

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 1898

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 11 OCTOBER, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of messages from the Governor, conveying His Excellency's assent on behalf of Her Majesty to the Jury Bill and the Intestacy and Insanity (Local Administration) Bill.

QUESTIONS.

NEW GUINEA CONCESSION.

Mr. GLASSEY asked the Chief Secretary, without notice—

Is there any further correspondence with reference to the New Guinea Ordinance and concession, and if so will such correspondence be laid on the table of the House?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied—

I may inform the hon. gentleman that very important correspondence has been received—the report of His Excellency Sir William MacGregor—which I hope will be laid on the table of the House either this evening or to-morrow.

MINISTERIAL TRIP TO GULF IN 1886.

Mr. KERR (in the absence of Mr. McDonald) asked the Treasurer—

1. What was the cost of the trip of the Honourable J. R. Dickson and Honourable Sir S. W. Griffith to the Gulf in May, 1886?

2. What were the amounts paid, and the separate amount paid to Honourable Sir S. W. Griffith and Honourable J. R. Dickson?

The TREASURER replied—

1. The cost of the trip was £1,615 2s. 5d.
2. £1,405 2s. 5d. paid by the Chief Secretary's Department; £200 by the Treasury.

CAIRNS GAS COMPANY, LIMITED,
BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of Mr. DRAKE, this Bill was read a first time.

DISEASES IN STOCK ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE, this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Council for their concurrence.

RABBIT BOARDS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

FIRST READING.

The House having, in committee, affirmed the advisableness of introducing this Bill, it was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

SLAUGHTERING BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE said: The Bill which hon. members have in their hands proposes to repeal the various Acts now in force in the colony connected with the slaughtering of cattle. The history of these Acts is as follows:—The Act of 1834 was passed at a time when there were but three towns in Australia, and it was intended to act as a check on cattle-stealing. In 1843 an amendment was passed, after the city of Sydney had been incorporated, placing the control of the inspectors under the municipal council. In 1850 another amendment was passed, prohibiting the establishment of slaughter-houses within the limits of cities and towns, and placing it at the option of

the inhabitants to decide by public meetings whether the Acts should apply to their localities. In 1851, in consequence of the appearance of a fatal disease in the county of Cumberland—disease commonly called the "Cumberland disease," but since recognised as anthrax—a further amendment was passed to prevent the slaughter of cattle affected with this disease, and imposing certain sanitary conditions on licensees of slaughtering establishments; and in 1877 an Act was passed exempting meat companies from certain conditions of the Act. All these Acts it is proposed to repeal by this Bill. The provisions which relate to the prevention of theft and cattle-stealing are re-enacted in a different form in this Bill. It is found that there is considerable need of a new Act. The circumstances of the colonies since the original Acts were passed under which we have been working have very much altered. It is found in all the colonies—for I may say that every colony except New South Wales is working at a new Slaughtering Act—it is found that there is considerable need of closer and different inspection. Up to the present, under the existing Acts, the police act as inspectors of slaughter-houses. They, of course, have no veterinary knowledge, and, even if they had that knowledge, the power has not been given to them to prevent the slaughter and sale of diseased animals. I may say that we owe a great deal to the police, who discharge this gratuitous duty with an energy and with a goodwill which is quite remarkable. In many cases it has been brought under my notice that the police, in spite of their lack of power, have informed the owners of slaughter-houses that if they choose to take certain diseased meat to town they do it at their own risk, and consequently the distribution of diseased meat has been stopped by that, perhaps, unauthorised action. I think that the colony and this House as a whole is agreed as to the need of inspection. I am not going into any repulsive details about the meat that is said to be slaughtered in some places for consumption. I would not even argue, as was argued before the Agricultural Conference at Rockhampton by a gentleman from Maryborough, that the consumption of cattle supposed to be affected with cancer distributes that disease among human beings. I am not myself absolutely clear that there is very much genuine cancer in the colony. I know that there are cancerous sores on cattle—as we all know—but I am not very clear; and I think that a great many better-informed men than I am are not very clear that there is a great deal of cancer in the colony. With regard to tuberculosis, too, I shall not go into the details of the spread of that alarming disease; but we know from the Royal Commission which has just sat in England, and which has just presented its report, that, while the consumption of milk from tuberculous cows and meat from tuberculous animals was not absolutely proved to give tuberculosis, or consumption, to human beings, it was absolutely proved by that commission that the consumption by pigs, rabbits—and, I think, guinea-pigs—of tuberculous milk, gave tuberculosis to those animals. I have the report of the commission, in which they say this—

The primary object of the commission, to learn the "effect of food derived from tuberculous animals upon human health," was obviously one that could not be attained by direct experiment upon human beings. Yet it was upon this question that there had been least accord among the witnesses, though they did agree in their assurances that there was no valid evidence on the point to be had. The commission undertook, therefore, these inquiries as to the effect of tuberculous food upon the health of lower animals, in the expectation of obtaining information applicable to the case of the human subject.

Dr. Martin selected for his experimental research a variety of animals which differed in their customary food material: pigs, guinea-pigs, and rabbits. The animals were fed with their usual foods, with the addition of some material (sometimes meat—much in the sense that a butcher might speak of meat—sometimes milk, but always uncooked) derived from a tuberculous animal. No particular examination for actual tubercle in the food material was made in the experiments now being recorded, but some care was taken to avoid any obvious mass of tubercle.

Of each kind of animal thus fed, a certain percentage was found to become tuberculous; of pigs, 36 per cent. (5 out of 14); of guinea-pigs, 16 per cent. (2 out of 145); of rabbits, 15 per cent. (2 out of 13).

The experiment comprised also a number of animals kept under the same conditions as the rest (the pigs being members of the same litter), and only differing from the other animals of the experiment by receiving no material from a tuberculous animal in their food. Of these "control" animals (numbering five pigs, 203 guinea-pigs, and eight rabbits), none became tuberculous.

I just mention that to show that the highest and latest authority considers there is danger, through the consumption of tuberculous meat, of the transmission of disease to the human subject. We already inspect the meat that we export, and that has been the case also in the other colonies. In fact, we have devoted more care and attention to what we send to the other end of the world for consumption than upon what we ourselves eat. It does not seem to be altogether right that we should be so unwilling that people at the other end of the world shall run no risks while we are careless of the welfare of our own people and do not protect them from the risks which most of us believe they run by eating unsound meat. This Bill is founded very much on the Bills which have been presented in other colonies. Clause 4 is the definition clause, and the list of animal diseases which is there to be found has been compiled by the veterinary surgeons, Mr. Irving and Mr. Quinnell, while the Central Board of Health have defined the diseases relating to human beings. I have been compelled to include in the definition clause meat-preserving establishments among slaughter-houses in order that the necessary provision for the inspection of waybills may be in force, as under the Act of 1877. One of the most important clauses, and one which perhaps will not give satisfaction to all parties, is that relating to the establishment of abattoirs. In some of the colonies the authorities think that abattoirs should be under the control of municipal councils; while in others—notably in New Zealand—the authorities are strongly of opinion that abattoirs should be under the control of the central Government. I have not thought it wise to provide in this Bill for the establishment of abattoirs on a large scale, because I am not sure that outside the precincts of the metropolis we are quite ready for them. I have taken power, however, in this clause for their establishment by the central Government, and if it is considered advisable that municipalities should establish them I think the provisions of the Health Act will allow them to do so. Practically, the rest of the Bill provides that all slaughter-houses shall be inspected, that they shall be kept clean, that all butchers' shops shall be inspected, and that the water used in them shall be pure. The Bill provides further that inspectors may condemn obviously diseased meat, and compel its destruction as unfit for human food. The greater part of the Bill indeed gives inspectors power to inspect slaughter-houses, to require cleanliness, and to condemn meat. Clause 13 gives the inspectors power to condemn meat unfit for human food while clause 15 provides for an appeal to the Minister against the order of an inspector. Clause 16 provides that owners of slaughter-houses must give notice of disease in stock

or among their employees, and must arrange for the isolation of diseased stock or persons suffering from disease. Clause 17 is a provision in force in the other colonies; it compels butchers to supply a list of their customers in order that the tracing of disease may be facilitated. Clause 19 prohibits the sale or exposure for sale of any meat infected with disease, and which has been previously condemned. Clause 20 is a very important clause; it prohibits the very objectionable practice of feeding pigs with diseased meat.

