

acity and wages for which the seaman had been engaged. The master filled up the dates, and the amount the man was to receive. The articles and the money were handed in and the man was asked if they were correct, and that being so the owner the seaman and the shipping master signed. Then the shipping master gave the man his discharge on a form. The owner gave no discharge, but simply wrote the man off the shipping articles.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As the information he had given had been supplied him and he did not desire to make a mistake, he asked leave to withdraw the amendment, and if it were found necessary it could be inserted in another place. He thought provision for a discharge must be made in the Bill.

Mr. MALE: The only reason he had drawn attention to the point was that it should be put straight.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 91—Construction of provisions in fifth schedule:

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved an amendment—

That the words in line 3 "this Section" be struck out and the words "Section 91 (except as in this Act otherwise provided)" be inserted in lieu.

This was simply to correct a mistake.

Amendment passed; the clause as amended agreed to.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

House adjourned at 11.2 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 4th September, 1912.

	PAGE
Papers presented	1446
Bills: Proportional Representation, 1r.	1446
Game, 2r.	1446
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Report stage	1446
Tramways Purchase, Com.	1446
Fremantle - Kalgoorlie (Merredin - Coolgardie Section) Railway, 2r.	1447
Landlord and Tenant, 2a., postponed	1474
Assent to Bills	1447
Motion: University Site	1466
Adjournment, Special	1474

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1. Annual report of the trustees of the Public Library, Museum, and Art Gallery, 1911-12. 2. Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1902—Return showing the number of members in each industrial union.

BILL—PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

Introduced by Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister) and read a first time.

BILL—GAME.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

BILL—PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Report, after recommittal, adopted.

BILL—TRAMWAYS PURCHASE.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Ratification of purchase:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved an amendment—

That the following be added to the clause:—"may and shall be carried into effect."

This amendment was suggested by the legal advisers to the Agent General. It was necessary to go further than ratify: it was necessary to say that Parliament must not only ratify but carry the agreement into effect.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH moved—

That progress be reported.

Hon. members had scarcely had an opportunity to read the report of the select committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not speak on the motion.

The Colonial Secretary: I would like to hear some explanation.

The CHAIRMAN: This motion must be moved and put without debate.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The report submitted by the select committee had only just reached the hands of members and probably many members had not had an opportunity to read it. The report and the evidence taken by the committee were likely to be of great interest. One would be voting absolutely blindly either for or against the amendment moved without opportunity for reading the report of the select committee. It seemed no use a committee of the House spending two or three weeks in taking evidence unless the work done by it was to be fully understood by the members of the House. He was not in a position to agree to or differ from the amendment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the hon. member discovered later on that there were strong objections to this amendment the Bill could be recommitted. It was simply an amendment suggested by the legal advisers of the Agent General in London.

Hon. M. L. MOSS moved—

That progress be reported.

Motion passed.

Progress reported.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Messages received notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Supply. £593,846.
2. White Phosphorus Matches Prohibition.

BILL — FREMANTLE-KALGOORLIE (MERREDIN-COOLGARDIE SECTION) RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): I rise with the object of joining issue with those hon. members who have suggested that there should be any delay in the construction of this work. It has been stated that the promise made by Sir Walter James, when Premier, and which contained an undertaking on the part of this State that if the work of constructing the Transcontinental railway were put in hand within five years, Western Australia would complete its portion from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie—it has been held that this is no longer binding upon the State. It may not be legally binding, but there has never been any doubt expressed on any public platform, or in Parliament, that Western Australia would do its duty in respect to that promise, and treat it as a binding obligation on the people of the State to complete the work from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. It is a serious thing and greatly to be deplored that when the Constitutions were granted to the old Australian colonies, no proviso was made providing for a uniform gauge of railways in the several colonies. I observed in a Press telegram in the *West Australian* to-day that to convert the lines in Queensland alone from the 3ft. 6in. to a 4ft. 8½ in. gauge would represent a cost of 27 millions of money. The cost of converting the railways throughout Australia would really be a stupendous item. But it is absolutely necessary that a beginning should be made to get these gauges uniform, particularly with regard to the line from Fremantle to Adelaide. It has been stated by Lord Kitchener in his report that the break of gauge throughout Australia is a very serious obstacle to the proper defence of the continent. No doubt the Trans-Australian railway will be a large and important factor in the proper defence of Australia.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: In what way?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I will leave it to the hon. member to form his own conclusions when I say it is a factor in the proper defence of Australia. I commend to the hon. member a perusal of Lord Kitchener's report, and further, if that does not satisfy him, that he should take up Admiral Henderson's report. Between the two he will certainly discover how important a part this line is to play in the defence of Australia. This is a very peculiar Bill, because we are asked to give authority for the construction of a line from Merredin to Coolgardie. It is the tail portion of the whole. The line which is to start from Fremantle will join this piece, which Parliament is now asked to authorise, at Merredin. From my point of view it is very unsatisfactory that we do not know more to-day as to the starting point of this railway and the route it will take from Fremantle to this point at Merredin, whence it will be constructed on to Kalgoorlie. It has been suggested repeatedly that it should be parallel to and quite close alongside the present 3ft. 6in. line. The expense in connection with the construction of the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge is very large and has been variously estimated at from two millions to three millions. I think it will be a great shame if that expenditure is undertaken for the purpose of constructing a line parallel to and close alongside the present line. There is a large tract of country lying along that line which should be opened up by the 4ft. 8½in. line. The new line ought to be constructed with the double object in view of making uniform the gauge and serving this unsettled country.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Where?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I do not profess to give any opinion at all. This matter should be viewed from two different standpoints. In the first place the question is for the engineers, and in the second place it is for those persons who know what the land is capable of doing.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Which land?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I do not profess to know.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: The country is already served.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The new line ought to be utilised for the purpose of opening up new country. That is an object which should be kept steadily in view.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: And make the present line unprofitable?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: It stands to reason that if you construct two lines where one has previously carried the traffic, obviously there will be a loss on the one line. While it is admittedly necessary to build the second line, we should utilise that line to open up new country. It has been pointed out by other hon. members that the Government have stated that the total capacity of the Public Works Department in connection with the construction of new railways is 200 miles per annum. That brings one to the question as to whether it is good policy that these new lines should be constructed departmentally, or whether the contract system should not be resorted to in connection with them. If the lines already authorised, together with those projected, are to be carried out within a reasonable time, it is quite impossible that day labour can be exclusively utilised with profit to the country. I hope the Government will take into consideration the necessity of having some of these lines constructed outside the department. If the limit of the department is 200 miles per annum it is not difficult to discover where we are going to be landed if all these works are to be carried out departmentally. I strongly support the construction of this line. I rose merely in order that it should not be suggested later on that I had associated myself with any doubting remarks made by hon. members as to the utility of this work, or the necessity of the country standing to the promise made by Sir Walter James. It is thoroughly well understood throughout the country that this obligation should be undertaken by Parliament, and I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban): It is certainly very difficult to understand what object could be gained by attempting to delay the construction of this line. One would think that it is broad views rather than broad gauges which are

required at present in Australia. We have had, not an attack, not a criticism, but a mere asking for information, a request by Mr. Colebatch for information. I can only say I hope the hon. member will never ask me for any information; because a more severe castigation of administration in connection with railway construction I have rarely listened to. Mr. Sommers said that whether or not we had the information he would vote against the construction of this line. I gathered that Mr. Connolly held similar views, and this afternoon we have been asked to adjourn the debate. What can be the reason for that? Is it to go forward, not only to Western Australia, but to the Commonwealth and the outside world, that the Legislative Council of Western Australia is blocking the construction of this line?

The Colonial Secretary: Repudiating its previous promise.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Oh, that is a comparative detail. We cannot expect that the people of the Commonwealth of Australia, to say nothing of the people outside the Commonwealth, will know anything at all about any promise whatever made by this or any previous Government. Not 20 per cent. of the people of this country know anything at all about that promise made by Sir Walter James.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It is an Act of Parliament.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: But so far as the people of the country are concerned, so far as this big national question is concerned, will anybody get up and say that the people of this country, or outside, know anything about the promise one way or the other? All they know is that if we refuse to put this thing through, or if there is any serious attempt at delaying it, it will be interpreted, rightly or wrongly, as an attempt on the part of the Legislative Council of Western Australia to block the construction of the national railway.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Why is not South Australia building her line?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: What has been the attitude of Western Australia to that very State? Even we in this

House, who have special opportunities for making ourselves acquainted with the details of Parliamentary affairs in the other States, even we certainly would not pretend to know all the details of what has occurred in South Australia in regard to the railway. All we know is that in this country, during the last 10 years, we have looked upon South Australia as taking up an unfriendly attitude, because they have not assisted us in putting this thing through. Surely we have acquired broad views in dealing with this question. And this criticism of the finances of the Government seems to me to be entirely beside the mark. In considering the main issue I would throw upon the Government of the day the whole of the responsibility of the system chosen, whether day labour or contract.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: In the hope that it will make it pay?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I say if they go on in their present policy of finance, and of discrimination between contract and day labour, it does not matter what I hope or wish, I am quite certain it will be a failure, has, indeed, already proved itself a failure.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: The people through the country will suffer.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: But the people of the country put the Government in office.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh: And will keep them there.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That remains to be seen. I think the Government are assuming so many mandates that they hardly know where they are. However, I am prepared to accept the position that the people of this country, with their eyes open—because no one could accuse the Labour Government of attempting to hide their platform—the people of the country by an overwhelming majority at the last election put them in office. Therefore, they must take the responsibility.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Then there is no use for the Legislative Council?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: There is a very valuable use for the Legislative Council. Let us take that question of finance. I would not like to set up my opinion off-

