greatest of Australia's national works; therefore he appealed to the Premier and the Government to do something to amend the clause in such a way as to avoid the difficulties that existed, at the same time to do what the Government wished to do—prove to the people of the

other States our earnestness and desire for the construction of this great railway.

THE PREMIER: It was because he indorsed entirely the concluding observations of the member for Coolgardie, when he stated that the Trans-Australian Railway was a great national work, that he had inserted Clause 4, which excited so much opposition from the anti-federalists. He expected this, because they could not grasp the broad view of Federation against the narrow view of parochialism. Speaking of it as a great national work, he could not contemplate the possibility of that work being carried from the Eastern States, wherever it might start, to Kalgoorlie within the boundaries of Western Australia, and there being mutilated by a change of gauge. To all who took a broad view in this connection it would not be wrong to impress, as we did by the Bill and by our advocacy in connection with the Bill, upon the Federal Parliament the obligation to build the line as a national work, and to say that we ourselves were not prepared to do all in our power to stamp that line from its commencement to the terminal point with the impress of a national work. The Federal Parliament were called on to consider the question of gauge, and they must be the arbiters if they were called on to foot the cost. Should they decide on the 4ft. 8½ in. gauge and that gauge terminated at Kalgoorlie, very few members in the House, and certainly fewer people in the community, would be prepared to look with satisfaction on a condition of affairs which would contemplate the possibility of the Federal line being 4ft. 8½ in. and our State line being 3ft. 6in. On the face of it that would be asking them to undertake a national work on national lines while we refused to undertake the work of completing it on such lines. If, on the other hand, the Federal Government came to the conclusion that a 3ft. 6in. gauge was the correct gauge, no burden would arise by Clause 4. The difficulties in the mind of the member for Coolgardie were difficulties that would need to be solved by the constructing engineers, who would be the persons to make up their minds, having regard to all the difficulties of break of gauge in

the different States. However, if once that point were determined, then would arise the obligation of this State to complete the national work, and not allow it inside our borders to be mutilated by a break of gauge at Kalgoorlie. We would deprive Clause 4 of all vitality and of all force if we inserted the words suggested, that on the completion of the Federal line we should take the matter into consideration. That did not convey any obligation at all.

MR. MORGANS: It obviated the guarantee.

THE PREMIER: The guarantee should be on the face of the Bill. We ought to use all our power to prevent the national work being stopped short of its full utility by a break of gauge at Kalgoorlie. The House should agree to the clause, because it impressed upon the line the national view that it would be a national line for the national benefit, and should not end at Kalgoorlie and then be controlled by purely State considerations. There were also State reasons why the broad gauge line should be built; but that view could be eliminated for the present.

MR. PIGOTT: What would be done if the Federal Parliament did not consent to build the railway?

THE PREMIER: The clause would not be operative. It would not affect the State's intentions with regard to the existing railway. The clause would only spring into life when the Federal Government commenced the construction of their line.

MR. MORAN: Three or four lines could be built to Kalgoorlie if necessary.

THE PREMIER: The more lines the State was justified in building the greater the promise of the future. To eliminate local considerations weakened his argument, but he desired to impress the national spirit. The House should agree that, when the Federal Government should commence the construction of their line, which it was hoped would be a national line, it should be continued from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle on the same gauge and on the same weight of rails, so far as it affected speed and comfort, as the Federal Parliament built their line with.

MR. MORGANS: Could that not be taken for granted by the Federal Parliament?

THE PREMIER: It could not. If Clause 4 were eliminated, an Enabling Bill would be passed asking the Federal Parliament to construct the line, while it would be necessary to rely for the proof of our sincerity on words. The Eastern States would say that eloquence, even the Gladstonian eloquence of the member for the Murchison, was no test of sincerity, because Western Australia only had to pay a small fraction of the cost, the bulk of the cost falling upon the population of the Eastern States. They needed evidence to show that there was sincerity in Western Australia, which State asked the Commonwealth to construct the line and asked the other States to bear more than nine-tenths of the expense. By putting in Clause 4 there was some guarantee outside empty words, so that the Bill might be impressed with a clear indication that we were sincere, and that we asked for the construction of the line as a national work, which would be justified from a financial aspect. We should give evidence to the remaining portion of the Commonwealth that we believed the line would be a financial success, but this could not be done unless we committed ourselves to a financial obligation.

MR. MORGANS: The Premier should remember that South Australia and Victoria had to commit themselves to similar obligations, if his arguments were good.

THE PREMIER: What he was dealing with was the construction of the line from Kalgoorlie to the border. At Port Augusta we came into contact with the Eastern Railway system. It did not necessarily follow even then that, if we wanted to get communication with the Eastern States, we must go through Victoria on separate rails. We were now only going on the assumption that we were building a line on part of the route to Port Augusta. Should we be justified, because we had not power to remove all difficulties, in refusing to remove difficulties which we could deal with? Let us remove the difficulties as far as we could, and he believed that if we could do that the more difficulties we removed now the greater power would there be to remove whatever difficulties remained. If we could show that here in Western Australia we believed this line

would be a financial success, and showed our belief not only by words but by the guarantee afforded by Clause 4, that would be an example which would, he thought, be more or less infectious. When we expressed the conviction that this line would be a national line and would as a financial proposition justify itself, there could be no possible danger in Clause 4. If we did not believe that, let Clause 4 be struck out; but in the name of fair play let not members get on to a platform and endeavour to assure the Eastern States that the line would pay, when they were not prepared to pledge themselves to that effect by Clause 4.

MR. HARPER: The Premier was splendid when he talked of high politics or the federal spirit; but when he got to anything practical he generally blundered. The hon. gentleman had asked this State to sacrifice its trade on the railways in the interests of Federation.

THE PREMIER: That was a statement; let the hon. member prove it.

MR. HARPER: The hon. gentleman used, he thought, the expression that we should not throttle or check the trade at Kalgoorlie. Then he urged this country strongly to commit itself to that, to show its *bona fides* to the Eastern States. At the same time he must know very well that before that through train could run he must ask South Australia and Victoria to lift the whole of their line from Terowie to Albury, and change it into the one agreed upon, or else build a new line from Terowie to New South Wales *via* South Australia and Victoria. The Premier had stated that the people who were going to settle this gauge were the experts. Was it to be supposed that the people in South Australia and Victoria were going to allow the whole of their railway system to be broken up just on the views of some experts?