Mr. GLASSEY: Hear, hear! The most important clause in the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The tendency in our meatworks here, and in all European countries, is to prevent pigs from running about slaughter-houses; but we consider it sufficient that we should prevent diseased meat from being fed to pigs. Clause 21 gives power to make regulations for carrying the measure into effect. It seems to me that the principal objection which will be taken to the Bill is that power is withdrawn from the hands of the local authorities. Some months ago, when I was collecting material for the Bill, I sent to the other colonies and asked them what they thought on that question.

Mr. JENKINSON: Some months ago?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Yes. I find that they were unanimous in thinking that, while abattoirs might possibly be placed in the hands of local authorities, there is no doubt that the inspection at any rate ought to be retained by the Government. In the case of New Zealand the Secretary for Agriculture says that he sees no objection to the local authorities in the larger towns being left to provide abattoirs, but the inspectors who examine the stock and meat should be officers of the Government, and he goes on to say—

Of course if the Government can see its way to erect buildings to undertake the whole duty it would be the far better plan.

He has very little faith in local authorities carrying out any system of inspection satisfactorily, and therefore the registration of slaughtering places and the appointment of inspectors should be with the Government. In New South Wales the inspection by the municipalities was such a terrible failure that an Act had to be passed, which is now in operation, under which they established a board of health which is directly responsible to the Government, and it carries out the work of inspection. In Victoria the head of the Stock Department writes—

The local bodies and the local boards are not amenable, and no one is responsible, and therefore effectiveness cannot be looked for while local difficulties intervene. I therefore think the inspection of meat and live stock should be entirely under the control of the Government, and all appointments should be made by the Government and the statutes bearing upon the question should be strictly administered by officers under Ministerial control and not otherwise.

In South Australia they consider that the Central Board of Health should have the supreme control of all slaughtering places, and in West Australia there is nothing but lack of supervision—that is all that West Australia has to report on the question. I would point out, therefore, that the withdrawal of these powers from the local authorities is only in accordance with the views and opinions received from the other colonies, where they have had somewhat longer experience than we have, and where at one time the local authorities did carry out the inspection. I should like to repeat that I hope this Bill will pass. We have protected outsiders, and I think we may very well protect our own people. In the interests of the health of the people of the colony, and in the interests of our children, I ask the House to grant the people

here the same safeguards that are granted to outsiders, and to pass this measure into law. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. GLASSEY: I think the request made by the Secretary for Agriculture that the House will carefully consider this measure, in order that the health of the people of Queensland may be protected as well as that of those on the other side of the world who buy our meat, is a very reasonable one; and if the hon. member for Wide Bay does nothing more this session but spur the Ministry onward in regard to this Bill, he will have rendered very good service. It is not my intention to oppose this measure on its second reading, because I think it is fair in principle, and I hope some day to see a law of the kind on our statute-book, under which the sale and slaughtering of meat will be regulated, and inspectors will be appointed to see that no diseased animals are killed for human consumption. But I confess that I do not see how some of the provisions of this Bill are to be carried out. The matter of the establishment of abattoirs is very important, and although in some cases they may be established by local authorities under very careful Government inspection, still, failing the local authorities taking the matter in hand—and no doubt they have been somewhat remiss in the matter—it is not unreasonable to give the Minister power to make provision for their establishment where practicable. I should like to direct the attention of the Minister to one or two provisions of the Bill in order that he may reconsider them before we go into committee. After referring to the establishment of abattoirs in clause 6, the Bill deals with inspection, and I agree with most of the provisions; but I confess that I am at a loss to know how a person who may be suffering from some complaint or disease, possibly a deadly disease, can be known to the inspector, unless the disease is apparent on the surface. Of course, if such a person were suffering from smallpox, or a disease which appeared on the surface, I could understand it; but if the disease is not apparent I do not see how the inspector can be aware of it, and I do not think the subsection is workable. How is an inspector to know that a person handling meat is infected with a disease which is likely to contaminate meat if he cannot see it? This is a matter that requires careful consideration. I quite agree that inspectors should be armed with full power in order that the lives and health of the people may be protected, but when passing a law of this kind it is necessary to see that it is workable. If the inspector were allowed to obtain medical advice in cases where he is suspicious there might be some show of reason in it, but as the inspector is not likely to be a medical man it will be impossible for him to say whether a man is suffering from any such disease or not. It is just possible that the Minister may have considered the matter in a variety of ways, but that does not appear in the Bill, nor has he given us any reasons for this provision in moving the second reading of the measure. Then, I wish to allude to the provision with respect to "the water supplied to stock or used in connection with meat that is impure or unwholesome." It is very desirable that cattle should at all times, whether in the town or in the country, have the best and purest of water to drink, but further on in the clause power is given to the inspector to do certain things with regard to water which he considers impure or unwholesome. Perhaps there may not be much objection taken to the application of this provision to towns and centres of population, but in the country it will be found to be impracticable; it cannot be worked; and it is just as well that in discussing a matter of this kind we should aim at embodying in our

statutes only such provisions as are reasonable and practicable. The power to say whether water is pure or not, and to cut off that water, is a power which no inspector should possess, except in some centres of population where there is always a supply of good water available. The same power is given with regard to "any place, thing, or vehicle kept or used for the storage, sale, carriage, or delivery of meat, if it is in an unclean or unwholesome condition," and I entirely agree with that provision. Referring, however, to subsection (b), which empowers an inspector to "order the supply of water to be discontinued, and a supply of fresh water to be used" where he considers the existing supply impure or unwholesome, I would ask how is that to be carried out in some parts of the country, particularly during the continuance of a long drought when persons are anxious to get a supply of water of almost any kind? I am not raising these objections because I am opposed to the measure, but merely to give the Minister an opportunity to consider them between now and when we come to deal with the Bill in detail. While I am anxious and willing, as I am sure the House is anxious and willing, to assist the Minister to make this Bill as perfect and complete as possible, so as to preserve the health of the people, still I do not think such powers should be given to inspectors. Of course we are not to assume that an inspector will in most instances use his powers in a harsh or unreasonable manner, but we all know what human nature is, and that when an inspector is armed with powers such as these it is just possible that he may do many things which will harass and annoy, and perhaps do very great injury to, persons who have stock for slaughter and sale. I certainly think that clause 20 is a most important one, and I think the House will be with the Minister in preventing swine being fed with unwholesome meat. I dare say that it has, unfortunately, been the custom hitherto to give to swine meat that was considered questionable for human food. I must confess that I positively shudder at the idea that diseased meat should be thrown to pigs, seeing that where that is done we who do not adopt the Mohammedan custom of absolutely prohibiting ham and bacon from our tables, must, of necessity, eat ham and bacon of a very questionable character. I, therefore, heartily welcome this provision of the Bill. With regard to the provision in clause 21, which empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations with respect to "the ventilation and drainage of slaughter-houses and butchers' shops, and the situation of water-closets, privies, cesspools, and urinals thereat," I approve of that. As I have said before in this Chamber, there is no question that I have taken a greater interest in than in sanitary matters, and in my opinion it is a matter of supreme importance that slaughter-houses and butchers' shops should stand on ground that is remarkably well drained, and that privies and cesspools, and other places of pollution, should be removed from them as far as possible. Although, as I have pointed out, the Bill has some defects, yet I welcome it, and I hope that before it leaves this Chamber it will be put into as practicable a shape as possible, with a view to effect the object aimed at—namely, to prevent the spread of disease, and protect the health and lives of the people of the colony.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I think the 6th clause must be regarded as the most important clause of this Bill. It is the clause in which power is taken by the Government to establish abattoirs. I know that a number of butchers spoke about this matter some years ago, and I gathered that the majority of them were in favour of concentrating the slaughtering of

