

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier. 1, Amendments to Public Service Regulations between 1st January, 1914, and 30th June, 1914. 2, Audit report and balance sheet of the State Steamship Service for year ended 30th June, 1913.

By the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin) : Amendment of By-law 24 of Leederville Municipal Council under "The Health Act, 1911."

House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 8th July, 1914.

	PAGE
Paper presented	108
Formal Business	108
Address-in-reply, fifth day	108

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

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Amendments to the public service regulations made and gazetted between the 1st January, 1914, and the 30th June, 1914.

FORMAL BUSINESS.

The PRESIDENT: The Clerk will call on the Orders of the Day.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Before the Orders of the Day are called on, may I direct attention to a notice of motion standing in my name asking for a return classifying the successful applicants and the advances for homes under the Workers' Homes Act. It is a formal motion.

The PRESIDENT: According to Standing Order 15 it is not formal.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: The Colonial Secretary is agreeable to treat it as a formal matter.

The PRESIDENT: Well, I am not. Standing Order 15 states—

No business beyond what is of a formal character shall be entered upon before the Address-in-reply has been adopted. The formal business which may be entered upon includes the fixing of days and hours of meeting and the appointment of standing committees and the first reading of Bills.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I took it that the word "includes" would not be exhausted by that list.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban): I suppose it is customary for new members rising for the first time to preface their remarks by impressions which were gained on taking their seats in this House, and it is with this object in view that I desire to fall into line with the method adopted by previous speakers prior to commencing their speech on the Address-in-reply, and indulge in some remarks of the nature of a preamble. I, like most hon. members, received certain impressions at the commencement of the session's proceedings. Apart from the pomp and circumstances, one could not fail to be impressed, sitting here as I was for the first time, having just emerged from a serious campaign and being fresh from the field of battle, by being attacked as I was by the hon. Mr. Cornell. I have since learned that, ferocious as was the appearance of the hon. member in making that attack, he is quite harmless. Therefore, under the circumstances, I intend to be very brief in my remarks as applied to the hon. member, chiefly out of respect to the people who sent him to this Chamber to represent

them. The fact remains that, evidently at the back of the hon. member's mind, he considered my pre-election speech of greater importance than the business before the House. If the hon. member had confined himself exclusively to the truth, I might have felt inclined to pass him over altogether, but such was not the case. The hon. member made reference to statements which he supposed I had made when I was before the electors, one of which related to the Mines Regulation Bill. I want to say here and now that I had very little indeed to say in regard to that measure when I was before the electors, for the simple reason that I knew very little about it, but I understand, rightly or wrongly, that a certain measure was brought before the House in connection with the mining industry of this State having for its object the betterment of the conditions of the miners. I also want to say that anything which has for its object the betterment of the conditions of those men will receive my most earnest attention. But no matter how thickly coated with sugar the nostrum may be when it is sent to the analyst it is easily discovered, and, from the information I have received in regard to this proposed enactment, I am led to believe—I am open to correction—that whilst the measure had for its object the betterment of the conditions especially in connection with the health and well-being of the miners, it contained a nostrum which was discovered when the members of this Chamber came to analyse it. I do not know anything whatever about stopes, and I am not going to say anything about them, but I understand that the Bill provided that certain inspectors, who should have unlimited powers, should be appointed from the miners themselves. We can readily understand what a detrimental effect this would have under certain conditions. If these inspectors happened to be men who had a grievance against either the management or the owners of the mine, we can readily understand how far-reaching anything in the way of condemnation emanating from those men would have

been in its effects upon the mining industry. Therefore, as we realise—and I am sure we all realise it—the great importance of the mining industry to Western Australia, anything which has for its object the undoing of that industry, or which may have a detrimental effect upon the conditions of mining to such an extent as to lead possibly to the closing down of the mines owing to the fact that circumstances were such that the owners found it absolutely impossible to continue their working, I say it behoves this House to discover at all times anything in the nature of a nostrum. I have no idea what the Bill contained, but that in itself was quite sufficient to make members pause before passing *holus bolus* a Bill combining such specimens of legislation as were contained in the clauses pertaining to the duties and powers of inspectors.