hand against that of the hon. member, but surely he will agree that the control of the finance which the council has, as compared with the power of the Assembly, is comparatively limited. In deciding the main point of the Bill I say throw the responsibility on the Government, both in regard to the day labour system and in regard to the finances. With regard to agricultural railways, I entirely agree with Mr. Colebatch that it is most discreditable to the Government, and perhaps to previous Governments, to get these people here under practically false pretences, settle them on the land and to leave them there. The solution I would offer of letting private enterprise come in is objected to by Mr. Colebatch. He insists on Government railways running all over the place and no one will urge that agricultural railways pay.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Of course they pay. Every one of them pays.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am astonished to hear that. I would like to ask the Commissioner of Railways' opinion on that point, but I say it is most discreditable if they pay, because they cannot be expected to if they give the proper facilities to the people.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Then every State would be without them.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: How will we develop the State under the present conditions? I agree with Mr. Colebatch about the discredit of getting people to settle on the land under what may be called false pretences. No doubt he has had more opportunities of seeing concrete cases, although I have seen something of it, and no doubt he feels keenly on it. Not only in his speech on this Bill, but in his speech on the Tramways Bill, he mentioned the advantage which would accrue by spending half a million of money on agricultural railways. I admit that fact too, and with regard to finances, there are few men as qualified as Mr. Connolly to give an opinion on the position of affairs, and I listened with interest to him on that point yesterday. But he is not responsible, and how can anyone in this House, or even in the other place, expect the Government to raise this money which they

put on paper? I suppose it would take five or six millions of money to carry out their works.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: It will take half of that amount to carry out this.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Yes, but the responsibility is on the Government, and the people put them in power. To say we have not had information on this line is incorrect. We have had ten or twelve years to get all the information we want. I am prepared to say we have had stacks of information, it can only be described by that term; we have had reports, Parliamentary debates, and engineering reports, and I have found it almost impossible to keep pace with the mass of information.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Let us have a little of it.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I do not propose to detain members with all these details because it seems that in these big affairs we must place the responsibility somewhere, and know where we are placing it. Personally I would have placed it in the hands of a company, and opened up the whole of the country ten years ago. We could have had a million acres of land settled if we had done that.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: We tried that once.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I would like to say something with regard to the Great Southern and Midland railways. I am thinking more of the effect in the State and in the Commonwealth, and of the misinterpretation, if Mr. Colebatch and Mr. Connolly prefer to put it that way, which will be placed on the attitude of the Council. It is the very thing our opponents want at this moment in an endeavour to show that the Council are narrow-minded and pettifogging and are prepared to take any step to block the progress of the country. I ask the Minister to consider the finances of the country most carefully. For the construction of this line we are going to import these rails and for every million pounds worth of rails landed at Fremantle we have to pay £150,000 in cash to the Federal Government before we can lift them. Is not that so?

The Colonial Secretary: I could not say.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: In duty, you mean.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Yes. I do not know whether it has anything to do with the construction of this line, except that the purchase of these rails must be intimately connected with the construction of every mile of this line. We cannot possibly, under the existing finances and the obligations we are undertaking all over the country, get this money, or I might say I do not think we have the slightest chance of getting this money if that will satisfy Mr. Colebatch. If we expect to raise this two millions of money—

The Colonial Secretary: We will take that responsibility.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Yes, and the people will take the burden.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: You want to see the people ruined in order that democracy may be discredited.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I am certainly amazed to hear the hon. member talk about democracy in connection with the Labour party.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: I am not talking about democracy in connection with any party.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I thought the hon. member meant the Labour party.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Not at all.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Democracy is the only thing politically I believe in. I would not be here otherwise. I hope the Ministry will seriously consider the question of the finances of the country, and the fact that £150,000 will have to be paid to the Federal Government on each million pounds worth of rails. I suggest in the gentlest way I can that negotiations be opened up with the Federal Government to see if we can get the money from them, or if they will construct the line.

Hon. W. Patrick: No hope of that; none whatever.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Then what hope have we for Western Australia if we block this Bill, and do what Mr. Sommers asks us to do, reject it, and what

Mr. Colebatch urges should be done if certain information were not given.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Are not we entitled to that information?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Certainly, and I believe we could get it. Whether we get it or not I wish to emphasise the point that it seemed to me yesterday, when looking at the notice paper, that the Bill would practically go through without debate, after what had occurred elsewhere.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Blind puppies.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: The hon. member cannot use that term when we have had the question before the Commonwealth for ten years, and have had the opportunity of finding out everything we want. An interjection was made by Sir Edward Wittenoom regarding the defence aspect, and it was a very pertinent interjection. We all support the Trans-Australian railway, and even Mr. Sommers would if he could get someone else to build it. I am looking at the position of affairs as presented at the present moment. Some people talk about getting out of Federation now; that of course is hopeless. We have had all those negotiations. Mr. Moss is an authority on the legal and moral rights, and Mr. Moss tells us that if we have no legal obligation, we certainly have a moral obligation to put this Bill through. I agree with him. I am certainly puzzled at the proposed adjournment of the debate: why should the debate be adjourned now?

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Who suggests it?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: Mr. Moss suggests it.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: No.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I said because I had moved the adjournment I had to speak.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I beg the hon. member's pardon, and withdraw. Although there are many points which I might touch upon, and I do not want to weary the House.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Let us have them.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I do not think I will let members have them all to-day. There will be other opportunities. I wish

to make the main point plain that this Bill should go through as quickly as possible, and that the Legislative Council of Western Australia should not be branded by the people of this State and of the Commonwealth as a body of responsible men who are doing something to block the construction of this great national work.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I think the Government should be commended in connection with this matter. Those who have long wished to see this Trans-Australian railway a reality are pleased to be able to support at any rate the first section which we will have to build. There is no doubt that we have pledged ourselves to construct that portion between Fremantle and Kalgoorlie. It was thoroughly understood that we were to construct that line, and I have always felt disappointed when I found members trying to repudiate the promise we made in connection with this matter. The time limit is neither here nor there. The need for that promise being carried out is more apparent to-day than when we made it, and, as Mr. Sanderson pointed out, it would make us appear little-minded if we publicly expressed that policy, and embodied it in an Act of Parliament. I want to say with regard to the route to be utilised in connection with the transfer of material required for the Trans-Australian railway that I had forgotten until Mr. Hamersley pointed out that another line is going from Goomalling to join at Merredin, and that the Wickepin to Merredin line which is now in course of construction will be a great factor in connection with the building of the Trans-Australian railway. Therefore we will have three different railways which can be put to use up to that point, Merredin, and from that point; it seems impossible for any Government, I do not care whether Labour or Liberal, to take up the material required on the single line. In the circumstances I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I have not very much to say with regard to this Bill, but first of all I admit that

the Government of Western Australia are in duty bound or under an obligation to construct this line. The vital question which we have to consider at the present time is first have we got all the information that is necessary; Mr. Colebatch has mentioned that we have very little; Mr. Sanderson has stated that there is any amount, and we do not want any more. I have a reason for asking this question, and my authority is that the Minister for Works himself has stated that he is looking for information and that certain information has not come to hand. We have it from his speech in another place that he himself is looking for information. He does not know what route the line will take from Merredin to Fremantle. That is one of the reasons why we want further information. Let it be clearly understood that when such a man as Lord Kitchener says for defence purposes this line is absolutely necessary, I have not a word to say against it. I fully believe it and apart from that I am satisfied that we shall not realise the benefits from being federated with the other States until such time as Western Australia is connected by rail with the other States. There is one great question which the Ministry have to consider. In view of the present financial position in Western Australia, and in view of the fact that the people are crying out for railways, I am not going to endorse the statement that people are there under false pretences. Of course there will be malcontents, do what you will. At the same time, the general policy of the Government should be to open up the land and get the people on it on the understanding that they will construct railways to those places eventually. They say that they are doing that as fast as they can. Does it not, however, seem somewhat—I will not say foolish, but I will ask whether it is a business proposition to admit that they are constructing railways as fast as they can and at the same time ask Parliament to immediately authorise and take in hand another work in the shape of this railway. Is it businesslike? I think it would be advisable for the Ministry at the present time to withdraw this Bill and introduce it later

on, when I for one would give it my support. I think it could easily be deferred for a time. The Minister for Home Affairs (Mr. O'Malley) has said over and over again that the Federal Government were going to have the railway started within a few weeks. That has been the cry all along, but that few weeks' time has not arrived, and that being so, if we can assure the Commonwealth that this line will be begun and constructed by the time they have their end of it completed, no harm will be done. In view of the fact also that the goldfields are to a very great extent petering out, and in view of the fact that before long we shall be entirely dependent on the men on the land—our other industries are not very considerable—and as we are bound to admit that the people are crying out for railway connection in all agricultural districts, I think it would be well for the Government to say "We will withhold this Bill for a short time and construct agricultural railways within the State." I might say, however, that it is not my intention to vote against the Bill. I think this railway must come. Australia wants it, and whatever my individual opinion may be at present, Australia is asking for it, but I think if the matter were put to the people as against the proposal to build agricultural lines they would say "Let us have the agricultural lines which will build up the State, and later on we will be in a better position to stand the burden which the construction of this railway will be bound to impose." I believe I am right in saying that our indebtedness at the present time is somewhere in the neighbourhood of £70 per head.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: It is £72.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: I always leave a little bit of margin, but before very long if we go on at this rate our indebtedness will be in the vicinity of £100 per head. I do not know whether this will appeal to anyone else, but I do wish to say that Western Australia at the present time is suffering from want of men who will create wealth. I do not care what they are, whether they be jarrah jerkers or miners, there is a too meagre proportion of people in Western Australia creating

wealth. My candid opinion is that there are too many storekeepers and too many publicans and other men of that class. I say with all respect to the jarrah jerkers, they are the men who are creating the wealth, and we want more of them, and the time is very near when I am absolutely certain Western Australia's prosperity will depend to a great extent on the cultivation of the land, and every producer will then have a chance of competing against his neighbours. Therefore it is necessary first and foremost that we should have agricultural railways all over Western Australia.

Hon. R. J. LYNN (West): It has been refreshing this afternoon to have had so many different expressions of opinion with regard to this particular Bill. I think if it had been necessary to convey to me that this House was a non-party House, the discussion on this Bill in itself would have been sufficient. I quite agree with Mr. Colebatch to this extent, that a certain amount of information is necessary at all times when an expenditure involving some few millions is concerned. I agree with him that in connection with the building of this line, the House should have sufficient information in order to enable it to come to the conclusion that when it starts the building of this line it will be known where it is intended to place the finishing point, and in that direction I agree with him that a certain amount of information is necessary. Mr. Sanderson said that he had stacks of information relating to the construction of this particular railway.