animals for public food in one spot. I hope and trust that it will not be long before the Government are asked to take action under this clause to establish abattoirs in one or two centres suitable to the population in and about the metropolis. One advantage of having public abattoirs will be that the area of inspection will be narrowed down to one, two, or three places. That will be great economy in administration. The next point will be the admirable arrangements—if they are founded and built upon the most modern systems—that obtain even in cold countries, whereas ours is a semi-tropical climate. I had the good fortune when I was at home to be able to visit the abattoirs at Birkenhead, which are under the control of the Liverpool Dock and River Trust, than which I think of all I saw in the United Kingdom none better could be devised. There they slaughter both sheep and cattle, particularly imported sheep and cattle, and they are models of arrangement, system, and cleanliness; and they give the greatest satisfaction in the facilities they afford to the trade at a most moderate cost. I think following out, in a small way, some such buildings and arrangements as there exist would be of the highest advantage to the metropolis of this colony and to the large towns in the provinces. I may point out that the Government may well undertake expenditure in this behalf, because the abattoirs are likely to be situated a few miles from town, and the transit of the cattle to that particular spot from the interior, and the transit of the meat when slaughtered into the city, would be an item of no inconsiderable amount to the railway revenue, apart altogether from the sanitary advantages of having public abattoirs from six to twelve miles outside the city boundaries. I am very much pleased at the introduction of this power, and I hope not only that the Bill may receive hearty support, but that this particular clause—the 6th—will receive the approval of all who may address themselves to this document. The other provisions of the Bill also are very good, and I am sure that the public will hail the passing of the Bill into an Act with acclamation and great satisfaction. As the introducer of the Bill well put it, it is a matter of the highest importance to every living human being within the territory. I shall have great pleasure in supporting the measure, and when it gets into committee any little matters that may occur to more practical members of the Assembly I trust will be suggested to the Minister, who I am sure desires to make it as perfect a measure as it can possibly be made.

Mr. KEOGH: On the first reading of this Bill I congratulated the hon. gentleman on having introduced it. I then stated that clause 4 was the crux of the Bill, but having looked over the matter I find that clause 20 is decidedly one of the best things in the Bill, and from what has come under my notice I am thoroughly in accord with that clause. I think that even if it were possible to make that clause more drastic I would be in favour of it. I am aware that cattle have been slaughtered, the hides taken off, and the carcasses thrown to the pigs, and it has been well known at the time that those carcasses were in a most advanced state of disease. And those very pigs have been sold to Brisbane factories, and the meat has been distributed as bacon in all its forms to the people of this colony, and while that has been carried on it is impossible that the people should be in a sound healthy condition. I contend that it would be better for the people and for the colony that more drastic measures should be taken with regard to the distribution of meat. There are one or two things in this Bill that strike me as rather severe. I notice that the inspector may order the owner of a slaughterhouse to produce to him the skins of all stock

that have been slaughtered within one month previous to the date of such order, or to give a full and satisfactory account of the manner in which such skins have been disposed of. I think that is a little too arbitrary. I think a month is too long a time back for skins to be produced or even accounted for, and I think the time should be a little less, say a fortnight. The next provision which I think is a little too bad is with regard to any person who cuts out, burns, or otherwise destroys or defaces any brand upon any skin. It is not always possible for a man when he purchases a beast or a hide to know whether the skin has been burned or not. When they are purchased the hides may not show any burning, but afterwards it may be seen that burning has taken place. I think it is difficult to determine this matter, but I leave it for those who are in a better position than I am to judge. I am satisfied, however, that these things can be done, and innocent parties may perhaps suffer. Then, according to section 10, every tanner or other person who purchases a raw hide or skin from which any brand has been cut out or burnt, or destroyed, or otherwise defaced, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £10. I think that also is arbitrary, because a tanner may in the course of his business get 100 or 200 hides, and it is a difficult matter for a man to turn over all those hides, which are salted or perhaps in a green state, and see whether they are burned or not. I think there should be a little more leniency in those cases. Those particular clauses are a little too arbitrary; at the same time if it were possible to make the other portions of the Bill even more drastic I would be prepared to support it, because it is necessary for the health of the people of this colony that a Bill of this kind should be passed into law. I am prepared to support it to the very best of my ability, and I have no doubt that the hon. members on this side will also do so, and I trust that the Bill will pass without serious amendment.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I think every hon. member in this Chamber will admit that it is necessary by all means possible to safeguard the community in regard to eating diseased meat.

Mr. SIM: What have the Jews done for centuries?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: As the hon. member for Carpentaria interjects, the Jews have done this for centuries. But I say that the provisions of the Bill go beyond the information which either the Minister or any hon. member in this House possesses. A great deal of sentiment may be uttered with regard to the question of using diseased meat, but I would ask the hon. gentleman whether it has been decided by scientists that stock suffering from the diseases enumerated in the schedule to this Bill are unfit to feed swine, as is mentioned in one of the clauses? If any hon. member is able to give me information on that point, I wish he would rise after me and tell me. A great deal of sentiment is introduced into this matter, but we have no certain knowledge on the subject.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: We must do something.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Quite so, but we may go too far in our desire to protect the people. I ask the representatives of country districts how the measure will affect the sparsely populated districts? Take an electorate such as my own, in which there are some sixteen or eighteen centres, where everything is conducted in a cleanly manner under the supervision of the police or the local authorities at the present time. Under this measure an inspector will, in the first place, have to be a doctor, in the second place he will have to be a veterinary surgeon, and in the third place he will have to be an

analytical chemist. He will be able to enter premises at all hours of the day or night. He may be a martinet, and his decrees will have to be carried out whether they are right or wrong. I ask the Minister whether there should not be some tribunal to whom an appeal can be made?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Clause 15.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That provides for an appeal to the Minister through a lot of machinery. But, without reflecting in any way upon the present Secretary for Agriculture, whom I congratulate upon the way he introduced the Bill this afternoon—are all Secretaries for Agriculture likely to be men to whom you can appeal on a question of this sort? Take the case of the Secretary for Agriculture in Victoria, who the other day stated that larval ticks exist in the flesh of the animal. That is the sort of Minister we may have to appeal to, and I hope that the Minister will consider the advisableness of appointing some authority to whom an appeal can be made from a decision of an inspector. Whilst we are dealing with this question, and doing all we possibly can to protect the community from eating diseased meat, what are we doing in regard to the consumption of fish, poultry, and so on? So far as our knowledge goes, there are just as many diseases contracted through eating diseased fish and fowl as through the consumption of diseased beef. Again, I notice that in one part of the Bill, in which certain commodities are dealt with, extract of meat is left out. Now, disease is as likely to be contracted from the consumption of meat in that form as in any other.