THE PREMIER: We were assuming the line was built now.

MR. HARPER: The hon. gentleman had never told us what that line was.

THE PREMIER: Yes; a line from Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie.

MR. HARPER: We were to be asked to break up our gauge without the other States having agreed to break up theirs.

THE PREMIER: Was that any reason why we should not do our duty?

MR. HARPER: Exactly; because they would be saved the expense of doing it, and the cost would be put upon us. The objection of the Premier as to there being a break of gauge would still exist in regard to those States.

THE PREMIER: Then the hon. member thought that as long as we had one break of gauge we might have a hundred?

MR. HARPER: The hon. gentleman wanted us to overcome the break of gauge while others did not do it.

THE PREMIER: As far as we could.

MR. HARPER: It would be quite time enough for us to do it when the others did it.

THE PREMIER: That was a narrow way of doing it.

MR. HARPER: It was in his opinion a very broad way. The hon. gentleman was not practical. He was fixing on this State that Western Australia was prepared to do anything in the interests of Federation, and the other States were not to do it. He was quite prepared to let this State bear all the expense of a break of gauge, without providing that others should bear such expense.

THE PREMIER: What he suggested was that we should attend to our own business, and do the best we could.

MR. HARPER: The hon. gentleman said that the gauge was to be fixed by experts, but he (Mr. Harper) said it was not, and that it was going to be fixed by the States. South Australia and Victoria were not going to pull up the hundreds of miles of railway from Terowie to Albury to satisfy either railway experts or the Premier of Western Australia.

THE PREMIER: That they were he had never contended.

MR. HARPER: No; but the Premier was quite content to let this State bear all the inconvenience, though the other States had not agreed to bear any.

THE PREMIER: Let us do our duty without worrying about them.

MR. HARPER: The duty should rest on all the States. Surely that was the basis of Federation.

THE PREMIER: Do our duty, relying on their doing theirs.

MR. HARPER: And the Premier would do that in advance?

THE PREMIER: Undoubtedly.

MR. HARPER: Supposing those States declined for 10 or 20 years to alter their gauges, were we to suffer for that time for the sake of the Premier's desire to be superior to all practical business arrangements between the State and the Commonwealth? We were to sacrifice ourselves and to set an example, not minding whether the other States followed.

THE PREMIER objected to the word "sacrifice."

MR. HARPER: We were not justified in committing this State to expend two millions. The figure would not be $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions; for he did not care a fig for the Premier's estimates, which would not be borne out by any calculation based on the cost of railways in Western Australia.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member did not care for engineers. The estimates were engineers' estimates.

MR. HARPER: Of what use were they when the engineers were instructed to bring in estimates to support as strongly as possible a Ministerial policy? That was a very old dodge, which he had seen practised many a time, and so had the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes). Were we justified in obliging this State to spend two millions of money without knowing whether the other States would reciprocate?

THE PREMIER: If that contention were correct, we ought not to pass the Bill.

MR. HARPER: We ought not to pass this clause, anyhow.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: The last speaker was in error in comparing the broad gauge of South Australia with our gauge, in respect of the alteration which would be necessary. If we had a 5ft. 3in. gauge from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie there would be no necessity to alter that gauge; for with it we could run trains as fast as would be necessary, or as fast as they could be run on a 4ft. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. gauge. But the railway authorities of the Eastern States were of opinion that the whole of the Commonwealth railways should be made of 4ft. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. gauge—the standard gauge of the world. For defence purposes there must be a broad and uniform gauge from Queensland to North-West Australia. He was of opinion that the cost of altering the Fremantle-Kalgoorlie line from a 3ft. 6in. to a 4ft. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. gauge would not be more

than £600,000. The 388 miles of rails existing could be used for the lines mentioned by the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson), together with the rolling-stock and sleepers, which would be worth from £1,200 to £1,500 a mile. All the earthworks were constructed between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie; and for the broad-gauge line we should have to find only rolling-stock, rails, and sleepers. There would be no difficulty in laying a 4ft. 8½in. line, and running a 3ft. 6in. line at the same time.

MR. HARPER: With the same curves and grades?

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: As to curves, the first part of the line through the hills, and the tunnelling, must perhaps be altered; but after leaving Spencer's Brook the curves would not affect the broader gauge. Through the Blue Mountains in New South Wales the curves were much more severe than in our Darling Ranges; but that was a mistake, and we had better spend a few pounds to make our curves and grades easier. Sleepers and rolling-stock for the new Fremantle-Kalgoorlie line would cost, say, a million; the value of the present rails and sleepers would be £400,000; and it must not be forgotten that within the last 12 or 18 months the whole of the sleepers between Perth and Kalgoorlie had been altered from 8 by 4 to 9 by 4½, so that the sleepers were practically new; and the whole of the rails from Midland Junction to Kalgoorlie had been relaid, and there was in them 20 years' life, so that it would pay to take them up and use them for other lines. The member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) spoke of the members for the South-West and their local requirements. Surely there was not a South-Western member who would not give up his pet scheme to see the Transcontinental Railway constructed. Much as he (Mr. Smith) thought of the Bunbury breakwater as a State proposition, he thought the Transcontinental line of far greater importance. To show our earnestness in urging the construction of the line we must pass the clause. The term mentioned in Clause 6 should be shortened; but to adopt the suggestion of the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) would not show the *bona fide* spirit by which we were actuated; and the people in the

East would say we were not much in earnest.

MR. NANSON: If there was one Bill which it was generally thought would pass without a dissentient voice, it was the Bill to authorise the Commonwealth Government to construct a Transcontinental Railway. It was impossible that this discussion would not do harm to the chance of this railway, and the blame for that state of affairs would rest on the shoulders of the Government. There was absolutely no necessity to introduce controversial matters into the Bill. It had never been suggested in the Eastern States that we were not sincere in regard to the railway. The first person who made that discovery was the Premier, and it was a figment of his own imagination. It had not been said that Western Australia was not absolutely sincere on the question. One had only to go to the Eastern States and to meet Sir John Forrest and see him advocating the question to show that the most representative Western Australian was absolutely sincere on this point. Yet we had our Premier not satisfied with bringing the point up in his second-reading speech and in the first speech in Committee, but bringing it up again a few moments ago that it was necessary to prove our sincerity; and members who supported the action of the Government declared that it was necessary to prove our sincerity. No one could establish a proposition by affirming it again and again. It was incumbent on the Government and those who supported them to show where our sincerity was impugned. Who challenged our sincerity? The only person who had done that was the person who made the insinuation in the first place, the Premier, by hinting at other persons believing we were insincere on the point. The argument had never have been heard of before, and his (Mr. Nanson's) own idea on the subject was that the Premier, when it became necessary to bring forward some sort of argument in favour of the clause, was in difficulties to invent an argument. Why put a preamble in the Bill of an extraordinary length and of an unusual character? When the Premier talked so much of insincerity, there was a possibility that he was not as sincere as he should be on the question.