Hon. W. Patrick: He referred to that part from Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I shall at all times be glad to listen to information which is being supplied to the House. I have watched for many years the various moves on the part of the Commonwealth Government to carry out what I have always considered to be the connecting link of federation in Australia, and the people all over Western Australia have for a long time been looking forward to the day when the iron horse, running from one end of Australia to the other, would consummate the true Federal spirit, and

that not until then would it be felt in our midst. I welcome this Bill because I think it is time that we in this State started our share of our small obligation in connection with the work, and if in days gone by Federal Governments have not been prepared to go on with what was their part of the contract which was entered into with this State when Federation was accomplished, then I say that if the present Federal Government are prepared to commence the work we in this State should certainly follow suit and assist in every possible and conceivable direction. I sincerely hope that the leader of the House will take seriously into consideration the point raised by Mr. Sanderson, and that is the question of duty in connection with the importation of rails which will be required to build our part of this railway. I do think, as we are a small portion in this Commonwealth, small in numbers—

Hon. C. Sommers: We are taking too much upon ourselves.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: We are taking a large amount of responsibility and liability which the Federal Government might possibly see their way clear to relieve us of by allowing the rails to come in at least free of duty.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Do you think it likely?

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I do. I may be, as some of my friends have often said, sufficiently optimistic to believe that certain things may occur, and I am always willing to believe that a certain amount of good prevails in the individual, and as an individual, possibly the Federal Ministry may in their wisdom see their way clear to permit a rebate of the duty on the rails. Mr. Connolly raised certain points as to how the traffic in connection with this line can be conducted from Fremantle to the goldfields without additional duplication. He states that 34 sidings existed averaging in distance $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles apart. I view it from the standpoint that if we have a siding at every $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Merredin to Coolgardie the increase in the number of sidings for this particular purpose should not be the serious state of affairs some of us are allowed to believe.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: That is not what they propose to do.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I do not know what they propose to do, but I know that I am willing to support the appointment of a select committee in order to secure the necessary information for the House.

Hon. F. Connor: A Royal Commission.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: In this case I do believe that a select committee might obtain for the House that information which it is desirable it should have. I am not a pessimist, and I do not believe that the construction of this line and the incurring of this debt will make any great difference to this State. I believe that the benefits that will be derived from the construction of this line will outweigh any of the disadvantages which we have heard of from those members who are opposed to it. While I am prepared to support the second reading of the Bill, I require certain information, particularly as to the point at which it will start and the point at which it will finish.

The Colonial Secretary: We do not know yet.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You have good information if you choose to give it to us.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: I am not willing to defer the construction of this line until such time as we have a dock to suit those interested in my province, but I do consider that this is a business proposition to a certain extent. I regard the construction of this line as not only necessary in the interests of our own State and the Commonwealth, but absolutely essential in the interests of all concerned. Regarding it in that light, I must be permitted to ask the Government what deviation will take place after it leaves that point at Merredin, because I do think that the goldfields line, so far as railways in this State are concerned, is the one particular line that has assisted to provide interest, depreciation, and sinking fund for the railways generally. Having regard to that, if we propose to build a second line in order to bring that into direct competition with the existing line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, we are not only saddling this State with that additional capital but we are asking that one line shall compete

with the other, that additional capital shall be expended, and that no further country shall be opened up in order to assist in providing the extra interest and sinking fund. I hope that if it is possible at all to deviate that line from the point at Merredin—I am not qualified to say where it shall go from there—

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Nor is anybody else.

Hon. R. J. LYNN: But in order to open up and develop some of the resources of this State, and, if possible, make the Transcontinental Railway take the place of certain agricultural lines that it may be necessary to build between that point and Fremantle, this House is entitled to know what route the line will follow from that given point until its completion. I do not propose to say anything further, except that I am only too pleased to support the Bill, and I hope that the leader of the House will, in order to satisfy some of the critics of the measure, give us all the information possible. As I said in my opening remarks, it must indeed be refreshing to the leader of the House to hear the divergent expressions of opinion from some of the non-party leaders of this non-party House.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North): Having listened with a great deal of attention to the many speeches that have been made on this Bill I find myself in a difficulty, and I throw myself on the sympathy of both sides of the House. The question is surrounded with a certain amount of difficulty to me in this way: I have no hesitation in stating that at the time when Federation was before the people of Western Australia I was entirely opposed to it. I was under the impression, and I am still of the same opinion, that Western Australia should not have joined the Federation for at least twenty years later than it did. Unfortunately, at that time I was occupied in London trying to look after the interests of the State, and I was not able to vote against Federation, but all that I have seen since has only served to confirm me in the opinion I then held. I have heard a great deal said about the good which this railway is going to do to

Western Australia. I have no hesitation in saying that I am one of those who are absolutely opposed to the railway, and I contend that not only is it not going to do good to Western Australia but it is going to do the State a great deal of harm. Mr. Moss, whose observations I always listen to with the greatest respect and regard, told us that the railway was recommended by Lord Kitchener for defence purposes, but I have never heard a single person explain how that line is to be used for defence. Are the people in the Eastern States going to send men across to defend us, or are we to send men across to defend them?

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: The line will be very useful to the enemy.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The manner in which we have been treated since we joined the Commonwealth by our generous brethren in the Eastern States convinces me that they would never spare a single man for the defence of Western Australia; and even if they did, can hon. members imagine anything more absurd than the sending of a large body of men across by rail when the enemy could land at Esperance, tear up the rails, and prevent those men from getting back again? But joking apart, I have always endeavoured to find out how this railway is going to benefit Australia and particularly Western Australia. It may sound parochial, but I believe that when the line is made it will take away every man from Southern Cross eastward who has any sympathy with the Eastern States, and those men will never see Western Australia again. Most of them have come from the Eastern States, and many of them have family connections there, and they will take all their interests back to the east. So far as the carriage of goods is concerned, I do not think it will do much harm, because railway carriage can never compete with sea carriage, but, so far as individuals are concerned, very few will come from the goldfields to Perth once that line is completed. Another remark we hear is that the line is going to make Fremantle a terminal point. I am certain that the time will come when the

mails will be landed at Fremantle for transport to the other States; but that is all. The railway will improve Fremantle, and help the port to develop, but beyond that it will not do much good. However, the matter resolves itself into a very small question. The railway cannot do very much good to us, but it has been accepted universally that this line is to be constructed, and it is useless and superfluous to discuss now the usefulness of Federation or the railway. It has been decided to build that line, and however much I might be inclined to vote against the Bill, I feel compelled to support it for the reason that a past Premier gave an undertaking that when certain things were done by the Federal Government we would do certain things here. Therefore, I quite agree with the remarks of the leader of the House when he said that it would amount to repudiation if this State were not to carry out the undertaking given by Sir Walter James. I am in accord with the carrying out of that undertaking, but the point arises as to when it shall be carried out and on what lines. Are we going to construct an expensive line years before it can junction with the railway from the other side, and in such a way that it will run counter to those lines we have already got, and are we going to pay interest on a large sum of money for a number of years earlier than it is necessary? Although I quite agree that we should carry out our obligations and that the Bill should be brought in, I think the House should go thoroughly into the question as to the time when this money should be spent. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I find myself in a difficulty. I do not want to vote for the railway to be built now, but I cannot take up a position of repudiation after a promise has been made by a responsible Minister of the Crown. I am going to learn whatever I can from the speeches that are to follow. I am quite in accord with those members who have asked for more information, but if the Government press for the passing of the Bill I shall feel myself obliged to vote for it. The Government, I feel sure, have the interests of Western Aus-

tralia at heart just the same as others who have spoken on this Bill, and I hope Ministers will not undertake the expenditure of a large sum of money before it is needed, that they will not place the country in the position of having to pay a large amount of interest earlier than it is necessary, and that they will take the latest possible date for the construction of the railway which is to join with that from the other side of our boundary. Many would ask why the Federal Government should not construct the line the whole way, but I am of opinion that it is much wiser for us to control the railways within our own State. If we allowed the Federal Government to build this line they would have the control of it, whereas if we build it, we shall retain the control of all railways within our boundaries. With these few remarks, I desire to conclude by stating that if the Government press this Bill to a division, and if they cannot see their way clear to delay the building of the line until it is absolutely necessary, I am afraid I shall feel myself in the position of having to support the measure.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East): I feel that our thanks are due to Mr. Colebatch for bringing before the House a question which, to my mind, should be answered by the Government before they ask members to vote upon a measure of this nature. The Bill has been brought before us at a time when it seems to me there is a very great scarcity of money, and when a great number of other railways that the people are expecting to be built, will, according to the statements made by Mr. Colebatch, be held up for some years through the building of this section of the Transcontinental line. A very pertinent question has been asked in regard to the conversion of the order for 260 miles of 60lb. rails to an order for 80lb. rails, and I think the House should pause before it gives support to this measure. That is altogether apart from the fact that this Bill is committing us to the ultimate building of the Western Australian section of the Transcontinental railway. I am not one who feels at all inclined to repudiate in any way an undertaking that

this State has entered into. I fully believe that through the rashness of a former Government this State has been committed to the construction of this section of the Transcontinental railway at some future date, but certainly not necessarily within less than five years of the Federal Government carrying through their portion of the line. I think it was very clearly put before us by Mr. Colebatch that there was no very urgent necessity for this work, seeing that we have already a sufficient line to carry the traffic for the construction of the Transcontinental railway. Mr. Connolly pointed out that there is a great number of sidings between Merredin and Coolgardie, and undoubtedly there should be no difficulty in the whole of the traffic being carried along that line for some time to come. We also realise that in the cancellation of the 260 miles of rails that a loss has necessarily been made of something like 12s. a ton. We have no information before the House on that matter, and when we know that 80lb. rails should be very much cheaper per ton than 60lb. rails, I should like to know why the Government gave a particular concession of 12s. a ton for 60lb. rails to the contractors to alter the contract into 80lb. rails, when the Government should have received the concession rather than that they should have given it. It seems to me that in every direction this question is bristling with surprises. We know that a number of settlers have been on their areas for a long while waiting for railway communication, and by every mile of railway put into the country for the benefit of the settlers we are helping the goldfields main line to continue to make the profits which are claimed for it. I think the 260 miles of railway should be constructed before any attempt is made to build the line from Merredin to Coolgardie. It is claimed that the agricultural railways are non-paying propositions, and I think there is a general misunderstanding as to the way in which the returns from the railways are made out. It is a very difficult matter indeed to know what many of these extensions mean to the country by way of profit because the returns from