Mr. MCMASTER: It is examined.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is all supposed to be examined at the present time. It is a mistake in the country districts to take the supervision of the meat supply out of the hands of the local authorities, because it will work harshly there, and will create grave difficulties.

Mr. KERR: The local authorities have not attended to their duty.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That may be so in the hon. member's district, but it is not so in other districts, where they attend to the duty of supervision sufficient for themselves. The way to overcome this difficulty would be by enlarging the measure in the direction of establishing abattoirs, and to allow the working of the Acts to remain as at present. In the large centres of population it is necessary that public abattoirs should be erected, and if the Minister had proposed to legislate in that direction he would have overcome the difficulty that is felt at the present time. I would just like to refer to one remark made by the hon. member for Rosewood with regard to the provision in the Bill which proposes to inflict a heavy penalty upon tanners who buy hides from which the brands have been removed. That is one of the greatest safeguards cattle-owners have against cattle-stealing and cattle-duffing, and it is a fair thing that they should have some protection, but the Bill will place many hindrances upon them. Although I see plainly that the Bill will impose heavy additional taxation upon the community—because the cost of all this inspection is not going to be a light one—I feel inclined to support the Minister; but I would ask him to consider the question of establishing some power to whom we can appeal, and with whom we can come in close contact. I also ask him whether he does not consider it necessary to include fish and fowl used for food in the measure? There are some provisions with which I agree as applied to the towns, but I cannot support those provisions which are objectionable to me.

Mr. STEWART: I think we may congratulate the Government this afternoon, first, on the fact that at last it seems to have awakened up

from out of its long trance, and appears to be anxious to go on with business; secondly, on the fact that we have this Bill before us; and, thirdly—and this is the most important consideration from my point of view—on its very rapid conversion to socialistic principles. When we know the opinions held by the hon. gentleman who introduced the measure, when we know what an ardent advocate he is of private enterprise, and how strongly he has opposed the public interfering in any way with private enterprise in the past, we must admit at once what a disagreeable duty he has had in introducing a measure of this kind, which deliberately attacks private enterprise.

Mr. LEAHY: No, it does not. It only says he may do it.

Mr. STEWART: The hon. member says "No." Have we not got a clause here authorising the establishment of public abattoirs? What does that mean?

Mr. LEAHY: It is not imperative on him. He may do so.

Mr. STEWART: I wonder if the hon. member is speaking for the Government? Is this merely a show Bill?

Mr. LEAHY: I am not speaking for the Government.

Mr. STEWART: Although the hon. member who is interjecting professes to lead a party in this House—a party of some importance perhaps—I do not know that he is speaking on this occasion for the Government. I hope not. I hope the Secretary for Agriculture, when he is replying, will tell us whether the Government really mean business or not in this matter. Whether the hon. member for Bulloo is right in his inference that nothing will be done—that this Bill will be passed—

Mr. LEAHY: I did not say that.

Mr. STEWART: That authority will be given to establish public abattoirs, but that none will be established? If that is the case, then we are simply wasting our time. I congratulate the Minister on his rapid change of front. If we on this side have done nothing else we have educated the Government, and this Bill is one of the excellent results. I must say that I am pleased that the inspection of cattle and meat is to be taken out of the hands of local authorities. My experience is that you can never trust local authorities in these matters. If the Bill left inspection in the hands of local authorities it would be tantamount to no inspection. I trust the hon. gentleman will insist upon the State having supreme control of these matters. One local authority may be extremely particular in its inspection, while its neighbour may be extremely lax, and disease will by that means be spread throughout the colony. I must say that I do not think the Bill goes far enough. I think every animal intended for human food should be examined before being killed, and passed as fit for consumption.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not before; after.

Mr. STEWART: I do not claim to be an expert, but I should think it extremely difficult to ascertain after a beast has been cut up whether it was diseased. The butcher is not very likely to exhibit a cancer on his table, but if the animal is inspected before slaughter any cancerous sores can be seen at once. The hon. member for Lockyer talked about introducing sentiment into this discussion. Well, my idea is that it is better to introduce sentiment into the discussion than diseased food into our bodies. The hon. member also talked about the cost of inspection and the additional taxation which it would impose; but if we increase the public health, is that not a good set off? What are a few thousands a year compared

with the public health and the working efficiency of our community? Again, if our taxpayers contribute more to the revenue they will pay less to the doctor. So that when we look at the subject in all its bearings we see that such a measure can do nothing but good. Before sitting down I should like to inquire whether this Bill is an evidence that the Government have entered upon their new policy? We know that the leader of the Government, when he obtained a seat in this House, was an opponent of the policy of the present Government. Is this measure part of the progressive policy of the hon. gentleman as shadowed forth in his election address? I have come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman has impregnated the Government with his policy—that he has captured the Government. If that is the case, I consider it is a triumph for Opposition principles. In reference to the clause giving power to make regulations, I observe that the Bill provides that the regulations shall be laid before Parliament, if sitting, or, if not, within fourteen days of its next meeting. Seeing that we are giving such large power to the Governor in Council to make regulations, I think before they have the force of law that they should be submitted to this Chamber. That is a deficiency in the Bill which should be remedied. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading, and, with the leader of this party, I congratulate the hon. member for Wide Bay upon having forced the hand of the Government on this question.

Mr. GROOM: I agree with the hon. gentleman who has introduced this measure that it is an extraordinary thing that for some time we have had inspectors at our various meat-curing works to see that the meat is fit to be exported, while the inspection of cattle intended for home consumption has been neglected. That has always appeared to me to be a great anomaly, and I am glad this measure has been introduced to remedy that state of affairs. At the present time slaughtering licenses are granted by the majority of the benches of magistrates, and the insignificant fee of 2s. 6d., which was imposed more than half a century ago, is still charged. I believe the multiplicity of slaughtering establishments and butchers' shops throughout the colony is largely due to the small slaughtering fee which is imposed. It has long been my opinion that the fee of 2s. 6d. is absurd and that the Government have been losing an important source of revenue by not imposing a higher sum, which would be cheerfully paid by those engaged in the trade. Parties applying for licenses have to satisfy the court that they are persons of repute, and fit to be entrusted with the slaughtering of cattle, but the hon. member proposes in this Bill to repeal that provision, and does not provide any substitute for it except by way of regulation, and against that I am going to enter my protest. I do not believe in, and have always contended, in this Chamber, against government by regulation. This Bill contains twenty-four clauses, but the hon. gentleman proposes that the Governor in Council shall also have power to frame regulations concerning twenty-six subjects, and those regulations, when once published in the *Government Gazette*, will have the force of law, whether this House likes it or not. I am strongly opposed to this government by regulation, and would ask the House to be very careful in granting this power, because my impression is that Parliament itself should be called upon to decide such matters. What possible reason can there be for taking the granting of licenses out of the hands of the local justices? There are police magistrates in various districts, and surely they and the local justices are competent to decide who shall be licensed to slaughter cattle, but that

provision is eliminated from the present Bill. I was not sure whether it was so, but I find that nothing is said as to who shall issue licenses, and therefore it must be done by regulation, and I think it is an interference with the administration of justice to say that this matter shall be provided for by regulation. This House should certainly appoint the board by whom licenses shall be issued, and by whom fees should be fixed; and the fee should be largely in excess of 2s. 6d., which is ridiculous. It is not customary to discuss details on the second reading of a Bill, but in regard to the general principle I think the hon. member has gone in the right direction. I cannot congratulate him upon asking for such extraordinary powers under regulation, and there is also the matter, pointed out by the hon. member for Rockhampton North, who suggested that when these regulations had been advertised in the *Government Gazette*, which very few people read, they should be laid on the table of this House, so that hon. members may call attention to any matters which may appear to be *ultra vires* in connection with them. That is provided for in other Acts of Parliament, such as the Education Act. As regards the general principles of the Bill, I am in thorough accord with the hon. member who introduced it, and I think he has done quite right, but I think at the same time that he might have paid some compliment to the hon. member for Wide Bay for having directed attention to the matter at an earlier period of the session. I think it is largely due to him, and to the promise made him by the late Premier, that if he introduced such a Bill the Government would assist him, that this measure is before us now. Perhaps it is better, considering the limited time at the disposal of private members, that the Government have taken the matter up, and I hope the Secretary for Agriculture will seriously take into consideration the matter I have referred to, and reintroduce the clause from the old statute, which gives the granting of licenses to the local justices, who know the persons and the districts, and are competent to form a fair opinion as to the suitability of applicants to acquire licenses. There are rigid provisions in the Brands Act for the protection of cattle-owners, and I think the provision should be just as rigid with regard to those who apply for licenses for slaughter-houses.