He did not impress people with his sincerity by reiterating his belief. Why should we not be sincere on this question? Why should we not wish for this line? Was there any possible reason it should be said we did not wish it? Was not our existence as a portion of the Commonwealth bound up in the construction of this railway? It was not an astonishing thing that we should be sincere, but that we possibly could be insincere. The argument was lacking in force. It was a childish argument to use in the first place, and no one dreamt of using it until the Premier brought it forward. Members were not asked, in dealing with this clause, to vote against a policy that was set forth in the clause. All that they were asked to do was to postpone taking the final action in regard to it, and the member for Coolgardie had pointed out what controversial questions arose on the matter of gauge. At present we were not called on to deal with that. There was a proverb which said "first catch your hare before you cook it." It would be more practicable to defer the question of gauge until we got a survey of the railway made. It would be a factor achieved when we got the Commonwealth Parliament to agree to a survey of the line. When the route was surveyed, then would be the time to deal with all points of detail. He did not doubt, and he did not suppose any member doubted, that if it was proved it was necessary to make a broad-gauge railway, we should have to build our line. The action which we were asked to take in Clause 4 was premature, and could be taken at a later stage next session. The other aspect was that if we put this clause in the Bill at this stage, we were taking a final and irrevocable step from which there was no turning back. If we delayed for a little time we could deal with the matter next session equally as well as this session. No one supposed, if we eliminated the clause from the Bill, that we were going to imperil the making of a survey of the railway. It was easy for us, if we made a mistake by not putting the clause in the Bill, to remedy it next session or the following session; but if we made a mistake by insisting on the insertion of the clause, it would be most difficult to retrace our steps without lay-

ing ourselves open to the imputation that already had been cast at the sister State of South Australia, or one of the past Premiers there, of a breach of faith in the matter. If we put the clause in the Bill we must stand by it; therefore he asked members to look at the question not as a matter of detail, but from a broad point of view. If we delayed it now there was nothing to prevent our dealing with it effectually at a later stage. No one suspected, when it was first suggested that an Enabling Bill should be introduced, that into the Bill would be placed all manner of controversial matters. As he had already stated, it would be infinitely better if the clause was left out, so that the Bill could be passed in the shortest possible time and with acclamation. Something had been said about parochial motives in dealing with this question, and he (Mr. Nanson) had been taken to task by the Treasurer for importing into this question the consideration of other great public works in this State. If we were to look at the matter from a common-sense point of view, which the Premier was pleading for the other night, we must see that when we were deciding a question of expenditure of upwards of a million sterling, we could not do so without looking to the other needs of the State. If we were going to settle upon spending a million and a-half or two millions of money in the building of a railway before we came to the final conclusion, we should ask ourselves what were the other works we required, and he had mentioned three or four other works: half-a-dozen might have been mentioned. If we looked at the matter as business men we were bound, to a certain extent, to cloud our view by the recognition of other needs of the State. This was a great need undoubtedly, but there were other needs. Let us postpone the matter so far as the consideration of the broad-gauge railway from Kalgoorlie to the coast was concerned until the next session, and upon general principles pass the Enabling Bill. Not in a single instance had the Premier shown that we were insincere, and so far from answering the arguments brought forward, the Premier had indulged in personal remarks.

MR. PIGOTT: The Premier was not correct in saying that anyone who voted

against the clause was really opposed to the principle of the Trans-Australian line. That was a most unfair statement to make. Though he (Mr. Pigott) was of opinion that the line should be of one gauge throughout, he did not think at the present time we were doing our duty to the country by passing the clause. We did not know when the railway was to be built. It might not be built for 15 years, and we were to hang up the present line in its present condition, or run the risk of building it on a broader gauge.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: The line had just been re-laid.

MR. PIGOTT: Yet the Premier said that, no matter whether the Trans-Australian line was built or not, the line to Kalgoorlie would need to be re-laid.

THE PREMIER: It might be necessary to duplicate it, was what he said.

MR. PIGOTT: If money was to be spent it should be spent on public works, where it would be well spent. We should make the line to Kalgoorlie as complete as it was possible to make it. If the Committee decided to alter the gauge to Kalgoorlie, by all means it should be made a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, instead of duplicating the present 3ft. 6in. gauge. There was a danger in the clause that we would be throwing away our right to do so. No one questioned the sincerity of the State. The Trans-Australian Railway was a fad in the mind of the Premier, who considered that the railway would be a panacea for all ills. The Premier had stated in Queen's Hall that as soon as the railway was built he would accept, on behalf of Western Australia, the "common rule" clause lately thrown out by the Federal Government. In other words the Premier would sacrifice Western Australia to any extent provided the Trans-Australian Railway was built. The truth of the matter was that the Premier had given his word that, if Western Australia joined Federation, the railway would be built, and he wanted the railway to be built in order to prove his word true. The clause should not be passed.

MR. YELVERTON: The country should not be pledged to the unnecessary expenditure of one and a-half to two millions of money. The greatest curse that could befall any country in the

matter of railways, except the curse of incompetent management, was a break of gauge. For that reason he opposed the 4ft. 8½in. line to Kalgoorlie, unless the 3ft. 6in. line was retained. The construction of the 4ft. 8½in. line to Kalgoorlie should only be agreed to conditionally that South Australia and Victoria would agree to alter their 5ft. 3in. gauge to a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, so that there might be one line right through from Fremantle to Sydney.