the railways are invariably credited to the main line and not to the section. These extensions into the country are only credited with the immediate return they make on the section, and they get no credit whatever for the returns they are the means of contributing to the main line. Another matter that affects the agricultural extensions in nearly every instance is the fact that a lot of traffic is charged forward, and when the rates are made up the country stations from which the freights start get no credit at all; it is the station where the goods have been received that gets the credit. I know from the terrific rates charged on many items that the railways into the agricultural districts should be a handsome profit-making concern to the State. We realise that last year the railways were the means of returning a large income indeed, and I think at that time it was recognised that the agricultural centres, and the general policy of agricultural railway construction had been the means of making many of the profits. When we find that many of the goods sent to the country people are costing in railway freight alone just as much as the goods themselves, it is rather startling. Some of the commodities passing over the railways practically cost 100 per cent. more when they reach their destination. Therefore, I say the agricultural railways should be as good a paying proposition as the Merredin-Coolgardie line is likely to be. In constructing this section we shall be committing ourselves to an expenditure we cannot afford at the present time. We shall be committing ourselves to the expenditure quite four years before it is necessary, and for that reason I do not see that we should at this stage be asked to pass this line. At the same time, I do not wish it to be considered that I want to repudiate any promises which have been made in the past. I am in favour of the State carrying out the construction of this railway, and keeping the promise made in the past, but I do not see why it should be done now, particularly when we do not know how many agricultural railways are being prevented from being constructed by committing

ourselves to this expenditure at the present time. Whether the Bill is passed or not, I hope we shall have more information from the Government, and I hope the Government will see their way to withdraw the measure for another two or three years.

Hon. F. DAVIS (Metropolitan-Suburban): Those of us who were living in the State 12 or 13 years ago will remember the agitation that took place prior to the Federation of the Australian States being accomplished, and will remember that one of the conditions imposed by a large number of those who were opposed to Federation was that some specific promise should be given to Western Australia in return for federating with the other States. The chief item asked for was the promise of a Trans-Australian railway from Western Australia to the other States. That cry was repeated over and over again. The majority of those who opposed Federation used that argument very freely, and made it the chief point of attack of the opposition to Federation, and it comes as a very great surprise to those who remember these circumstances to find that so many are opposed to the construction of this line, while it was the very thing that the anti-federalists years ago asked for.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: This is not the Transcontinental Railway.

Hon. F. DAVIS: This is the first section of it, so far as Western Australia is concerned, and for that reason I contend this House, out of loyalty to the State, should give its support to the Bill. I suggest this point for the reason it appears that while we may have a prosperous State, and all may rejoice in the prosperity of Western Australia, if we cannot hold and retain that prosperity, it is of little use to us. Without the shadow of a doubt, if any of the countries of the East who may at any time think fit to make an attempt, whether successful or not, in the future, of invading these shores, however much we may pride ourselves on our courage and skill, we should recognise the fact that this country is one of huge distances and sparse population.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Bring in more people.

Hon. F. DAVIS: I believe they are coming. We have to recognise the fact that it is possible for any of these countries to invade and probably be successful in attacking Western Australia, and unless we can adequately defend ourselves all the prosperity will not be of any advantage, but it may be to our disadvantage because it may attract those who have the power to take what they think they will. Therefore, the first section of this line is of value in starting what may be to us the means of providing valuable help in time of need. Sir Edward Wittenoom questioned whether the building of the line would be of any use for defence purposes. I would point out that the number of settlers in Western Australia is comparatively few, very few compared with what there ought to be, and if an enemy should attack Australia it is quite possible they may find many landing places which at the present time are almost inaccessible to ourselves as far as landing places by rail are concerned. It would therefore afford many vantage points to those wishing to come to Western Australia, and if we had not the means of defence we should be in an unfortunate position. It must be readily recognised that if we had this line possibly comparatively quickly, we could bring over a sufficiently large number, or a fair number of men who would place us in a better position to hold our own country and to hold it for the white race. Whether we are able to hold this country against all-comers remains to be proved. In view of that possible danger, it seems we would be acting wisely if we lent all possible assistance to protect ourselves against that danger. For that reason, if for no other, apart from the advantages we may gain from a commercial point of view, it seems reasonable that we should support the second reading and give effect to the first part of what will be, in truth and in deed, a Trans-Australian railway. For that reason I shall support the Bill.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH (North-East): I wish to say just a few words in connection with the Bill before the House. I

wish to say that I am favourable to the construction of this line, but like other members who have spoken, I desire also to obtain some further information as to its construction, and the questions that have been mentioned by hon. members during the course of the debate I feel sure will be readily answered by the Minister later on in this debate. As hon. members have said, this is a matter that has been before Parliament in years gone by in this State, and a moral obligation exists on our part to construct this railway. I believe the time will come when it will prove of great benefit to the people of the State and to the Commonwealth; and, though some members seem to think we are beginning this work at too early a stage, I feel confident, as one who has resided in Western Australia for many years, that the State will prosper and that the slight burden the construction of this line may appear to put on the people will not have such a bad effect after all. I think it was Mr. Clarke who said that the goldfields were petering out. I cannot agree with him. I think it will be many, many years before the Eastern Goldfields will peter out. I think a great deal more gold will be won; in fact I am prepared to say that in the very near future, at any rate in years to come, the gold yield will not decrease, but I am confident will increase. I am not interested as to the remarks made by some hon. members on the question of where this line will be deviated when it reaches Merredin. I think the construction of the section mentioned in the Bill is quite sufficient for the State to go on with, and I think there will be sufficient routes to meet this new line at Merredin, or in that vicinity, and so carry it on. Consequently I do not think there is much need for discussing that aspect of the question. All I have to say is that I am favourable to the construction of this line.

Hon. F. CONNOR (North): Like Sir Edward Wittenoom I never was an ardent advocate for the building of this line, and, as he pointed out to any who think at all, although this line will be of benefit so far as defence purposes are concerned, ac-

cording to Kitchener, it will certainly be a detriment in many ways to this State, inasmuch as it will draw the goldfields trade to a certain extent to South Australia in place of its continuing with Western Australia. I would not presume to offer an opinion as to the value of the railway as far as defence purposes are concerned, and I think that some hon. members who talk about this aspect of the question know exactly as much as I do myself, and that is nothing. It is mere claptrap. Why do we need to worry about it? If one of these Asiatic powers comes down and wants to take Western Australia we could not prevent it. What we ought to do is to look after the practical opening up of this country, and it is not opening it up practically when we are starting to get toy soldiers and toy steamers. I have no hesitation in saying we are altogether out of our element when we get into the question of "defence or no-defence" so far as this railway is concerned. I think the line will do us harm. I would not oppose it, but if I were asked in my innermost conscience, "Is this railway going to do Western Australia harm?" I would say, "It will do Western Australia more harm than good." Of course it will develop Australia as a whole. The question of Federation comes into the matter. Certainly it will do Federated Australia good; but how much good has Federated Australia done to Western Australia? That is a question we want to ask ourselves and put before the public as public men; and I say here and now it has been a curse to Western Australia up to the present that we have been bound down by the Federal tariff. I am going to support the Bill for a very simple reason, that I know it will secure and ensure settlers of the right type on the line of this railway. May I have permission to expose in the Chamber a plan? It is a Lands Department plan. There is an imaginary line drawn across it where this imaginary railway, so far, is going to be placed. It is approximate, but I think it is nearly correct. On that line I see within the last few days there has been settlement of the land. I see "A. Francis, 628,000" acres. It is not Francis

Connor as some people think. Then there is a gentleman named T. Davis, 100,000 acres; and then a gentleman named deLargie, 121,000 acres; then Mr. Fisher—Andy, I think—50,000 acres; then there is A. H. Fisher. This is the reason why I am going to support the Bill. Mr. Scaddan has taken up 212,000 acres.

Hon. F. Davis: Is this a joke?

Hon. F. CONNOR: There is no joke about it. That is the reason why I am supporting the Bill. It is sufficient reason why we should give all our support to the Bill. I do not intend to labour this question, but I want to impress what I say. I do not hold with the people who say that the success of this country depends upon the building of this railway, and that the necessary expenditure will be repaid to the State in the near future—not in our lifetime at any rate. I say now I think it will not be a benefit to the State. I think it will be a curse to the State for the time being, though eventually I believe it will be successful, and it will bring here people who will not travel by sea. That is the only practical benefit I see in connection with the building of this railway. I did not intend to speak had not my attention been drawn to the fact that we were having such excellent settlers, such responsible men, going on the land along this line. Therefore I support the second reading.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (in reply): Judging from the speeches made yesterday and to-day, some hon. members appear to have aroused themselves from a deep slumber. They seem to have been asleep for years, and totally oblivious to what has been going on around them, and what the country is pledged to. They fail to realise that the Bill is a measure for the construction of the first section of the Trans-Australian railway. Some of those members wish the whole question to be reopened and revived. So far as I am concerned, and so far as the Government are concerned, there will be no reopening or revivification. This question has been

before the House for years past; indeed, ever since 1903, when the James Ministry introduced a Bill in which there was a clause guaranteeing that if the Federal Government put through a Bill for the construction of the Trans-Australian railway, Western Australia would construct the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Was there not a limitation?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I will come to that. The leader of the House on that occasion was confident that he would receive almost unanimous support; so confident was he that he signified his intention of moving the suspension of the Standing Orders in order to get the Bill through in one sitting. As to my attitude on that occasion, I strongly condemned Clause 4 of the Bill. My opinion was that the construction of the whole of this line should be a Commonwealth undertaking. I adhered to that attitude, and when the Bill passed the second reading I moved that progress be reported, in order that the matter should receive further consideration. However, I failed; there were only four on my side. Mind you, my intention was merely that the matter should receive ample consideration; that it should be deferred for one day only. Yet there were but four with me, and 15 against me, and the Bill was carried through the Committee stages. On that occasion there were some very interesting speeches made by certain hon. members, which do not harmonise with some expressions we have heard to-day. Sir Edward Wittenoom contributed to the debate, and this is what he said—