Mr. LEAHY: This Bill does not repeal that.

Mr. GROOM: The hon. member said in introducing the Bill that he proposed to repeal all the existing statutes in relation to the slaughtering of cattle, and amongst them there is an Act assented to in New South Wales on the 4th July, 1834, the second section of which vests the granting of licenses in the local justices. That Act also provides that licenses shall be applied for in the month of August, and the fee shall be 2s. 6d. The hon. member proposes by this Bill not only to repeal that clause, but the whole Act, and he makes no provision analogous to it in the Bill. I do not think the provisions of the Local Government Act apply to the granting of licenses by local justices. I have been in the colony for forty years, and have never seen the practice varied. The local justices possess absolute powers, and no local authority has ever exercised those powers.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Look at the Local Government Act of 1879.

Mr. GROOM: Local authorities may have the power, but they have never exercised it, and I notice that under the Act of 1834 the license fee is to be paid to the consolidated revenue, and the local authorities would not grant licenses and not keep the fee themselves. The issuing of licenses to slaughter cattle has been always accepted as the act of the Government, and not an act of local administration; and from my

knowledge of the country districts I maintain that the proper authority to issue these licenses is the local justices or the police magistrate if there be one. There should be a given period in the year when these licenses should be applied for, and the fee should be something more substantial than 2s. 6d. I agree with the general features of the Bill, and shall vote for its second reading.

Mr. CROSS: During the course of the remarks of the leader of the Opposition that hon. member in the fulness of his heart paid a very warm tribute to the genius who represents Wide Bay, and who, he said, is the godfather and originator of this Bill. The memory of the leader of the Opposition must be remarkably short, because I think a good many hon. members sitting on his own side have taken part in urging the necessity for some legislation of this kind. I also find that last year the hon. member for Wide Bay, who was then not Mr. Jenkinson, but Sir Horace Tozer, introduced a Bill dealing with the subject which was read a first time, and yet the present hon. member sitting on the back cross benches plumes himself upon this bantling of his as if it were quite a new thing. But if this young legislative phenomenon will look over the records of the last five or six years he will find himself a little too late. He should have arrived here six or seven years ago at least. I hold in my hand a Bill initiated in committee on the 8th September, 1897, by Sir Horace Tozer to provide for "the licensing and inspection of slaughter-houses and to regulate the slaughter and sale of meat," and this wonderful clause 6, which the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Toowoomba have lauded to the skies, is here in its pristine purity and without one word of alteration. And clause 20, which the hon. member for Rosewood is so much in love with, prohibiting swine from being fed on diseased meat, is also in Sir Horace Tozer's Bill. In fact, all the best features in this Bill are to be found in that. Therefore, if there is any honour due to anybody for the measure it should be given to those to whom it is due. And at present I content myself by saying that Sir Horace Tozer is its creator. I congratulate the Government heartily upon the introduction of the Bill. It is the initiation of some legislation which will be very acceptable and extremely useful. Nothing concerns the welfare of a country more than that its inhabitants should have healthy meat for their consumption, and this Bill deals with the matter in such a way as to render it acceptable to all sections of the community. I am not in accord with much that has been said with regard to local authorities. They have not acted in the past up to the extent of the powers given them, but that is no reason why they should not act up to them in the future. In my opinion the nearer the inspectors are to the head authority the better their work will be done. One great cause of complaint has been that the central authority supervising the inspection of work of this kind has been too distant, and I believe that if the local authorities were stirred up and told that they must do their duty the work of inspection of slaughter-houses and the regulation of the sale of meat would be more effectually carried out. I agree with the hon. member for Rosewood that there would be some difficulty with regard to country districts. The Bill is well calculated to operate in places like Rockhampton, Townsville, Gympie, Charters Towers, and Toowoomba; but when you get into small bush townships I am afraid the Minister will have to set himself to consider very carefully to make its provisions as elastic as possible, so as to cause the least obstruction or annoyance. I heartily congratulate the

Minister on the introduction of the Bill which cannot but have a very healthy influence on the community. It is the first step towards dealing with diseased meat.

Mr. LISSNER: The law is a very old one. Moses introduced it.

Mr. CROSS: We know that the Jews have for ages eaten what is known as "Kosher" meat. I remember reading a very able article some years ago in the *Nineteenth Century* dealing with tuberculosis in meat. The paper was written by a German scientist, Dr. Behrand, who dealt with the slaughter of cattle, the conveyance of animals for slaughter, and the manner in which they were treated, in a manner exceedingly instructive. He pointed out that the inspection of meat for human consumption was one of the most important things which could be undertaken; and the success of a Bill of this kind depends largely upon obtaining really efficient officers. As the writer pointed out, it takes a clever expert to be always able to detect diseased meat. In addition to inspection by the Government, he gives a bit of practical advice to persons who eat meat as food. After detailing many experiments of physiologists and others in various parts of Europe, he stated that the bacilli of tuberculosis were not killed unless meat was treated at a certain heat—220 degrees, I think—for not less than thirty minutes. He deprecated the use of roast beef, because the interior portions of the joint were not subjected to the same heat that the outer portions were, and reminded his readers that the Jews ate broiled or stewed meat, always taking care that it was subjected to the proper state of heat; and added that statistics all over the world indicated that the Jewish race were practically free from consumption. I hope this question will meet with general support, and that the public will assist the Government when the Bill is passed, as I believe it will be, in carrying out its provisions. It is high time a measure like this was in operation in Queensland.

Mr. SIM: I should like to say a word or two on this question; I shall be unable to say many, as I am suffering from an attack of pneumonia. I would urge on the attention of the House what has been put before them by the hon. member for Clermont, and I desire to do so by an illustration. I have, on two occasions, had the privilege of being conducted over the Eagle Farm works, and I have also visited the works at Lake's Creek and other places; and the fact which struck me as being most remarkable was that when cattle are being slaughtered for the purpose of export every care is taken that no cattle exported from this country shall be other than healthy cattle. All animals showing signs of tuberculosis are set apart for the purpose of being boiled down, and used for some purpose other than human consumption. If these precautions are taken, under Governmental supervision, for the protection of the health of those to whom we consign meat, I ask, as a Queensland, is it not desirable that some measure should be taken to protect the people of Queensland from eating meat, which is considered unfit, at Eagle Farm, to be sent outside the colony? That is one of the remarkable facts brought under my attention which thoroughly warrants the Government in bringing in this Bill. I recollect, many years ago, when a young Radical in the old country, standing in an audience of 25,000 people, to listen to a speech by Mr. Disraeli, who initiated what was satirically called "the policy of sewage." I have grown older and wiser since then, and have come to the conclusion that no Government can adopt a better policy than that of sewage, or, in other words, the policy of sanitation. For many years, in this and other colonies, the health

of the people has been notoriously and shamefully neglected. We have allowed disease after disease to come in and invade the human body and to invade the cattle on which we have to depend for our chief sustenance. We have taken steps with regard to cattle, but we have done nothing with regard to human beings. I trust that this Bill, upon the introduction of which I commend the Government, will be the first of a series of measures passed to effectually protect the health of the people of Queensland at all points against the insidious attacks which are now being made upon that health in many directions. There is another question, which I think I am not wrong in referring to in discussing the general principles of the Bill, and that is the question of the intaking—I cannot think of a better word—of disease through the use of tuberculous milk.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am going to deal with that question, probably next week.