Hon. J. Cornell: What were they?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: You know more about it than I do, probably. There is another reference made by the hon. Mr. Ardagh to the Esperance railway. I want to say here that up to the present time I have an open mind on that question, notwithstanding the fact that when I was before my electors, amongst other things on which I was expected to give my word in the form of a pledge was the Esperance railway. I received a letter from a gentleman residing in Kalgoorlie asking my opinion on this railway question. I politely acknowledged receipt of his letter and informed him that I had an open mind, that there was certain information which I would seek, and that on obtaining it, if all things were equal, I would give my opinion at the right time and in the right place. I have to acknowledge, with a certain amount of thankfulness the straightforward manner in which the reply came to my letter. Briefly, the reply was this: "We have before met gentlemen with open minds, and our experience of them is such that we have no faith in them. Allow me to tell you that we will not vote for you and that we hope you will not be successful." I consider that frank, and I appreciate anything in the nature of frankness. However, a reply of that kind has not made the slight-

est difference so far as I am concerned. At the proper time, when the Esperance Railway Bill comes before the House, I shall be prepared like other members to give it every consideration, to use my discretion, and to vote without fear or favour one way or the other. Mention has also been made of the Traffic Bill. When I was before the people seeking election to this hon. Chamber, I told them without hesitation that I considered this was a House of review, and that, the Legislative Council being such, I would be prepared, if sent there, to use my very best discretion on all subjects; that no matter what Government might be in power in the other House, I would, without fear or favour, do as I said before, vote according to the best of my knowledge and ability. A great deal has been said in regard to the battle-cry which was raised by the Premier. All of us will remember how a month or two back, when the Premier was in the Eastern States, arrangements were made for the holding of a monster meeting in Perth, when the hon. gentleman was going to deal out to the people his reasons as to why this House should be abolished. What was the result? I went before the people making this the greatest question which I had to place before them, whether they were in favour of this House being abolished or whether they were in favour of the retention of the two Houses. I was opposing a man of whom I can hear nothing but praise on every hand, a man who I feel bound to admit is a gentleman in every sense of the word. I realised this whilst I was conducting my campaign, and I almost felt sorry that it was not possible for us both to be returned. The campaign was a clean fought campaign; but, notwithstanding that, the main issue was whether there should be one House or whether there should be two Houses. And what has been the result? The people in no uncertain manner, and with no uncertain sound, affirmed the necessity for this House of review. I am here, and I can assure hon. members that I shall do all within my power, if need be, to uphold the dignity of this Chamber. I want to say here and now that I do fully appreciate the latitude which you, Mr. Presi-

dent, accorded to me when I was attacked as I said at the commencement, by the hon. Mr. Cornell on first taking my seat. One can only expect that the fighting spirit may be very quickly aroused, and I felt I would have liked to reply. That was the reason why I may have acted somewhat indiscreetly by interjecting. However, as I said earlier, out of respect for the people who have sent Mr. Cornell to this Chamber, I shall not deal as harshly with him as otherwise I might have done. I bear in mind also that Mr. Cornell is not as ferocious as he looks, and, indeed, I have learnt since he is quite harmless. Now, a good deal of capital was made by the Labour party out of the rejection of some measures by this Chamber. I have already referred to the Mines Regulation Bill. I come now to the question of the Traffic Bill. This, of course, I understand was not a party question. The measure came before this Chamber in due course, having passed through the other House; but there was a nostrum also wrapped up, wrapped up very nicely, in Clause 23 of that Bill. That clause, to use the words of the member for Perth, Mr. Dwyer, amounted to constituting the Minister for Works nothing short of a Czar of the metropolitan area. It conferred on the Minister powers under the circumstances, and judging from the powers which have already been usurped by the Minister, sufficient to warrant members of this House in considering very seriously the advisability of placing in the hands of the Minister such further powers as proposed by Clause 23 of the Bill. Generally speaking, and taking the Traffic Bill as a whole, I believe that if all objectionable clauses were eliminated, and especially Clause 23, it would be a measure bound to benefit the metropolitan area; provided, however, that all the license fees and moneys brought into the revenue as the result of the passing of that Bill were retained and spent within the boundaries of the metropolitan area. Next, I come to the state of the finances. The finances, I say without hesitation, are in a most deplorable condition. Notwithstanding all that the Premier said in the other Chamber last evening, I venture to assert that the finances

at present are of such importance that it is high time members left off slangwhanging each other and devoted their combined attention and ability to the squaring-up and the betterment of the financial position. I cannot believe for one moment that the hon. Mr. Kirwan was in earnest when he referred to the finances the other evening. That hon. member spoke in almost a flippant manner when he likened the position of the State to that of a merchant who was doing a turnover of £5,000 on an overdraft of £500. I cannot think for an instant that the hon. member was in a serious mood. What about the 27 millions? What about the deplorable state of affairs throughout the length and breadth of the land? Consider for a moment the fact that during the regime of the present Government no less a sum than nine millions was borrowed by a party which professedly went into power as a non-borrowing party. Consider for a moment what would be the effect under normal conditions of such an expenditure of loan money. When I say normal conditions, I refer to the conditions which would prevail if a Liberal Government were in power. With nine millions sterling flowing into the country inside of three years, I say, under these normal conditions people would be flocking here: they would follow the money from all parts of the civilised world. But what is the fact? Instead of people flocking here immigration has received a check. People have been retarded. Instead of everyone already here being happy and prosperous, instead of there being an absence of any signs of turmoil, what exists to-day? Notwithstanding the fact that nine million pounds sterling has come into this country during the period mentioned, there is more industrial strife in the atmosphere than ever there has been before. I say it is a crying shame. I say without hesitation, or mental reservation either, it is a disgrace to the present Government that such a state of affairs should exist. Mr. Cornell made the statement that this Chamber was responsible for the last strike. Can hon. members think for a moment that Mr. Cornell meant it?