I do not believe there is a member in the House who will oppose the Bill. Everyone sees the utility of the measure. The only question is, how to get the railway constructed. It is unfortunate that there will be a break of gauge, which necessitates our building this portion of it ourselves. It is perfectly correct, I think, as Dr. Hackett has said, that it will be impossible to run the service with a 3ft. 6in. gauge; therefore, if we are to retain our own revenue, we must go to that expense.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is just like your speech on the Esperance railway.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: My speech on the Bill in 1903 is not the speech I would deliver to-day, were it not for the fact that the Federal Government have since been led by repeated assurances of Western Australia that we would construct the railway from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: What page are you quoting from?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: From page 1159 of the *Hansard* of 1903. Then we had Mr. Sommers, who said—

I desire to support the second reading of the Bill. At the same time, I regret the necessity to incur this expenditure knowing, as Mr. Drew has pointed out, that there are so many works which are necessary to be carried out in the near future, and also bearing in mind the point which Sir Edward Wittenoom has raised, that the fact of our having authorised a line to cost two millions may affect our borrowing powers. On the other hand, we must not forget that a great deal of advantage will accrue to the whole of the State from the construction of this line, and therefore although there are disadvantages in one sense, I think the advantages so much outweigh them that we shall be able to congratulate ourselves in the long run if we pass the Bill. I do not think there is very much more I can say in regard to the matter. As Dr. Hackett has pointed out, it has been very thoroughly brought before the country for some time past, and we have heard what can be said for and against it. I think that if we are in earnest, we shall pass this Bill to construct this portion of the line as soon as the Commonwealth Government are prepared to carry out their portion.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: I would like to say in explanation that I said the only question was as to when the line should be constructed and the route it should take.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I understood from the address made by Mr. Clarke that he also thought it was an in-

opportune time to present the measure, and he did not consider it necessary to the best interests of the country.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Do you not realise that the financial position has become more stringent since 1903?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. Indeed it was more stringent in that year. Some very drastic retrenchments were effected immediately after the Leake Government took office, and again when Sir Walter James came into power further retrenchments had to be made. Mr. Gardiner was Treasurer at that time. Of course, I understand these extracts must be unpalatable to hon. members. However, this is what Mr. Clarke said in 1903—

Being a supporter of this Bill, I have carefully listened to all the arguments advanced against it. I admire the courage of those who expressed them, but, at the same time, I remain just about the same as I was when they started. It is recognised that very soon a sum of money, I will not say how much, has got to be placed on that Eastern Goldfields' line, either to replace it by a 4ft. 6in. gauge or by building another line. That being the case, it appears to me we have to look upon this, not as altogether a reproductive work, but as one of those that must be performed in order to protect our own industries in more ways than one. I think it goes without saying that we must face this matter in order that we may conserve our own interests. We should have all the earnings of this line, and have the control of it, and I think that is quite sufficient to justify some expenditure in this matter.

Mr. Clarke went on with a very able speech, to which at the time I disagreed entirely. If I were back in 1903 now, I would disagree still. The Act lapsed after five years, and the legal agreement became void. But it was succeeded by a definite understanding. From 1903 right on, there has been no dispute. The understanding that Western Australia was to construct the section of the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie has remained in

force. Indeed, we find that it was reflected in the Governor's Speech of 1910.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: What was the object in placing five years' limitation in the Bill?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They desired to fix some definite time. But still, after the expiration of that time, it was generally understood by the people, not only of Western Australia, but of the whole of the Commonwealth, that the promise of that measure would be strictly adhered to. This is what was stated in the Governor's Speech. It will be found on page 4 of *Hansard* of 1910—

Feeling that the delay in beginning the construction of the Trans-Australian railway is fraught, not only with grave injury to the interests of Western Australia, but is also a menace to the safety of the Commonwealth as a whole, my advisers are of opinion that, rather than incur a further indefinite postponement, the project should be undertaken by the two States through whose territory the line will pass. The success of the recently completed bore on the proposed route of the Trans-Australian railway proves that a vast artesian basin extends into South Australian territory, and adds immense value to the large expanse of pastoral country lying between Kalgoorlie and the South Australian border.

Here is a proposition, not merely to build the line to Kalgoorlie, but to the South Australian border, a very different proposition indeed. It all led the Federal Parliament to believe that Western Australia was prepared, at any rate, to build the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: On a point of explanation, the hon. member is scarcely fair, because in speaking yesterday I explained very clearly the meaning of those words in the Governor's Speech. I said it was a proposition to construct the wide gauge line from Kalgoorlie to the South Australian border if South Australia were willing to construct their part from Port Augusta to the border.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is the hon. member's interpretation, and I take it I am entitled to my opinion as

to which is correct. If the hon. member's statement is correct, these words are meaningless. What was the object of introducing it in the Governor's Speech? However, I will furnish further information later on with regard to this. The Hon. Mr. Patrick has not spoken on this question so far, but I presume that, with characteristic consistency, he still adheres to the opinion expressed in 1910. He then said—

Some members have spoken in favour of the attitude taken up by the Government in regard to the Transcontinental railway, and they think that if the railway is not taken in hand at an early date by the Federal Government the State Government ought to construct it themselves in conjunction with South Australia, while other members have criticised that portion of the Governor's Speech adversely. I entirely approve of the attitude of the Government on this question. I do not see why there is any need for us to take up a humble attitude in relation to the Federal Government in this matter.

I am simply quoting Mr. Patrick to show that there has been a general feeling that the line should be constructed. I strongly opposed it, and there was only Mr. Kingsmill besides myself who adversely criticised this paragraph in the Governor's Speech. In another place the Hon. Frank Wilson made a speech in connection with the matter, when he said—

Hon. members have taken me to task for saying that Western Australia would build that line.

According to Mr. Connolly it was to have been a 3ft. 6in. gauge.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: I rise to a point of order. Did I understand the leader of the House stated that I said a 3ft. 6in. gauge?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I understood the hon. gentleman stated that the present line from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle—

Hon. J. D. Connolly: I flatly contradict that. I never said a 3ft. 6in. gauge. It was intended to construct it on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge from Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The statement I was quoting from the Hon. Frank Wilson's speech continues—

Hon. members have taken me to task for saying that Western Australia would build that line. I repeat, rather than have that construction delayed for two or three years longer, let alone 10 years, as will probably be the case, I would pledge Western Australia to build it. I am satisfied that the line would be a payable proposition very soon after its completion, and I am satisfied from inquiries that I have made during the past few months that we could build that railway on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, equip it, and find a plentiful supply of water along the route, for a million and a half of money. I am satisfied also that I could run that line for not more than a loss, over and above working expenses and interest on capital, of £25,000 per annum. And I am backed up by the expert officers of my department in my opinion that that loss of £25,000 per annum would very soon disappear, and that in a couple or three years the railway would be self-supporting.

Of course this was a proposition to build a line to the South Australian border.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: What has the Kalgoorlie to Port Augusta section to do with this Bill?

The PRESIDENT. Order! I asked members if they wanted to speak and they were all silent.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Our predecessors signified their willingness to construct the whole of the line in Western Australian territory, and this House uttered no protest. Only two members out of thirty raised a voice against it and, as I have explained, I was one and Mr. Kingsmill was the other. What was the effect of these pronouncements; they were circulated widespread throughout the Commonwealth: they influenced members of the Federal Parliament and the Federal Government, and they rushed on the Bill for the construction of the line.

Hon. M. L. Moss: When was that done?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Shortly after this speech the Bill was introduced into the Federal Parliament. It was submitted to the Federal Parliament largely on the understanding that the State would build the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie and the Bill was passed, and that Bill as passed by the Commonwealth Parliament simply provides for a line to Kalgoorlie and no further. That shows that the Commonwealth Parliament and Government regard the pledge in the Bill of 1903 as still existing.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Will the Minister deal with the point at issue?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am coming to the point at issue. I want to say that at this 59 minutes past 11 this House wants to revive and reopen the question as to whether it is advisable for the State to construct a section of this line. Members say they are thirsting for information and hungering for facts and arguments in favour of Western Australia undertaking the construction of this particular section. I am sorry that at this particular stage I am not in a position and I do not propose to justify the construction of the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. I propose to justify the construction at an early date of this particular section. It is too late now to discuss the other question. We cannot reopen it. What members wish to know, I am certain, is what Mr. Cullen pointed out—whether it is advisable to construct this section from Merredin to Coolgardie with all possible haste. What are the reasons for this Bill? Why not wait until we are in a position to inform members of the House as to the route right through? Those are questions which have been asked. I propose to furnish members with all the information at my disposal in regard to that aspect of the question. What we have done, we have done on the advice of our expert officers. The Commonwealth Government have notified us that it is their intention at a very early date to commence the construction of the Trans-Australian line. In view of that statement we asked the advice of our expert officers, the Engineer-in-Chief

and the Chief Engineer of Existing Lines, as to what would be the best to do under the circumstances.

Hon. F. Connor: Did you consult Mr. Chinn?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There was a meeting of Cabinet, and I will read a copy of a report dated the 15th July, 1912—

Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, 4ft. 8½in. gauge railway.

(1) Referring to the minute of the Hon. the Premier, dated the 27th May, 1912, we have to report that the question of linking up Fremantle and Kalgoorlie by means of a railway built on the 4ft. 8½in. gauge is being carefully considered, and it is obvious that this cannot be dealt with hurriedly. There is, however, one section which may be taken in hand without much delay, viz., that between East Northam and Coolgardie, if the Government will adopt the recommendation which we now offer for their consideration.