MR. MORAN: The country should not be committed to the expenditure of a million and three-quarters in such a haphazard fashion, and should thoroughly understand the result of the division that would take place. It was usually considered the part of a responsible Government to take the country into confidence before going into a heavy loan expenditure of any kind. That was one of the principles the Premier used to fight for in times gone by; it was one of the many things he had abandoned of late. We were asked by the very man who railed against Sir John Forrest for committing the country to unauthorised expenditure over a hospital, when typhoid fever was about, to deduct for no earthly reason from the credit of the country, without sanction, some two million pounds. [MR. DIAMOND: It was only a contingency.] It must prejudice every other loan, and was no laughing matter. It was to be regretted very much that the same bungling rashness and inconsiderate action which led to precipitate entry into Federation, had led the Premier to introduce into such a simple little Bill a fad of his own. The Premier was a faddist, known throughout the State as such. No big Bill came down to the House but contained some little fad of the Premier's; and now the Premier had his heart set on getting into this Bill a ridiculous clause about some gauge which the Federal Government might adopt in the future; but the results were most serious, no matter how ridiculous the Premier's contention might be. One could discuss a proposal to build a line from Collie to the Goldfields the freer if it were not for the superimposing weight of £2,000,000 upon our shoulders. It was not for us to say, if this clause was carried, when the Federal Parliament would choose to start this railway. They

had power to start within five years, and they might start at any moment. We were not going to stand still in our public works policy for five years; yet at any moment when we were talking of the construction of two or three railway lines, we might hear from the Federal Parliament that the Bill had been carried to start the Trans-Australian Railway, and we should be bound by our pledge to start a work that would cost a million and three-quarters. We should have to do that in addition to other works. The clause was unnecessary, and most unfair to the country. It would be placing Western Australia in a condition of grave uncertainty financially, for she would never know when she would be called upon to undertake the expenditure of a million and three-quarters. The seriousness of the break of gauge at Kalgoorlie was entirely overdone by the Premier. He (Mr. Moran) said, "Suppose this national railway line would be owned by the nation?" and the Premier said "We would give them running rights." The hon. gentleman would give them the right to run the unprofitable part from Kalgoorlie; but we should keep the profitable end from Kalgoorlie down to Fremantle. This Bill would have been passed at seven o'clock this evening, if the Premier had not put one of his own fads into it, and it would have been law inside a day or two. The division on this question would be wired all over Australia, and it would read that the Railway Enabling Bill as introduced by the James Government, was passed by, let us say, 19 against 18. That would be the unanimity of opinion referred to. We were so kind and generous to the other States that we did not consider the Western Australian taxpayers. The Western Australian taxpayers simply paid the piper. The present Parliament in their last session were endeavouring, without authority from the electors, to pledge the country to build a broad-gauge line to Kalgoorlie. The passing of this clause to-night would be used as an argument in favour of extreme caution in authorising future public works in the State. It would kill the Collie Railway if we had hanging over us an additional burden of £1,170,000, taking the Premier's figures. The Collie line would cost £120,000 to £150,000; the Pilbarra line £120,000;

and as our railways cost us £5,000 a mile, these railway proposals contemplated an additional 270 miles. The deep drainage of Perth was estimated to cost half a million, and the Fremantle graving dock another half-million. The Kalgoorlie-Norseman railway represented another 120 miles, at £5,000 a mile; and there was the Magnet-Lawlers line also. If the Government did not intend to build these lines, then we might lightly take the responsibility proposed by the clause. Moreover, it was the policy of the country to buy the Midland Railway at a reasonable price. That might involve one and a-quarter millions, or say a million. The total expenditure thus indicated would be about four and a-half millions, and this clause would be passed at the expense of these works, though they deserved every consideration. They would not be retarded by a simple Enabling Bill, for the Federal Government would give due notice of their desire that we should construct a broad-gauge line to Kalgoorlie. Had a plain Enabling Bill been introduced such as Sir John Forrest asked for, without contentious matter, the wire would have carried throughout Australia the news that Western Australia had unanimously passed her Enabling Bill. But the State had some representatives who, even to secure the goodwill of the Eastern States, were not prepared, without consulting the electors, to pledge the State to a loan of two millions. When future public works proposals were considered, the truth of his remarks would appear, and the people would ask why the Government had, without authority, pledged the country to this expenditure. However, if the clause passed, it would probably have to run the gauntlet somewhere else; and a much maligned other place might consider that the policy of the country should follow the precedents of the past.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. J. M. Hopkins): After the diatribes and high-falutin' travesties of the members for West Perth (Mr. Moran) and the Murchison (Mr. Nanson), the Committee might proceed to business.

MR. MORAN drew attention to the state of the House.

Bells rung and quorum formed.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was a remarkable thing that the member for West Perth should in his time have sat behind a Government which had floated loans to the amount of seven and a-half millions in one year, and could now stand up and intimate that if Clause 4 were carried the whole of the public works policy of Western Australia would be abrogated. It did not need much consideration to show how absurd was that contention. Were we to understand that the opinion of the member for West Perth was that the resources of Western Australia had reached such a low ebb that, with the announcement that the Western Australian Government had carried a Bill for the construction of a railway to join the two ends of the continent together in that bond of union which had been looked forward to, and because Western Australia had to raise over a million of money, this country was to sacrifice the whole of her public works policy? Even if the money had been raised for the other nominal purposes which had been stated, and the construction of this railway was at stake, he undertook to say, even if it came to the reappropriation of the moneys raised for the works enumerated, not only would Parliament but the people of Western Australia would willingly indorse the action of the Government, who would bring in a Reappropriation Bill for establishing that bond of union between the East and Western portions of Australia. The member for West Perth was the one man in the House who was capable of opposing the Premier and the Government. The member for the Murchison had thrown his lassoes round the Chamber. He had spoken of the Collie-Great Southern Railway and of the construction of the dry dock at Fremantle. Were the people of the South-Western districts prepared to sacrifice the Transcontinental Railway because it might postpone the building of their line? Was the building of the Transcontinental Railway to jeopardise the building of this agricultural railway? The member for the Murchison trotted out the proposition of the Midland Railway. That work, when sold, could only find one customer. A proposition which had been running so many years and had never paid a dividend could not be classed

as a marketable article. It could not be placed in London or in any other market, and at present the only party to negotiate for the purchase of that railway was the Government, and the Government would not be required to float a loan for the purpose, but could issue bonds, the interest on which they would be required to pay. This was one of the questions on which it might have been expected the member for the Murchison would have come forward with one of those fervent appeals when he spoke of those great social forces ever moving onward and the banner floating over our sunken heads which would also float again in the future to far distant victory. That also represented an extract, almost word for word, from a speech Mr. Gladstone made many years ago. He was beginning to think that, throughout the debates that had characterised the last few sittings of the House and the Committee, a great deal of attention had been directed to party politics by members sitting on the Opposition cross-benches.