Either Mr. Cornell is ignorant of the fact or else he was not speaking what was really in his mind. As a matter of fact the strike was the result of a resolution passed in March last by the Builders' Industrial Union. All the unions freely admit this. There is no doubt about it. And if it had not been the carpenters it would have been some other union, for they intended to take the various employers in detail. There was the result of the resolution, which had for its basis compulsory unionism, or the refusal to work with non-unionists. The unions freely admit that the deliberate and unprovoked attack on Millars' was the result of that resolution of March last, and that they would have compelled Millars to submit if it had not been for the Employers' Federation. In face of that, how can the hon. member make such a diabolical charge as he did against this Chamber? I would like to draw attention in passing to the number of State enterprises in which the Government have indulged. I do this for obvious reasons, principally to make a comparison of what has actually taken place with what might have taken place. We heard from Mr. Baxter last evening what can be fairly claimed as the mandate of the Farmers and Settlers' Association, as represented by two members of this House.

Member: He is the deputy leader.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Whether he is the deputy leader or not, I can assure you that there are really more than the deputy leader or the leader, either, who are in sympathy with this movement. I say this without hesitation. We must all more or less take a very keen interest in the welfare of the country. The point I wish to make is that the Premier last evening stated that the cost of living in this State was less now than in 1912, and that the price of meat was lower to-day than at that period. I venture to say the statement is not in accordance with the facts. I contend that if the money which has been spent on some of the State enterprises had been made available for the assistance of people going on the land and to assist the people when upon the land, we would have had a better result

than we have at the present time. The Premier said that the whole of the assistance, including seed wheat, which was afforded to the farmers amounted to something like £240,000. When we take into consideration the fact that they have spent almost that amount on two of the State enterprises it is a very small sum to boast about as having been made available to the farmers. No doubt the present high cost of living must seriously affect the whole of the community, and what affects the community affects us as their representatives in this Chamber. Therefore in anything we can do to lessen the cost of living we will be doing our duty to our people and to the State generally. We cannot reasonably expect very much relief from the State steamers. When the Wilson Government were in office, and just prior to the closing of that Government's term, a scheme was started by the then Premier, and men were sent to Wyndham to locate water and other facilities close to the jetty, with a view to establishing freezing works there. If those freezing works had been established instead of our purchasing State steamers, we would have had not only cheaper meat but better meat than we are getting at the present time. The Premier declared that they had found the means of cheapening meat. Again I say that statement is not in accordance with facts. Furthermore, the high cost of living is also very much affected when we take into consideration the position throughout the world at the present time. Since 1880 the population of America has increased 83 per cent., and during the same period the increase in food production has been only 24 per cent. From these figures we can reasonably infer that in the very near future America, instead of being an exporting country, will be an importing country. What a vista does this open for us in Western Australia! With our climatic conditions second to none in the world, and with the millions of acres we have at our disposal, the money which has been spent on those State enterprises could have been better employed by making it easy for the people to settle on the land instead of indulging in manufacturing enterprises

in all directions. I do not intend to prolong my remarks. I realise that already a great deal has been said, many statements have been repeated, and unnecessary delay in the conclusion of the Address-in-reply debate is, I feel sure, unwarranted. In conclusion I wish to say that I was very much impressed with the decorum of the House at its opening proceedings; and I can only say, in accordance with the prayers with which our proceedings are opened, that I am at all times willing, by Divine wisdom, to be guided and assisted in doing my duty without fear and without favour as one of the members of this Legislative Council of Western Australia.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH (North-East): According to the list of Bills proposed to be introduced this session, the session promises to be a short one. Apparently the intention of the Government in intimating that only a small number of Bills will be brought down this session was to give this Chamber more time to consider some of those old friends which we have had before.

Hon. F. Connor: Is this a Ministerial statement?

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: No; it is the statement of Ardagh. Mr. Cullen has given us a further illustration of his proclivity for attacking the Government in the first place and the Labour party and trades union movement and workers generally. In fact the hon. member, whenever he has risen to speak, has never had a kind word to say in reference to anything done by the working classes.

Hon. F. Connor: Nonsense.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: I am a worker myself.

Hon. R. G. ARDAGH: You might have been at one time, but at all events you do not show it very much in this Chamber towards those who are really workers. The hon. member has on every occasion when speaking in this Chamber attempted to belittle the actions of the present Government and the Labour movement generally, and consequently I think that Mr. Cullen appears to have gathered an excess of hatred against the Labour party and the workers generally.