(2) Our proposal is to lay, for the present, a new line, with 80lbs. rails and long sleepers between East Northam and Coolgardie, to a gauge of 3ft. 6in. more or less alongside the existing line between these two localities. On this length there will probably be 50 or 60 miles of deviations, rendered necessary by the adoption of a one in 80 grade, for which length the proposed line would not be within the existing railway fences. The lines would be connected by suitable cross-overs where necessary, and the two worked as a double line until all material for the Transcontinental railway (some 250,000 tons) had been conveyed to Kalgoorlie.

(3) When this is accomplished, the new line will be disconnected from the existing line, and one rail lifted and pulled out to its place to form a 4ft. 8½in. gauge road.

(4) From the quantities taken out for an average section of the line between the points referred to—there being neither time nor staff to compute the quantities for the whole length, make surveys for deviation, etc.—it is

estimated that the total cost to build a line 4ft. 8½in. gauge on this section is £1,025,000.

(5) The additional cost to this, by adopting the proposal put forward, is £33,500, made up as follows:—Connecting up the new line as a duplicate road £19,713, rails and fastenings £6,705 totalling £26,418; disconnecting and pulling over rail to 4ft. 8½in. gauge, £7,082; making a total of £33,500.

Hon. W. Patrick: That is from East Northam?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The section we have decided to build is one as to which there is no dispute regarding the route. We cannot decide as to the construction from East Northam until a decision is come to whether the Swan Valley route will be adopted. As far as we can discover there is no controversy as to the route of the particular section proposed by the Bill.

Hon. M. L. Moss: When will we get a decision on the Swan Valley route?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The matter is under consideration.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Will we know this session?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I should think so. The report continues—

(6) Our recommendation for this scheme is based on the following reasons:—(a) To transport the material for the Transcontinental railway would necessitate the construction of some 20 additional crossing stations (at a probable cost of £25,000) which, for normal traffic, are not required. Moreover, if the present gauge line is to remain after completion of the wider gauge, the former would be largely robbed of even its present traffic; (b) The saving in annual expenditure in maintenance and staff for the additional crossing stations as it is considered that the present stations and staff will be quite sufficient to work the double line; (c) The Chief Traffic Manager estimates that an amount of £20,250 per annum will be saved in the actual carrying of the material for the Federal line, owing to the avoidance of delay at the crossing places.

(d) The time occupied by the journey

being thus reduced by double line working, the rolling stock will be more quickly returned and consequently fewer engines and trucks will be required.

(7) It will thus be seen that in addition to the saving in annual expenditure on maintenance and staff referred to in (b) of preceding paragraph £8,000, (c) £20,250, there is a probable saving of £25,000 on capital cost of crossing stations:—Saving, capital £25,000, saving annual £28,250; total amount for three years equals £84,750, making a total saving of £109,750, by the scheme under consideration; against this must be placed the additional cost, estimated in paragraph (5) of £33,500, showing a net approximate saving of £76,250.

(8) It is not probable that the rails, fastenings, and sleepers for the Federal line will be ready for delivery before 12 months; there should, therefore, be ample time to construct at least half of the proposed work and the other half would be brought into use section by section as completed—say six months later.

That is the report we received from Mr. James Thompson, the Engineer-in-Chief and Mr. E. E. Light, the Engineer of Existing Lines, and on the strength of that report we took action in the direction of hastening on the construction of the Trans-Australian railway for that particular section about which there could be no dispute as to the route. Mr. Colebatch stated that it would be a mistake to run two lines of railway to Kalgoorlie, one a 4ft. 8½in. gauge and the other a 3ft. 6in. gauge.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Through two different localities, I mean.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I thought the hon. gentleman said it would be a mistake to run two gauges. What he states is perfectly correct. It has been stated that we countermanded an order for 60lb. rails. We cannot exactly call it countermanding; we gave instructions that the 80lb. rails should be supplied first; the others will come later on.

Hon. W. Patrick: Are the orders still in hand?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes. A question that has been asked is whether this will hang up agricultural lines. The answer is "No, it will not." The 60lb. rails are not required for railway construction in the general sense of the term, but for relaying.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: You will require them for the Merredin-Wickepin line.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: These rails are required for the Great Southern and South-West, and they are not urgently needed. They can wait for a few months.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: We would like to have ours.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The relaying will be performed by the Railway Department and the agricultural lines will be constructed by the Public Works Department. The carrying out of this section will not in any way interfere with the progress of agricultural lines because the Working Railways will take this section in hand, whereas the Works Department will take in hand the construction of agricultural railways.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: Will they each have the necessary equipment?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They will each have the necessary equipment. The Working Railways find that owing to the lines running parallel, they can, with little difficulty, carry out the construction of the railway. If it comes to a deviation, the Works Department will carry it out. This can be carried out comparatively inexpensively by the Working Railways Department. We are putting it in the hands of the Working Railways on the suggestion of the Commissioner of Railways. He is quite prepared to take it on and is doing so to prevent the stoppage of agricultural lines.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You will be able to make the 200 miles of lines a year and this in addition?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes. Another question was whether the Coolgardie to Merredin line is to take precedence over others? The answer is "No, it is to be constructed by the Working Railways except where there are deviations."

Mr. Connolly said we ought to wait until the Federal Government makes a bona fide start with the work. It seems to me they have done so. The matter has been talked about for years, but it was the present Federal Government that passed the Bill and they have actually made a start. The Federal Government have entered into a contract with the Government of this State to supply sleepers; they have turned the first sod and the secretary to the Minister for Home Affairs is here now and it is proposed at an early date to commence the work of construction. What more proof is required that a bona fide start is being made?

Hon. J. D. Connolly: It is not a very great effort.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Connolly also stated that we were building the line to compete with the existing line in order to serve 100 people. Well, that is a most damning indictment against every Government that has been in power for many years and it is also a reflection on the intelligence of the majority of members of this Chamber and the people of Western Australia, because with few exceptions there has not been one word of protest against the action of the James Government in 1903, and very little protest against the still more elaborate scheme formulated by the Wilson Government in 1910. Some members want more information, but I think I have given all that is necessary; at any rate I hope members will not expect me to justify the construction of the railway by the State from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. I maintain that the time for discussing that is past. What we are doing now is not exactly in accordance with our own views; this is a legacy left us by the previous Administration. This is practically a Bill for the construction of the whole of the line from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie, and I wish members of this House to thoroughly understand that it commits us to the expenditure of two millions of money, and it is too late now to utter a word of protest. If hon. members had assisted me nine years ago a different state of affairs might have arisen. A pledge has been given to

the Federal authorities and we must honour it. I have heard the word confiscation used during the last few weeks, but there is one word closely allied to confiscation, and that word is repudiation. If this Bill is thrown out the Legislative Council will repudiate its obligation to the Commonwealth.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	19
Noes	5

Majority for 14

AYES.

Hon. R. G. Ardagh	Hon. R. J. Lynn
Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. F. Connor	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. Cornell	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. F. Davis	Hon. C. A. Plesse
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. A. Sanderson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. D. G. Gawler
Hon. W. Kingsmill	(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. P. Colebatch
Hon. C. Sommers	(Teller).

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

MOTION—UNIVERSITY SITE.

Debate resumed from the 27th August on the motion of the Hon. J. F. Cullen:—"That in the opinion of this House, the University Senate, having accepted the Government offer of the Crawley estate in exchange for endowment lands of corresponding value, should now, with the consent of the Government, negotiate with the trustees of King's Park for an exchange of the Crawley estate for land of corresponding value on the highest available part of King's Park, as the most suitable site for the University of Western Australia."

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan): This debate so far has not shed that amount of light on the subject which one would have wished. I do not suppose the few remarks I have to make will shed

any very much further light on it, but I would not be true to the views I hold if I allowed the question raised by Mr. Cullen to go without at least contributing my thoughts to the discussion. The discussion has been primarily caused by the fact that apparently a choice has been made of Crawley as a site for the University of Western Australia. I hope that in spite of all that has been said it is not too late to withdraw from that position.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Hear, hear.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I hope that Parliament will yet have the opportunity of discussing the question as to whether the purpose of the reserve at Crawley should be changed from being devoted to recreation purposes, to be devoted to a site for the University. If as I think is correct—I speak subject to being put right—Crawley has been gazetted as a Class A reserve—

Hon. J. D. Connolly: It is not a Class A reserve.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: That is the greatest mistake the late Government made.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: I plead guilty.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: It should have been made a Class A reserve in order that its purpose might not be changed without an Act of Parliament.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: You are quite right.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: A few words have been said about the unsuitability of Crawley as a site for the University, and with a good deal of ingenuity the supporters of Crawley have switched off the discussion on to the comparatively unimportant point, the healthy or unhealthy nature of Crawley. We do not propose to build a university as a sanatorium, as a health resort, or as a boarding house. What its healthiness or unhealthiness has to do with the major point to be considered passes my comprehension. Even if we attach the importance to this point that has been attached to it by supporters of Crawley, we find some very direct evidence in this connection. When Sir Winthrop Hackett, may I say hereinafter known as Chancellor of the University,

was speaking on this subject, he alluded several times to a report which both he and Mr. Cullen treated with a certain air of mystery, a report which appeared to be somewhat hard to get at, because Mr. Cullen did not have it and the Chancellor said if Mr. Cullen did not produce it he would do so. Apparently, however, he forgot to do so and that report which was treated so lightly by Sir Winthrop Hackett has some features in it which hon. members will do well to weigh. Sir Winthrop Hackett said that it was a report which appeared from his observations to be somewhat colourless and he added that it was a report which he could sign himself. Let us examine this report; here is the original text of it which I have verified and found to be word for word with the transcript which appears in the *Daily News* of Friday, 20th August, and in a less complete form without the signatories in the *West Australian*. The report sets forth—

To the Chancellor and members of the Senate of the University of Western Australia.—We, the undersigned members of the medical profession, humbly beg to petition the Senate against the proposal to establish the University at Crawley. We do so on the following grounds:—Firstly: That Crawley is inaccessible, and its selection will cause serious inconvenience to all extramural students. Secondly: That when a medical school is established in connection with the University great inconvenience will be occasioned to medical students who will be attending hospital practice at either the public hospital, the children's hospital, the infectious diseases hospital, or the hospital for the insane whilst having to attend classes at Crawley. This will involve a great loss of time and an increased expense to the student. Thirdly: That a large part of the Crawley estate is low-lying and damp, and none of it can be called high. Fourthly: We consider that it is desirable that the University should be placed on high ground in a convenient locality.