MR. MORAN: Entirely directed to party politics. He desired to put an end to the rotten Ministry that existed.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: If that word "rotten" could be taken in its entirety, and if the Ministry could be measured and put on a par with the member for West Perth, then a change might be necessary in the administration of the country. One thing to be thankful for in connection with the debate was that there had been no references to the liberties of the people, and none of the grand constitutional platitudes that formed the bulk of the remarks of certain hon. members. There was no doubt as to what the division would be. The people of the Eastern Goldfields were practically unanimous in their desire to see the railway built. There was not one representative in the House for the Eastern Goldfields not pledged to do his best towards its construction, always recognising that the railway would form a connecting link with the Eastern States, with which the people on the goldfields had the very happiest associations. One thing struck the new arrival from the Eastern States, and that was how little of the State was known to the Eastern portion of Australia. Since the mail boats had called

at Fremantle the capital and the seaport had become better known; but there could be no progress of the State until knowledge of it was made universal, nor could there be any expansion of settlement until that result was achieved. If we wanted the railway we should be prepared to accept some financial obligation to get it. The Bill had been introduced in the best form possible. The division would be one which would emphatically state the desire of Western Australia to secure the building of the railway, and would show at the same time that the State was coincidentally willing to accept a share of the responsibility which the construction of the railway might entail.

MR. TAYLOR moved that progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. THOMAS: One could not record a silent vote on the question. Remarks had been made by the Premier that any person voting against Clause 4 was an opponent of the railway, and that no man who was a federalist could possibly support the striking out of the clause; and farther that the debate was a fight between the federalist and the anti-federalist. Having recorded his vote for Federation, and being a strong believer in the railway, he (Mr. Thomas) resented such an imputation. He would vote to strike out the clause. A simple Enabling Bill would have passed through the House early in the evening with a unanimous vote. It was the Premier's fault that the debate at one time had degenerated into a farce. It was not right that it should go out to the Eastern States that Western Australia was disunited on the question. He objected to the clause because it pledged the State's credit, and because it would be necessary to think twice before agreeing to public works to which at an early date the House must be asked to agree. One could understand the Premier's position. He had to give the Eastern States something in the Bill to show that he was at last possessed of some little federal spirit and of some fairness, and to show the sincerity of the Government. It was not necessary for members for country districts and gold-fields districts to show their sincerity by the inclusion of such a clause. The Premier had altered very much in federal matters. He (Mr. Thomas) had hundreds

of clippings of speeches made by the Premier on Federation. Last session, speaking on the Esperance Railway, the Premier dwelt almost entirely upon the subject of the Eastern States coming in and competing with the Western Australian producer for the market at Kalgoorlie. He had a *verbatim* report of every word uttered in the whole of that debate from start to finish, and he could quote, if he wished to do so, extract after extract in which the Premier accused him of being practically a traitor to his country because he dared to advocate a line which he considered to be in the best interests of the State. At that time he was accused by practically the whole of the coastal people in this House of advocating the Esperance line for the whole and sole reason of bringing Adelaide into closer touch with the markets of the Eastern Goldfields. When in Adelaide with the Minister for Works an interview was had with that gentleman, in which that gentleman stated that Western Australia was surprised at the lack of federal spirit shown by South Australia. When he (Mr. Thomas) advocated something to bring these States into closer touch, the man who most vigorously opposed him in so doing was the Premier himself. Before the Premier started to move the mote out of our neighbour's eye, let him remove, not the beam but the girder from his own eye. They had every complaint against us. He did not see any necessity for this Bill coming before us at all until, first of all, South Australia passed an Enabling Bill through her Parliament. The only argument the Premier had given us was that a survey had been undertaken; but we knew the value of a survey. He thought Sir John Forrest only intended to ask the Federal House to agree to a flying survey of that line. If we were possessed, in this State, of the true Federal spirit, we would unite and cease attempting to put official barriers against our neighbours of the Commonwealth. The *South Australian Advertiser* said that what was likely to delay the construction of a railway to Port Augusta was the refusal of the Western Australian Parliament to build the Esperance line; and it also said it might not unfairly be required that the Trans-Australian Railway scheme should stand over until trade between Western Aus-

tralia and the Eastern States was free. The article concluded with quotations to the same effect from other speeches of our Premier. It would have been better to postpone this Bill until the Premier was able to announce once for all the abolition of the differential railway rates and the intention to remove the sliding scale. These points would be seized by the Eastern States, and rightly. They would say to us, "You ask us to incur this enormous expenditure, and you refuse to remove those barriers which prevent our closer union." There was no need for the pledge contained in the Bill till the Federal Parliament promised to construct their portion of the railway, or in fact until the other States decided on a uniform gauge. The Premier said that passengers would have to change at Kalgoorlie for Perth, owing to the break of gauge; but they must change at other places also. Unless South Australia altered its gauge they must change at Port Augusta. The Premier's statement that members would show their faith in the country by voting for the Bill was beside the point; for the one and a-half millions would not be raised now. Yet the Premier called the proposal a broad public works policy. If he wanted a go-ahead policy, let him propose to open up every part of the State, and he would be supported. There were several urgent public works on which the money could be employed. Progress should be reported to give time for considering the Bill before committing the country to such an expenditure on the eve of the dissolution of Parliament. The Government knew this was not a party question; yet the Minister for Lands said the division would show the position of parties. The only effect of such a statement would be to put pressure on members to vote with the Government.

[12 o'clock, midnight.]

MR. J. J. HOLMES: The debate forced one to the conclusion that members unanimously believed that the railway should be constructed as soon as possible, and that the State should own the section between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie.

MR. MORAN: All were not agreed on that.