Mr. SIM: I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that he is going to deal with this question. At the same time I may mention that Sir Horace Tozer told me on one occasion that he believed that consumption had been introduced into his family through milk affected by tuberculosis. As I have already said, I trust that this measure is only the first of a series which will protect as effectually as man can protect—for man is only human after all—the health of the people against those diseases with which they are threatened. The Bill will have my support.

The HON. G. THORN: The Bill has also my hearty support, and I am very pleased to find that all sections of the House are in favour of it. In my opinion, however, it does not go far enough. There are some diseases among stock which are not enumerated in the schedule to the Bill; I shall mention a couple of them, one in cattle and one in sheep. The lumpy disease which occurs in cattle is not set forth in this Bill, and you cannot tell that disease in its first stage until the cattle are slaughtered. Then, again, what is known as fluke in sheep is not mentioned in the Bill. With regard to tuberculosis, I am glad that the measure deals with that disease, because there is no question but that a good deal of the consumption throughout the length and breadth of this and other lands is caused through tuberculosis in cattle, and through meat being imperfectly cooked. I regret to say that tuberculosis is on the increase in Queensland, especially among cattle grazing on marshy land, and I am pleased that this disease, above all others, is attacked by this Bill. The hon. member for North Rockhampton talked about the inspection of stock before they were slaughtered, but this disease you cannot discover until the animal is killed, and it is one which most affects the younger portion of our population. I am glad to hear that the Minister is going to deal with the milk from dairy herds, as that is very necessary. Some hon. members have talked about Israelites being free from consumption, and that is no doubt due to the way in which they slaughter beasts for food, and also to the way in which the meat is cooked. I have always preferred a dinner cooked by a Hebrew, or Israelite, to one cooked by a Christian for that very reason. There is another disease in the colony to which I would refer, and that is the disease of leprosy. I read in a recent scientific book only the other day that leprosy is contracted through eating imperfectly cooked flesh of pigs that have been fed on diseased meat. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I believe there is a great deal of truth in the statement, and that is an excellent reason why we should at once pass this Bill without further

consideration. It shall have my hearty support, with a few amendments which I shall suggest in the second schedule.

Mr. McMASTER: The Government are to be congratulated on introducing this Bill, and I think the Secretary for Agriculture is to be congratulated on his conversion of the opponents of the measure who sit on the other side of the House.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: There are no opponents.

Mr. McMASTER: There were opponents.

Mr. SIM: Who said so?

Mr. McMASTER: The hon. member for Carpentaria was not one of them. The hon. member for North Rockhampton said the Government had come down to socialism, and so forth, and last week some hon. members on that side did their level best to prevent the Bill being introduced. I shall give the names of those members who kept the discussion going till nearly 6 o'clock, and then divided the House on the question. The parties who opposed the introduction of the Bill when a vote was taken were—Messrs. Glassey, Fitzgerald, Dunsford, McDonald, Hoolan, Kerr, King, Turley, Dawson, McDonnell, Kidston, Daniels, Jackson, Hardacre, Maughan, and Stewart. Therefore I say the Minister is to be congratulated on having converted hon. members opposite and obtained their hearty support to the Bill. I was very pleased to hear the hon. member for Clermont put the matter truthfully before the House as to who were the first to insist upon this Bill. Many of the local authorities have been asking for such a measure for years, because no local authority in the colony has sufficient funds to establish proper abattoirs. Some years ago the municipality of Brisbane made an attempt in that direction, but they found that to do so on the principle suggested by the then Government they would have to spend something like £60,000, and they were not prepared to go to that expense. Our local authorities are so divided—very different from local authorities in the other colonies—that it would be difficult to get them to agree to one authority establishing abattoirs. I think the Government have taken the proper course in providing that they may establish abattoirs where they think necessary, but it would be well to amend the clause in such a way as to give the Government power, after abattoirs are built, to hand them over to the local authorities, so that the supervision might be more local. They would be looked after better in that way than they would if the supervision was all from one centre. I would be willing that the Government should have general control, but power should be given to lease to the local authorities. I am pleased to see that this Bill has been introduced, and I hope it will become law this session without any further difficulty, so that the meat intended for home consumption may be inspected as well as that intended for export. We are paying inspectors to examine and attach the Government brand to meat before it goes out of the colony, and I do not see why we should not look after our own people. I am pleased to see the clause that refers to the feeding of swine on the offal of the slaughter-houses. It is a most abominable thing to see swine rolling about in the mud that is about slaughter-houses and feeding on the offal, and it is high time that some person stepped in and put a stop to the practice.

Mr. HARDACRE: The hon. member for Fortitude Valley was disingenuous in quoting the names of hon. members who voted against the introduction of this Bill last week, and I think he was entirely out of order in doing so, because he was quoting from a debate of the same session, and his doing so will necessitate an

explanation why those hon. members voted against the introduction of the Bill. It is patent to everyone, and to the hon. gentleman himself, that those hon. members did not vote against the introduction of the measure because they were opposed to it, but because they thought it was the duty of the Government, on the change of Premiership, to consult the people of the colony and get a mandate from them before going on with any public business at all. I would like to congratulate the Government on this measure, but it is rather too early to congratulate them. After all, what is it? It is merely a changing of the letter of the law while leaving the law the same as it was before. Practically the whole of the clauses in this Bill are law at present under the old Slaughtering Act. The Government have already substantially all the powers contained in this Bill.

Mr. LEAHY: And a good deal more.

Mr. HARDACRE: And a good deal more in some cases. There are constables to inspect the slaughter-houses.

Mr. SMITH: It is not done.

Mr. HARDACRE: Of course it is not done; therefore I say it is too early to congratulate the Government, because the whole force of this Bill will lie in its administration, as in the case of the old Act; and if the old Act has been a failure for lack of administration, who is to say that this Bill will not be equally a failure for want of administration? I think it is bound to be very largely a failure, judging by the experience of the past. I am very glad to see the matter of abattoirs being dealt with in the Bill, but I noticed that the Secretary for Agriculture, in connection with the question as to who first advocated the establishment of public abattoirs, claimed that two or three months ago he was collecting information in order to bring in this Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Quite true.

Mr. HARDACRE: We know, however, that last session Sir Horace Tozer actually brought in the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: A Bill very similar.

Mr. HARDACRE: And the hon. gentleman was collecting information four months ago to introduce a Bill that had already been introduced.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: So I was collecting information.

Mr. HARDACRE: It appears that there was not much information required. It was all done last session when the Bill was introduced. I may say that five years ago I strongly advocated this part of the Government Bill in the public Press of Brisbane and on the platform.

Mr. LEAHY: It was advocated in other places besides.