Here follow the signatures of 48 medical men in Perth and district out of a total

of 52, all, I think, gentlemen who are well qualified to deal with the suitability of Crawley from the point of view from which they regard it—firstly, as to its being a healthy or an unhealthy site, and, secondly, as to its being a proper site for the medical portion of the University. Now, how Sir Winthrop Hackett can venture to say that that was a report which he could sign passes my comprehension, and if he is prepared to sign it, how he can, either inside or outside this House, stand up as an advocate of Crawley again passes my comprehension. The first point that is raised by these gentlemen, namely, that with regard to the inaccessibility of Crawley, is the most important point of all. There is no doubt that Crawley is extremely inaccessible. It has been said that, as soon as a University is established there will be simultaneously established a tramway service to that point, but let me draw the attention of the Government to the fact that if they propose to run a tramway service for the University alone, they are taking a step which is unwise in the extreme. The tramway, if built, will run along the foreshore of the river—

Hon. C. Sommers: Right down to Claremont.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Why does the hon. member say that?

Hon. C. Sommers: Because the traffic will warrant it.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Is the hon. member in the confidence of the Government, or is the wish only father to the thought? But however that may be, looked at from a traffic point of view, the tramway can hope for no traffic between the City and the University of Western Australia if the University is established at Crawley, because on one side of the tram line will be King's Park and on the other side the river. That being so, it is hard to see how the tramway service could be run for the benefit of the University. Again, I would ask the advocates of Crawley in this House to consider that, after all, the work of a University extends over a large part of the day. It extends practically from 9 in the morning to 10 o'clock or 10.30 at

night, and it is not as if the student during that time went to all the lectures. Some might be attending lectures on science, some lectures on law, others lectures on medicine, and so on, and all at different hours. Further, I would draw attention to the fact that in all modern universities, particularly those run on democratic lines—and these arrangements being made under the ægis of a Labour Government, I presume the lines they are establishing the University on are democratic lines—many of the students are men and women who are fully occupied in the day time, and consequently a good deal of the tuition must take place at night. Now, I ask the Government if they are going to ask women students to travel to and fro at night to attend lectures at a place like Crawley? It is a monstrous proposition. In my opinion the inaccessibility of Crawley is sufficient in itself to condemn it as a site for the university, however healthy or unhealthy, or however fitted or unfitted it may be in other respects. It is a most astounding thing to find a Government representing the workers of the State choosing a site, which of all sites is the one most calculated to shut out the workers from the benefits attached to the University.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The Government have not chosen it.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The Government have not chosen the site, but I propose in a few words to show how far the Government have gone towards influencing the Senate in that choice, and how far the inclination of the Government jumped with the inclination of the senate.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Did you say influencing them?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Perhaps I was not right in using that term, but I want to point out how far the Crawley scheme seems to fit in with the wishes of the Government. The Government are anxious indeed to secure certain lands for their experimental scheme of workers' homes. They have cast envious eyes on certain blocks of land that had been given to the University Endowment Com-

mittee, and that are now controlled by the senate, lands which it was proposed should furnish part of the revenue of the University, and which undoubtedly, as this State developed, would have furnished a very handsome addition to that revenue. Instead of doing what any Government might have been expected to do, instead of making a free gift of certain lands for the purpose of erecting a University thereon, a huckstering spirit seems to have entered into the bargain, and the Government said to the senate "We will give you Crawley, but we will take away from you your endowment lands." Now, that is not a generous way of approaching this question. It is ungenerous indeed, especially when the Government obtained very much the best of the transaction. It is not as if the Government gave the senate the whole of the Crawley site; the Government say it is not proposed to grant the University the use of the foreshore. They are cutting off from the University site the most valuable part of Crawley, and in exchange they have taken from the University lands, which, under the Endowment Act, would have brought in a considerable revenue to the University.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Are they not getting the whole of Crawley?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: No; there is to be a highway along the foreshore.

Hon. J. E. Dodd: To which they will have the same access as anybody else.

Hon. C. Sommers: Quite right.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: It is quite right. Everybody should have access to that foreshore, and there should be no attempt to take it from the public of Western Australia. But let me point out what it will mean to have University buildings abutting on that foreshore of the river. When Crawley becomes, as it must become, one of the principal pleasure resorts of the people of Perth, on public holidays there will be on and surrounding the University lands anything up to 10,000 people. Is that a desirable state of affairs, either for the University or for the people who go to Crawley for recreation? Even if the University is built on the foreshore, the public will

go there just the same; they will be a nuisance to the University, and they will not get the benefit that Crawley was meant to be to the people.

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister): You said the tramway service would not pay.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: Holiday traffic will not make a tramway service pay; it must have continuous traffic, and I would remind the hon. member that many people will travel by steamers, perhaps by Government steamers. Perhaps the Government intend to put the "Mongolia" on that service when she has proved unsuitable for the North-West trade. However, to have the University grounds overrun by 10,000 people on public holidays is impossible, but that is the fate which those gentlemen who favour the Crawley site are absolutely inviting. In my opinion, the interests of this University have been absolutely sacrificed to the land greed of the Government, in order that a scheme, which after all is only an experiment, may be put into execution.

Hon. J. Cornell: How do you reconcile that with the Adelaide University? The public get pretty close to that.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: The public must get close to any university, but it was never proposed to put the Adelaide University on a picnic ground. When the Adelaide University was established, it was started with four acres of ground, and for a great many years it carried on its work excellently in that area. Later it was found necessary to extend the ground, and the Government allowed the University the use of 15 or 20 acres of park lands, and they are now about to allow the University a few more acres. But the University of Western Australia—and if it is as successful as the University of Adelaide has been it may congratulate itself—is going to start, as if the idea was that it is to be a farm or cattle station, with an area of land which is going to prove more of a responsibility than a benefit to that institution. The Adelaide University has never been overrun by the public, because there has been no inducement for the public to do so. But the opposite is the case at Crawley,

where the public have every inducement to make use of what has always been looked upon, since the late Government acquired that estate, as one of the recreation grounds specially set apart for them. The weak point about Mr. Cullen's motion is that it provides only one alternative, and that is to negotiate the exchange of Crawley site for the highest part of King's Park. Speaking as a member of the King's Park Board, I should be sorry to see the University established on the highest point of the park; in fact, that is impossible. But I have always advocated that the ideal spot for a university in this city is, for the main building, that piece of land which lies just opposite this House, the Observatory site adjoining the High School reserve. That piece of land is absolutely the crown of Perth, a site that has been waiting for years until somebody should find a suitable building to erect on it. The University should be, and I hope will be, one of the finest buildings in the city of Perth, and if it is, we should provide one of the finest sites whereon to place it. The site I am alluding to is eminently adapted for the purpose.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Only it is too small.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: It is too small. It contains altogether about 17 acres, but it is capable of substantial additions. It could be added to for instance by the resumption of the land between Wilson-street and Hay-street, and it is susceptible of further addition by giving to the University what nobody would object to, that is 20 or 30 acres of ground to be used for recreation purposes adjoining King's Park-road in the park itself. I have heard the hon. gentleman who occupies the distinguished, and deserved position of Chancellor of the University, say that one of the ambitions of his life was to see the northern end of the park fringed with recreation grounds. Those recreation grounds have been started. There are already in that vicinity a bowling and croquet green, a tennis court, and the High School cricket ground, and in my opinion a very desirable addition would be the sports ground of the University. But to

take the University and court failure, to shut it off from the working classes of this community by placing it at the site at Crawley is injudicious in the extreme and not in the best interests of the State or of its chief educational institution. I like, as little as anybody, the idea of destroying the inviolability of King's Park, but I would sacrifice my prejudices in that respect in order that the University of Western Australia might occupy a position fitted for it, and fitted for the public of Western Australia. I deprecate with all the power at my command the fact that the interests of this institution are being sacrificed to the experimental frenzy of the Government; and, further, I am sorry that the constitution of that august body, the Senate of the University, has lent itself to this. After all that Senate has characteristics about it which are, to say the least of it, unusual in university senates. We find in that Senate that the Government is fairly well represented. We find two Ministers in the Senate. We find secondly that that institution which is known as the Trades Hall has also two representatives in the Senate. So there we get a solid little body of four prepared to carry out whatever the Government may wish. It is unusual in university senates to find political opinion represented, but I presume the Trades Hall representatives have replaced in the Senate his Lordship, the Bishop of Perth, whose great services to the University movement in this State entitled him to have it forgotten that he is a churchman, and the late Government Astronomer in Western Australia, than whom no more unostentatious worker in the university movement existed. We find that two gentlemen like these, who are obviously fitted for seats on that particular body, have been passed over in order that two representatives of the Trades Hall might be selected. I have nothing to say personally against Mr. Somerville or Mr. Burrowes, but as members of a university senate surely they are somewhat out of place when we have such a rich choice as those two gentlemen I have alluded to to select in their stead?

Hon. V. Hamersley: Who represents the secondary schools?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: So far as I know no one represents them; but, apart from that, I think the senate of a university should not be made a vehicle of party feeling, and I am sorry to think that in this connection that has occurred. That is how I look at it, and I think there are many people who have not the opportunity of expressing their views who look at it in that way. I cannot too strongly deprecate the choice the University Senate has made with which the Government have all too readily fallen in; and in order to show my deprecation of that action it is my intention to support the motion that has been submitted by Mr. Cullen.

Hon. A. SANDERSON (Metropolitan-Suburban): I am glad to have the opportunity of hearing Mr. Kingsmill on this subject, because we all know he is very well qualified, owing to the interest he has taken in the matter, to give an opinion on it; but when he points out his pet site—and I cannot help but think he is right—it is clearly opposed to the site proposed by Mr. Cullen.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: They overlap.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: They do not seem to be the same sites; and my reason for opposing the motion is that the Government have appointed a Senate to manage the University of Western Australia, and if these men are not qualified to choose a site they must be ill-qualified to be members of the Senate; because there will be many important decisions they will have to make in the near future, many of them more important even than selecting a site. Mr. Kingsmill has criticised the appointment of the Senate. I think possibly a good deal may be said on that, but I prefer to throw the responsibility for the selection of the site on the members of the Senate who have been specifically appointed for the business.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: How can you cure a blunder?