MR. HOLMES: All agreed that it was necessary to improve the existing

railway system between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie, apart from the construction of the Trans-Australian Railway. All were agreed that nothing could be done in connection with improving the present system until the Federal Government decided the question of gauge for the Trans-Australian line. If we eliminated the clause, in what way would that improve the position or help us to arrive at a solution of the difficulty? The clause showed our *bona fides*, and placed us in a position that as soon as the Federal Government decided to go on with their railway we would be in a position to go on with ours. If we eliminated the clause, we should first have to ask the Commonwealth Government to go on with the Trans-Australian line, and then come back and ask the State Parliament to sanction the construction of the Fremantle-Kalgoorlie section. If the suggestions made by Mr. Morgans were given effect to, that would be worse than anything else that could be done in connection with the clause. Mention had been made of what the Premier stated as to guaranteeing the interest. The Premier went a little too far in making the statement which he did. The South Australian Government had as much right to ask at a later date that our Government should stand by the promise, as we had to ask the Government of South Australia to fulfil a promise made by their late Premier in connection with the construction of the Trans-Australian Railway. Our Premier should not have made any promise without farther authority and after more consideration. We all agreed that the railway should be constructed at an early date, and it was admitted that the section between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie should be State-owned. Improvements were necessary between Kalgoorlie and Fremantle, but nothing could be done until the gauge was decided on for the Trans-Australian line. The clause would facilitate that decision being arrived at, therefore he supported it.

Clause put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	20
Noes	11
				—
Majority for	9

AYES.

Mr. Bath
Mr. Daghish.
Mr. Diamond
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Gordon
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hopkins
Mr. James
Mr. McDonald
Mr. Oats
Mr. Rason
Mr. Reid
Mr. Smith
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Higham (Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Butcher
Mr. Connor
Mr. Harper
Mr. Isdell
Mr. Moran
Mr. Nanson
Mr. Pigott
Mr. Stone
Mr. Thomas
Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Jacoby (Teller).

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Act to cease in certain events:

MR. PIGOTT moved as an amendment,

That the word "ten" (years), in line 4, be struck out with a view to inserting "four" in lieu.

After the discussion to-night, very little argument was necessary in regard to the amendment. The term of four years was quite sufficient for the Federal Government to determine whether they would start the line or not. Four years would be ample time for the new Federal Parliament to come to a decision. There would be the whole life of the next Federal Parliament to consider the question and one year for the following Federal Parliament. If the Committee considered the matter, it would be seen that, by reducing the term to four years, we would have a just Act as far as the State was concerned, and would be treating the Federal Parliament justly at the same time. If it was necessary at the end of four years to extend the powers, there might be no objection to such a step; but, on the other hand, if we agreed to an extended term of years over and above the four years, we bound ourselves with a distinct bond that we could make no move ourselves no matter what cropped up in the way of new development to cause us to wish to have the railway and build it ourselves. The Committee should accept the amendment, recognising that we only retained for this State a portion of the State rights we should be expected to retain, and that we were not in any way taking from the Federal Government what we might be expected to give them.

THE PREMIER: One gathered from the remarks made by the various speakers that there seemed to be a general opinion that 10 years was too long a term. Personally, he was prepared to trust the Federal Parliament for a period of 10 years. Members appeared to think that by giving 10 years it might interfere with the State building the line. Whatever might be the term, the State, by the clause, was not prevented from building a line. If the Bill passed unaltered, and 12 months hence we came to an arrangement with South Australia by which that State agreed to join us in constructing the line, we could construct it; but by passing the Bill we would give the Federal Government the power, if they desired it, to construct a line also. Our hands were not tied. However, appreciating the general opinion of the Committee that 10 years was too long a term, he thought a period of four or five years was too short. There would be a Commonwealth general election soon; and the new House would meet in January, 1904. No one could expect the question of this railway would be a burning question at this general election. There were indications that parties would be somewhat in a state of solution, and it was hard to anticipate how parties would be formed when the House met. The general election following would be that of 1907. During the course of that Parliament—the Parliament of 1907 to 1910—the question would probably be dealt with; but in case it should not be so dealt with, we should allow one extra year so as to extend the term into the Parliament of 1910 to 1913. To do this we should provide a period of seven years, so that between September, 1903, and September, 1910, when the seven years would expire, there would intervene three general elections. That period was a reasonable time in which to ask the Federal Parliament to decide definitely on the question.

MR. JACOBY: The Premier had a lot of confidence in the Federal Parliament!

THE PREMIER: That was so. He was confident the Federal Government would build the line. He would be sorry to think that our own developments in the meantime, before the seven years expired, would not justify the two States building the line themselves.

MR. FIGOTT: In what time did the Premier think the line would be a payable proposition? Did he think it would be 13 years?

THE PREMIER: One should have greater faith in the State than that. In about ten years' time the line would be payable. The experts in their report suggested that period. There might be a tendency in the Eastern States to dwell on that point, and to say that the matter might be allowed to rest for a year or two, and to think that, as Western Australia developed, the work might be carried out at less risk of incurring a loss.

MR. FIGOTT: When ought the line to be built?

THE PREMIER: It ought to be built at once. It was a work which justified its prompt construction; but there were a great number of people in the Federal Parliament who would not see eye-to-eye with us on that point. We could not ask the Eastern States to immediately fall in with our views. We could not expect much from the first general election. If power was given to the Federal Parliament to build the line at any time, there would be the risk of their building a competing line in the course of 20 or 30 years, upon certain terms. No fear of a competing line would arise, in a period of 10 years.

MR. JACOBY: Say four years.

THE PREMIER: Four years would be too short.

MR. FIGOTT: Say five.

THE PREMIER: That meant they could start at the end of the fifth year, and might not finish the line until the tenth year. The line would take three or four years to build. He did not want the Federal Parliament to think we were behaving like Shylock, asking that there should be a bond, and insisting upon our pound of flesh. He thought the lowest time ought to be five years, and a fair medium would be seven.

MR. NANSON: We could easily re-enact the Bill.

THE PREMIER: In the meantime there would be uncertainty.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: If the matter were brought up as a burning question in 1907, surely twelve months after that would be ample time to enable them to start the survey and commence

the line. He would like to see the term three years.

Amendment (to strike out words) put and passed.

MR. HOLMES moved that the word "five" be inserted in lieu.