Mr. HARDACRE: I believe the most important part of this Bill is the establishment of public abattoirs. You cannot properly inspect beasts intended for slaughter, and the meat after they have been slaughtered, unless you have abattoirs where the slaughtering is centralised. But, in my opinion, this Bill will be largely a failure. It says the Minister may, out of the moneys appropriated by Parliament for that purpose, establish public abattoirs. Where will he establish them? The hon. member for Fortitude Valley has told us that it would take £50,000 to establish abattoirs in Brisbane, and is it likely that the Government are going to establish abattoirs all over the colony? When boiled down, it means that the Minister may establish abattoirs, if he establishes any at all—probably there will be none—but if he establishes any at all it will probably be one for Brisbane. If it is going to cost £50,000 to establish abattoirs in Brisbane, and similar amounts in other places, I do not see

how the Government are going to establish public abattoirs in various parts of the colony, and I think a very much better way of making the Bill effective would have been to have introduced a section compelling the local authorities—not merely giving them permission—to establish abattoirs for the slaughter of meat intended for local consumption. The biggest change, practically the only change in this Bill, from what is already in force in various Acts, is in the very extensive power under the regulations, and the effectiveness of the Bill all depends on whether the regulations are put into force or not. I shall support the Bill simply to give the Government the chance of making stringent and effective regulations, and I hope they will put them into force.

Mr. LEAHY: This does not say what the regulations will be.

Mr. HARDACRE: No. It only says they may make regulations. I would like to see some of the things provided for in the regulations put into the Bill itself. Some of the things the Government may do by regulation under this Bill are already law. At any rate, I am prepared to support the Bill in the hope that the Government will put it into force, and administer it in such a way that it will contribute to the health of the people of this colony.

Mr. SMITH: This is a very necessary measure, and I congratulate the Minister on introducing it. It did certainly seem an anomaly that we should have the inspection only of meat intended for export from this colony, and thus in some degree prevent or disallow diseased meat from being exported, and I think the hon. member for Toowoomba was quite right when he referred to that matter. But as far as my information goes that inspection does not go so far as to prevent that meat, though it may be condemned, from being exported. I think I am correct in stating that. It is certainly my impression. For instance, if the owner of cattle sends his stock to one of our meat-preserving works the meat is subject to inspection by a Government inspector, and the inspector classifies that meat.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No. There is no grading.

Mr. SMITH: It is subject to his inspection and condemnation, but there is no executive power behind the inspector to prevent the meat from being sent on to the London market if the owner of the meat prefers to have it sent there.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. SMITH: I am very glad to learn from the hon. gentleman's interjection that this state of affairs, which has been a grievance in the past, exists no longer. I believe the Government are quite right in making this inspection a very strict one, and in taking it into their own hands. It is all very well to say that the local authorities have had powers conferred upon them for the purpose; but what is the use of having the powers if they do not choose to exercise them? It is in the administration of these Acts that the people benefit or otherwise. This Bill contains excellent provisions; but if, when it becomes law, it is not properly administered, then it will be a failure. There is no doubt that diseased meat now goes into consumption, and that it has been the cause of a great amount of misery and disease, but that can be prevented by the faithful administration of this measure.

Mr. JACKSON: There is no doubt whatever that the effect of this Bill, when it becomes law, will depend upon its administration; but I suppose that in a colony like Queensland, with such small scattered populations, it is simply an impossibility to administer an Act of Parliament

of this character. Still we have a right to expect from the Government efficient administration, at any rate, in the large centres of population. The Secretary for Agriculture, in introducing the Bill, referred to the fact that the police have done very good work in the past in the way of inspecting slaughter-houses. I suppose the hon. gentleman referred to the inspection of hides as well as to the inspection of the slaughter-houses, but in that respect my experience is contrary to that of the Minister. I cannot speak of the towns, but in the country districts the inspection of hides by the police in the past has been simply a dead letter. Under the old Acts the fees used to be paid direct to the inspectors, but since those fees have been taken away from the inspectors there has been little interest taken in the matter by the police. I might call the attention of the Minister to the fact that under the Brands Act of 1872 the inspectors of slaughter-houses are required to furnish the inspectors of brands with weekly returns of stock intended to be slaughtered and that had been slaughtered. We are repealing all existing Acts on the subject, and, if the hon. gentleman cannot give us the information now, probably when the Bill gets into committee he will be able to tell us whether that provision will still apply. There is no such provision in the Bill. It has been dropped out, as other things which have been referred to by hon. members. The Minister will probably say that it is proposed to deal with these matters by regulation, and I admit that this might be done under paragraph 3 of clause 21, which provides for the making of regulations dealing with "the conditions on which slaughter-houses may be licensed, and the licensing of slaughter-houses." It would be possible under that to frame regulations providing that notice shall be given by people intending to slaughter. That provision is valued very much in some of the outside districts. At any rate, it used to be valued when cattle-stealing was rife. I do not suppose there is anything like the same amount of cattle-stealing now that there used to be, but I know that that provision was very much appreciated by the owners of cattle in the outside districts. The senior member for Toowoomba pointed out how many paragraphs there were in clause 21 specifying the subjects on which regulations may be made—there are twenty-six altogether—giving the Government a very large amount of power indeed. The hon. member pointed out that this practice of dealing with matters by regulation is growing. It is the same in the Mining Bill, with the Diseases in Stock Bill, and other important measures. It is rather a bad practice. Although, I admit, there may be an objection to cumbering the statute-book with too many details, at the same time, if such important details as I have mentioned were inserted in the measures themselves, those who want information would be able to get it by a reference to the statutes, without having to turn up the *Government Gazette* or get copies of the regulations. The Government ought to take particular care that the most important matters should not be left to be dealt with by regulation, but should find a place in the Bill itself. The hon. member for Toowoomba had therefore some justification in drawing attention to the matter. Something has been said during the course of the debate about the danger from the milk of tuberculous cows. The Minister hinted that we could wait for that, as the Government intended introducing a Bill on those lines. I hope they will, because I consider that a Bill dealing with dairies is even more important than this, because, although a considerable amount of diseased meat gets into consumption, yet the fact of the meat being cooked

tends in the majority of cases to destroy the germs of disease. But with regard to milk it is quite the opposite. There is so much milk that is not scalded or boiled that there is really more danger from it than from the consumption of diseased meat. The matter of the establishment of public abattoirs has also been referred to, and members have refused to give the Government credit for introducing the Bill, preferring to wait until they see what is done under it. I think that is a very proper position to take up. The Minister pointed to the inconsistency of having inspectors of meat for export whilst we do not have inspection of meat consumed in the colony. The reason for that is apparent—simply because we have had no means of inspecting the meat. It has been pointed out that until we get public abattoirs it will be impossible to deal with the matter. I should have liked the Minister to have indicated how the Government intend to proceed in the matter of public abattoirs. I do not expect that they can establish them in every town of the colony. It has been said it might be done in Brisbane, and that Brisbane is the only place where they were likely to be established. I admit there is considerable difficulty about establishing public or Government slaughtering-houses. Of course there are vested interests in the way, and I believe that would be considered a very great difficulty by the Government—how to deal with the butchers who have extensive slaughter-houses round Brisbane. I do not know whether the Government would entertain the question of compensation. There are difficulties, no doubt, but they ought to be surmounted, even if it comes to a question of paying compensation. I do not intend to say anything more at present. We shall have an opportunity in committee of discussing the various clauses, but I am glad the Government have introduced the Bill. Perhaps they do not deserve a great deal of credit for it. One member took away any credit the hon. member for Wide Bay might claim, and that of course would destroy any credit due to the Minister.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not want any credit.