Hon. A. SANDERSON: If it is a blunder I would let these people work out their own salvation. Mr. Kingsmill's criticism against the appointment of these men as members of the Senate is very sound; but, later, we will have the appointment of the professors, and

we shall be turning ourselves into a site-selection committee. This is a question I should like to ask the mover of the motion. Let us assume for the moment his motion is passed; is it going to have any effect, any more than the resolution passed after so much discussion at the beginning of the session on the Address-in-reply? Surely if these gentlemen are qualified to do anything—that is my view of the question, and I do not wish to be offensive to anyone—it is the one subject I should think they are qualified to give an opinion on, that is, the question of the selection of a site. As to their qualifications for managing a university in this country I prefer to give no opinion. I leave members to form their own opinions. I have mine, and it is not necessary, nor is it advisable, to give expression to it. On all these university questions I sincerely trust we shall have a minimum of Parliamentary interference, if we wish to see the University a success. But here, at the very beginning, on the one subject on which the Senate should be qualified to give an opinion—

Hon. J. F. Cullen: And on which they have blundered.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: That is the hon. member's opinion; it cannot be the opinion of the Senate. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Kingsmill, if I were on the selection committee, that Mr. Kingsmill's selection is the best, but I have had no opportunity of testing it, and I am not responsible for it, and, therefore, I have not taken any further interest in the matter. But surely Mr. Cullen, after the speech of his own supporter on the question of the site, can hardly expect the House to pass this motion. If it means nothing, if it is to have no effect, I scarcely wish to waste the time of hon. members; I am quite indifferent as to which way it goes; but if it is going to have effect, surely it means that the Council is going to take charge of the University, and on any matter which comes up, on which any member thinks there is a blunder made, we can pass a motion which is practically a vote of censure on the Senate. I am interested in this question of the University from an outside point of view, and I

do not wish to do anything in the way of criticism of the very difficult task these gentlemen have before them. I do not wish to criticise them or even refer to my opinion on the matter of the management of the University or their fitness to be in the position; I prefer, rather, as they have been selected, to leave them there. If it was a question of the election of members of the Senate, if members of the House had the opportunity of discussing the appointment, or as to how this appointment should be made, I would certainly take a great interest in the subject and do my best to see that truly representative men were appointed—I will not say representative men, I will say men well suited for the task they have, a most difficult and delicate task. It was only the other day that by chance I was reading the history of the commencement of the University of Sydney in the time of Wentworth and Robert Lowe. It was news to me that the appointment of the members and the debate on that occasion resulted in a challenge to a duel, so bitter was the feeling in connection with the establishment of that University and the restrictions that were proposed by Mr. Lowe. In this case, however, we are not able to refer to or deal with the appointment of the members of the Senate. We have had no opportunity or voice in the matter. I do not wish to embarrass the members of the Senate, or to criticise them in any way in their difficult work, or to criticise their fitness for undertaking that work.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: But that is open to cure as time goes on; there will be re-appointments and elections later on.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I do not wish to go into a long discussion on the establishment of the University here, but I think it will be found very difficult in numerous ways for the Senate, apart from the State altogether, to undo mistakes in administration. Let me put it in this way. The traditions of the University will be built up to a large extent by the present Senate, and the members who are there at the beginning. If the Senate is not competent to deal with the establishment of a University let us have a definite

resolution that we should have a new Senate under a new system altogether; but I cannot get away from the fact that, apart from the University business altogether, the question of finding a site for the University is not a question calling for any great experience in academic or university matters. It is one of those questions which I would be even quite content to leave to any section of members of the House; because if they had the opportunity for making a thorough inquiry into the matter, the chances are that they would arrive at a sound conclusion on the question of the site. Therefore, for that reason, that members of the Senate have made their decision, and partly because I think it would be most inadvisable and a very bad precedent to say that this House should interfere in University matters more than is necessary, and partly because I think that if we pass this motion it will have no effect, I trust the Council will reject it.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH (East): My only object in rising to speak to this motion is to endorse and emphasise the point brought forward by Mr. Kingsmill. We have heard something, and probably in the course of this debate we shall hear a good deal more, against the principle of taking away public reserves and the pleasure resorts of the people; but following on Mr. Kingsmill, I want to point out exactly what has happened in this present case. A few months ago we had in a certain spot some land set apart as a university endowment. We had in another spot a pleasure resort of the people, Crawley Park. It is quite true that was not classed as a Class A reserve, but it was generally understood it was a public reserve, that it was a pleasure resort of the people. I repeat we had on one hand a pleasure resort of the people, and on the other hand university endowment lands. Now, what have we done? We have made an exchange. We still have our university endowment lands, in a different place, but the pleasure resort of the people has gone. Instead of the pleasure resort of the people we have a certain area of land set apart for the purpose of erecting workers' homes to be

used by one section of the people only. I would like to point out exactly why it has been found necessary to do this. I do not think I am departing from the spirit and intention of the motion in mentioning the fact that during last session an Act was passed providing for the erection of these workers' homes. One feature of that Act was that the board appointed under the measure should borrow their money at 4 per cent.—obviously they could not borrow at less; indeed it might happen that they would have to pay more—and then, in the case of land purchased by the board for the erection of workers' homes, the board should charge those who took up the land on leasehold only 3 per cent. on the value of the land. That meant that without making any allowance whatever for operating expenses there would be a clear loss of 1 per cent. per annum. The board were thus faced with the position that it was not a businesslike proposition, and the only way they could carry on the scheme was to get some land for nothing. Consequently they wrote to all the municipalities in the larger towns, deliberately asking those municipalities to surrender their reserves or other lands that had been granted them for municipal purposes. Only very few of them were foolish enough to do it, but the board realised that it was only by getting the public reserves or other land for nothing that they could carry this scheme into operation. The answer to a question which I put to the leader of the House some weeks ago revealed the fact that the board have no time whatever for the applicant who wants money to build on freehold.

The Colonial Secretary: That is not correct.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: At all events, during the whole time the measure has been in operation, the board have advanced only some £300 to freehold applicants, and only about four applications out of a total of 60 under this part of the Act have been granted. They may have done better since, but that was the answer I received to my question.

Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister): On a point of order: has this anything to do with the motion under discussion?

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member is in order. He is showing the relation between Crawley Park and the endowment property.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I am simply endeavouring to show what has happened, because I really do not think members of the House, and people of the country generally, fully realise what is taking place. I am firmly of opinion that had it been that from an industrial point of view Crawley Park was a suitable place for the erection of workers' homes, the Government would not have dared to turn it to that purpose, for the people would at once have said, "What right have you to take away this pleasure resort, which is the property of the whole people, in order that you may build upon it workers' homes for one section of the people, and charge the occupants thereof only three per cent., or one per cent. less than the current value of money in the State"? The public would have been indignant; they would have said "No, it is not right. The scheme may be a good one, but the people who occupy these homes should pay a fair value for them. They must not expect that the public pleasure resorts should be abandoned in order that they might get the use of them for something less than they are actually worth." Therefore I say if Crawley Park had been a suitable place for the erection of workers' homes the Government would not have dared to turn it to that purpose; they would have feared the opinion of the people. The people would have said, "If you want land for workers' homes you must secure it in the usual way, and make the people for whom it is intended pay a reasonable rate of interest for it." But what they would not have dared to do directly they have done indirectly. We had land set apart for university endowment. We had also Crawley Park, a public pleasure resort. They have changed the two round. We still have land set apart for university endowment, but our pleasure resort has vanished. Instead we have certain land

which the Government intend to use for the purpose of workers' homes, and for which they are going to charge the occupants three per cent., making the State pay the balance of one per cent. or more.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Crawley was never dedicated to pleasure.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: I mentioned at the outset that although this Crawley reserve was not a Class A reserve, it was definitely understood by everybody at the time it was purchased that it was intended as a public pleasure resort. I know of no place, not excluding King's Park, more admirably suited for the purpose. I know of no action on the part of any Government which was more welcome than the purchase of Crawley; because the public realised that it was an ideal pleasure resort, and would be extensively used on all holiday occasions. I cannot support the motion as worded, because I do not know any part of King's Park which can be suitably used for the purpose of a university. As Sir Winthrop Hackett mentioned, the site at the corner overlooking the river would be an ideal one, but no edifice raised by human hands could represent other than an act of vandalism on a spot like that. It must be protected for the people. I do hope that other members, who will inevitably tell us what a wicked thing it is to take away the public parks of the people, will realise exactly what has been done.

On motion by Hon. R. G. Ardagh debate adjourned.

BILL—LANDLORD AND TENANT.

Second Reading postponed.

Order of the Day for second reading read.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY moved—

That the Order of the Day be postponed till the next sitting of the House.

The PRESIDENT: I think the leader of the House has charge of the business.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I am not interfering with the leader of the House.

This is Mr. Moss's Bill, and I have moved the motion at his request.

The PRESIDENT: I thought it was a Government Bill.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, 10th September.

Motion passed.

House adjourned at 8.54 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 4th September, 1912.

	PAGE
Questions: State Hotel, Dwellingup, appointment of manager	1474
Liquor license granted to Japanese	1475
Old Men's Home, disease among inmates	1475
Land resumptions, Appointment of valuers,	
Commissions to purchase	1475
Papers presented	1475
Bills: Coal Inspection and Development, a.	1476
Industrial Arbitration, Report stage	1476
Pearling, Report stage	1476
Shearers and Agricultural Labourers' Accommodation, Com.	1476
Motions: Railway Viaduct through Perth	1490
Abattoirs and Chilling Works at Geraldton	1493

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—STATE HOTEL, DWELLINGUP, APPOINTMENT OF MANAGER.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Premier: 1. Has his attention been drawn to a report in yesterday's *West Australian* of a