Put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Preamble:

MR. THOMAS: This preamble should not remain in the Bill without a protest. The Premier should have contented himself with making a second-reading speech in the House, and not placed a second-reading speech in the preamble of the Bill. Controversial matters should not be put in. Every possible issue was raised in the preamble, commencing thus: "Whereas the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, Tasmania, and Western Australia being desirous of securing closer union and the benefits of mutual protection and defence"—all right so far—"and being desirous also of enjoying the advantages of freedom of trade," etc. If those words were to remain a portion of the preamble, the words "and Western Australia" should be struck out. The preamble also said, "And whereas, in furtherance of these objects, power has been conferred upon the Parliament of the Commonwealth"—that was all right, but now came the most controversial point, which he did not intend to allow to remain if he could avoid it—"and whereas on the faith of the early construction of a railway to connect the Western and Eastern portions of the Commonwealth, by means whereof they could enjoy the full benefits of such union, the people of Western Australia did agree to the said Constitution and to form part of the Commonwealth." He maintained that Federation in this country was not carried on the faith of the early construction of this railway. If that was to remain a portion of the preamble, he would want to insert after "Western Australia" the words "residing in Perth and Fremantle," and then go on to define the reasons advanced by the leaders in the various portions of Western Australia to induce the people in those districts to cast their vote in favour of Federation. He was on the goldfields at that time, and it was his not being on the coast that prevented him

from taking a greater interest in the coast, because he had been desired to form one of the goldfields delegates to fight the matter of Federation in the coastal districts. As far as they were concerned up there, they were certainly led to enter Federation because they were told it would be the means of creating a better federal spirit, and would remove opposition to what they considered to be their just rights and demands in regard to their natural railway. People in other parts of the State were told other things. He supposed people in some districts were told that the carrying of Federation would mean the keeping on of differential railway rates and creating more artificial barriers, in order to induce farmers or some of them to cast their votes in favour. He objected to a statement of this sort appearing in the preamble of a Bill. If anything was controversial, surely that statement was. He hoped the Premier would agree to the striking out of these few lines in the preamble. The rest was bad enough, full of controversial matter, but he could not without a protest, and if necessary a division, allow to remain in the Bill words which he claimed were a gross misrepresentation of the fact. He desired to move an amendment to strike out those words later on, unless any other member of the Committee desired to speak or alter anything in the previous part. The words he wished to strike out were from "and whereas" to the word "Commonwealth" on the next page.

MR. NANSON moved as an amendment,

That all the words after "Whereas," the first word in the preamble, to "aforesaid," in line 9 of page 2, be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: "It is desirable that Western Australia and the Eastern States of Australia should be connected by railway."

Why should the preamble be so long as in the Bill?

THE PREMIER: Nothing could be added to the explanation he gave on the second reading.

MR. NANSON: That the Premier could add nothing to what he had said then formed the best of reasons why controversial matter should not be introduced into the preamble. Long preambles were absolutely out of date. This one stated that the people were desirous of enjoying the advantages of freedom of

trade and commerce and reciprocal intercourse between the States—was not that rather contradictory, when we had the sliding scale preventing reciprocal intercourse? And while a majority of our people favoured free-trade, a large minority favoured protection—why introduce the fiscal issue? Confine the preamble to the desirableness of a railway connecting East and West; and do not lay ourselves open to a charge of eccentricity. Defence was mentioned in the preamble, and we all admitted that the railway was essential for the defence of the Commonwealth; but Major General Hutton did not consider it essential, so that even there we found difference of opinion. Why introduce such controversial statements when a simple assertion of the desirableness of the railway would serve all purposes?

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. THOMAS rose to move an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was out of order, having accepted the previous amendment.

MR. THOMAS: By accepting it he meant merely to give it precedence over his. He moved as an amendment—

That all the words after "whereas," in line 11, be struck out.

It was not on the faith of the early construction of a railway that the people entered Federation.

THE PREMIER: That was one of the reasons.

[1 o'clock, a.m.]

MR. THOMAS: It was to be hoped the Premier would agree to the amendment. The Premier had said that this was only one of the reasons advanced in favour of Federation; but he (Mr. Thomas) contended that it was not the reason why the vast majority of the people of the State agreed to join Federation. The leaders of the federal movement were not unanimous that the railway was to be the reward for joining Federation. Certain speakers did refer to the railway and gave prominence to that point, but in many large centres that question was not referred to at all. The preamble was a misrepresentation of facts.

MR. NANSON: It was very doubtful if the inclusion of the words would serve

a good purpose; at the same time they might have a bad effect outside Western Australia. There was no doubt a majority voted for Federation in the belief that it would lead to the construction of the Trans-Australian Railway; still we could not argue that there was any obligation on the part of the Commonwealth Government or Parliament to build the railway. This preamble would raise another point of debate in the Commonwealth Parliament, and we did not want to cause points of debate, but to take everything out of the Bill which would give members of the Federal Parliament who were hostile—and many of them were—points of debate. While there was justification for building the railway, it could be said that so far as the Commonwealth was concerned there was no obligation, as the Commonwealth was not in existence at the time. The only pledge given was that by the State of South Australia, and it was admitted that the pledge was given by the Premier at the time, and although binding on that Parliament or Government, could not be regarded as binding on the people of South Australia. In the same way to-night we had passed a provision which, whilst unquestionably binding on the Government in office and those who voted for Clause 4, was not in the slightest sense binding on those who voted against it, or the people of the State who had not been consulted. We should not rely on pledges which were non-existent. It was perfectly legitimate to say the words implied a sort of moral obligation on the part of the Commonwealth Parliament to construct the railway. That was the probable construction which would be put upon the words by the Commonwealth, and therefore it raised a point of debate. For that reason it was desirable to eliminate the words. There seemed to be a desire to get the Bill through this morning at all costs and hazards. There were enemies to the Bill outside the State. Bad work had been done to-night.

THE PREMIER: That was the hon. member's fault.

MR. NANSON said he was willing to bear the responsibility. When the country had an opportunity of seeing exactly what was done to-night, the people would say the fault lay, not with members who

opposed pledging themselves to the large expenditure, but that the fault lay with the Government and the members who supported them. The same tactics were employed in regard to the preamble. The Premier gave no argument in his speeches during the Committee stage, only personal allusions, and the example set by the Premier had been followed by the Minister for Lands. The Government had kept their majority together and were going to push the Bill through at all costs. They could do so, and the result would extend farther than this State. The occurrences to-night were lamentable, and the Premier was going farther by including in the preamble what might be construed into a distinct slur on the Commonwealth. The most simple preamble was desirable. He supported the amendment as it tended to take one controversial point out of the preamble.

MR. THOMAS: In moving the second reading the Premier had stated there were many and varied reasons given why we should enter Federation, but he felt sure the people on the coast agreed to Federation on the one ground. There was no reason why the Premier should not have inserted in the preamble the reasons why other sections of the community voted for joining the union. The preamble might have given the inducements offered to the electors in the various electorates if Federation became an accomplished fact. Some distinct promise was implied. The Premier knew what dependence could be placed on certain promises, and to what extent they pledged the country. The promise of Sir Frederick Holder did not bind the South Australian Parliament. If promises had to be carried out, the Premier knew that he would have to fulfil Sir John Forrest's promise to build the Esperance line. The Premier had foolishly promised South Australia by telegram that, if they would pass the Enabling Bill, he would guarantee South Australia against all loss. Was that a personal guarantee? If it was on behalf of the State, the feeling of the House should be tested as to whether Parliament was agreeable to the Premier pledging the State to such an extent.

MR. JACOBY: The amendment should be supported. He wished to relieve him-

self of the possibility of being placed in a false position. The House had decided by retaining Clause 4 to bind this State to do certain things. The possibility ahead was that the Federal Government might refuse to build the line, or that South Australia might refuse permission for any portion of it to be made in their territory, or that we might not be able to build the line ourselves. At the end of the book-keeping period revenue would probably be distributed on a population basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not discuss that question. It had nothing to do with the amendment.

MR. JACOBY desired to make an explanation of his attitude. He would probably be forced to take up the attitude of repudiation of the federal compact. He objected to the word "indissoluble" in the preamble. Could he not speak to the main question of the preamble?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member could not go back. That point had been decided and he could not discuss the whole preamble.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member could speak on the third reading and point out what he desired.

MR. CONNOR: The Premier should allow the small concession asked for by the Opposition. When any party could force a matter holus-bolus through the House, we had arrived at a bad state of our political history. The Premier should take warning. Had it not been for the rabid promises of the federalists we would not now have to go cap-in-hand to the Federal or South Australian Parliament to ask them to pass a Bill to have certain works done. The position was entirely reversed. The people who should be the suppliants in this case were the South Australians and not the West Australians. They were the people who should come to us cap-in-hand and ask us to pass such a Bill, instead of our demeaning and debasing ourselves in every possible way by the antics of the hon. gentleman. He asked the Premier to allow these words to be struck out, or to permit progress to be reported and have this discussed later on. It would be wise to adopt that course.

Amendment (to strike out words) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	8
Noes	19

Majority against ... 11

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Connor	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Isdell	Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Stone	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Yelverton	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Jacoby (Teller).	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Holmes
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. James
	Mr. Johnson
	Mr. McDonald
	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. JACOBY said he wished to relieve himself from a false position. Many members in this House were likely to be called pretty strong names in the future, as the result of the divisions which had taken place here to-night. He desired to raise his protest and explain why he proposed to vote against this preamble. We had tied ourselves up for a term of years regarding the building of this line, against our being able to do anything with it, and we had the possibility and extreme probability of the line not being allowed to be undertaken by the Federal Government. In addition to that it was highly probable, if we were to accept as a guide the debate which had taken place during the Federal Convention, we should find at the end of the book-keeping period that the revenue contributed by the Commonwealth would be distributed to the various States on a population basis. If that were the case, and according to the figures of the Federal Treasurer, if the position at the end of the book-keeping period in three years was the same as it was to-day and the Federal Government then distributed the revenue on a population basis, a sum of £600,000 contributed by Western Australia would be distributed amongst the Eastern States. If we had to lose an enormous sum, somewhat less than £600,000 but approaching that amount, and in addition we had nothing to show, as he fully anticipated, in the way of a Transcontinental Railway,

and no other advantage at all of a concrete nature we could possibly point to, then there would arise in this State a strong demand for separation. Whilst he sincerely held this strong anticipation he objected to recording a vote in favour of a preamble which repeated what was a portion of the Federal Constitution Act, that this union was indissoluble; and fully believing that the result of Federation in a few years would be such that it would be impossible for this State to continue in the Federation, he wished to relieve himself from being accused of repudiation; so he desired to take the opportunity of stating that he objected to this preamble, and objected to the Bill as far as Clause 4 was concerned. He objected entirely to the preamble, and it was his intention to vote against it. He took this objection honestly, and those members who had voted as they did to-night would probably be called "infernal fools," three or four years hence.

Amendment negatived, and the preamble passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council, and, on motion by the MINISTER FOR WORKS, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 1:30 a.m. (Thursday), until the afternoon.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 17th September, 1903.

	Page
Questions: Railway Water Supply, Geraldton ...	1079
Stock Routes, how maintained ...	1080
Stock Department, Papers Missing ...	1080
Municipal Institutions Amendment ...	1080
Old Age Pensions ...	1080
Metropolitan Waterworks and Drainage ...	1080
Resident Magistrates and Medical Officers ...	1080
Bills: Mining Bill after Count-out, Explanations ...	1081
Constitution Act Amendment, third reading ...	1085
Trans-Australian Railway Enabling, third reading ...	1085
Inspection of Machinery, in Committee resumed, reported ...	1085
Factories Bill referred to Select Committee ...	1087
Bread Bill, in Committee, reported ...	1100

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Annual Report of Medical Department.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

QUESTION—RAILWAY WATER SUPPLY, GERALDTON.

MR. STONE asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Why a large condensing plant has been imported to Geraldton by the Railway Department. 2, By whom it was recommended. 3, What will be the cost of same when erected. 4, What was the cost of supplying water to engines at Geraldton for the last twelve months. 5, What is the estimated cost for twelve months by condensing. 6, Whether the Government have taken any steps to conserve water by dams near Geraldton. 7, Whether there has been any adverse report against securing water by dams, and if so, by whom. 8, Whether the Government recognise that by erecting a condenser at Geraldton, where there is a 20-inch rainfall, they create a bad impression among directors of financial institutions and intending settlers as to the value of the district.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, In order that traffic may be more economically worked by the use of suitable water for locomotives. 2, The responsible officers of the Railway Department. 3, Estimated cost, £7,400. 4, £4,360. 5, £1,500. 6, No; as no suitable site has yet been found in spite of several examinations of the surrounding country, the results of which proved the