Mr. JACKSON: I am glad the Minister is so modest, but I compliment him nevertheless. I think the Bill is a step in the right direction, and I hope he will effectively administer it. It is impossible to administer a measure of this sort in outlying districts; it will remain a dead letter, as the present Slaughtering Act has done. Therefore I do not expect any great good to come out of it immediately. Still, in the future no doubt it will be a great benefit, and I therefore support the Bill with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. JENKINSON: From one or two arguments that have fallen from hon. members, especially on this side, it has been suggested that I desired to take credit for forcing the Minister to introduce this Bill. I desire to do nothing of the sort, and I hope I shall be acquitted of that desire. I have previously congratulated the Minister upon introducing the Bill, and I do so again. I am glad the Government have taken the matter in hand, because I consider the subject a most important one. To what extent diseased meat affects the health of the people we cannot tell, but that it does affect the health none can doubt. It must be apparent to everyone that the time has arrived when legislation on this subject should take place. We have been told that although the meat intended for export undergoes direct supervision, yet the meat that our fellow-colonists consume undergoes no inspection whatever. It would be rather interesting if someone could tell us what becomes of the meat that is condemned at the freezing works—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: To the pots.

Mr. JENKINSON: Whether it goes into human consumption, whether it is fed to swine, or whether it is destroyed in the manner it should be. In all probability it is boiled down and fed to pigs. There are Acts on our statute-book at the present time providing for that which the Minister seeks to accomplish, and this Bill is only a slight alteration in the wording of those Acts. Everyone must admit that those who have charge of the inspection of slaughter-houses and of the sale of meat have been very lax in the performance of their duties, and it is quite time the law became much more stringent so that the public health will be better looked after than it has been in the past. It is very evident that the powers given to local authorities need a great deal of revision and extension if they are to deal with matters of this kind in an effective way, and the law should be administered with much more stringency. A law that is a dead letter on the statute-book is practically valueless. Queensland has been very much behindhand in legislation of this sort, and the other colonies have shown the way.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Which colony?

Mr. JENKINSON: New Zealand.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No, they have a Bill before the House now. There is only New South Wales.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Minister will pardon me if I tell him that they have an Abattoirs Act in New Zealand.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: How many abattoirs have they?

Mr. JENKINSON: And they have a Slaughtering Act and a Sale of Meat Act in New South Wales. They have also public abattoirs in that colony, at Glebe Island and at Homebush.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Where else out of Sydney? What about Bathurst, and Maitland, and Newcastle, and all those big towns? Where are their abattoirs?

Mr. JENKINSON: The principle has been affirmed in the other colonies, and I trust if this Bill is passed the Minister will see that it is carried into effect. In other parts of the world the matter has been gone into for years past. It is not a new question. I quote now from an article written by a medical man—

Berlin has municipal abattoirs, and derives about £38,000 a year from slaughtering fees. They keep a staff of 200 men, and the meat of no animal which has been suffering from tuberculosis, trichinosis, or any other disease is allowed to be sent out for human consumption.

The Jewish nation have also shown us how to do things, and I quote the following from an article in the *Sydney Bulletin*, written by Mr. S. A. Mills, describing an interview with the Chief Rabbi of Sydney, who said:—

All the meat we eat is examined by the Shouchat (the killer): one of our own, a competent in the detection of disease. He critically examines each carcass throughout—takes the lungs for instance, blows them out and searches them. Should he find a symptom of disease, he condemns the carcass. Tuberculosis is much more prevalent than is generally supposed, and our care in meat examination greatly explains our vitality and longevity. Our meat, too, being drained of the blood is more healthful.

At the present time I think every hon. member will admit that sufficient care is not taken in the examination of meat, and it is therefore essentially necessary that we should have efficient inspection. Even though our laws at present provide for inspection, yet they are not carried out properly, and there is no reason why slaughter-houses should be so obnoxious as some are. I am speaking from a little bit of experience,

because I have made it my business to go round some of them; and I can assure this House, if hon. members do not already know it, that some of them are kept in a disgraceful state, and to see them is almost enough to make a man become a vegetarian for the rest of his life. The question of inspectors is one of the most important things the Minister will have to look after, for it will be no use appointing incompetent men to the position, because the position will then be that we shall appear to have protection, but in reality there will be no protection. The inspectors should be men who thoroughly understand the business—men with some veterinary education, or, at all events, men with sufficient scientific knowledge to know whether there is disease in an animal or not, otherwise the inspection will be ineffective. What we have to consider more than anything else is the health of the people, and possibly the effect of this legislation will be more far reaching, and lead to stockowners breeding healthy stock. The placing of such a law as this on our statute-book, with a few amendments, will mark a forward step in our legislation, and I am inclined to congratulate the Government upon the spirit of democracy that appears to animate them at present judging from this measure. If the inspection be carried out properly, we shall have a guarantee that the beasts are in a healthy condition. In New South Wales the inspection of meat, apart from the public abattoirs, has not been so satisfactory, and even the New South Wales people, especially those in the neighbourhood of Sydney, are complaining of the amount of diseased meat that has been placed on the market. In reply to a deputation some time ago the Premier of New South Wales said he did not think there would be much improvement unless public abattoirs were established, and it appears to be the intention of the Government there to introduce a measure providing for the establishment of abattoirs under the control of some of the local authorities. I shall read an extract from the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 3rd September last—

Speaking on the subject yesterday the Premier said the Government will have to deal with the diseased meat question soon, but the difficulty is that it cannot be properly dealt with until municipal slaughter-houses have been established in convenient centres. Such municipal slaughter-houses being established, the next step would be to prohibit the sale of any meat within the areas served by such slaughter-houses which had not been killed at these institutions. The meat killed at each of these municipal abattoirs could then be properly inspected and branded.

That, said Mr. Reid, requires not only legislative, but also municipal action. However, as the establishment of such municipal abattoirs would be a perfectly safe and remunerative investment, there would be very little difficulty in the way of establishing a system of State-guaranteed municipal loans for such purposes.

I gather from this Bill that it is not the intention of the Government to place any provision in the hands of local authorities for the establishment of abattoirs, which will be really erected by the State. Clause 6 implies as much, and I should like the Minister, when replying, to indicate what money is going to be appropriated for the purpose. There is another matter which was touched upon by the hon. member for North Brisbane, and that was in regard to the situation of these abattoirs. I think it is essential that they should be at such a distance from towns that the meat cannot be in any way contaminated by close settlement. The New Zealand Act is very stringent in regard to that matter. Sub-section 2 of clause 11 of the Bill gives an inspector power to enter any slaughter-house or butcher's shop if he has reason to think any offence against the Bill has been committed, but I do not think the clause goes far enough in regard to penalising people for selling or exposing diseased meat for sale. I presume that will be a matter

for regulation. Like the hon. member for Toowoomba and others, I think it is a mistake to attempt to govern by regulations; I would far rather see them embodied in the Bill, so that when it becomes an Act, and we want to turn it up, we shall have it all in front of us, and not have to go through the *Government Gazette* for the regulations. There are some other clauses I intended to touch upon, but it is just as well to leave them until we get into committee, when I shall move a few amendments, which I hope to have printed and circulated amongst hon. members previously. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, and shall do all I possibly can to assist the Government, because the Bill will not only prove a useful one, but it is necessary for the public health.

Mr. ANNEAR: I did not intend to make any remarks on this Bill, because I admit, like several other members, that my knowledge with regard to the breeding of stock is very limited indeed. But we have in this House a gentleman who evidently, from what we have seen since his advent as a member, is an expert in the breeding of stock, and is also conversant with all the diseases which cattle are heir to in this colony. This Bill is almost similar to a Bill that was initiated in committee last session by Sir Horace Tozer, and read a first time, so that it is no new measure. Indeed, for many years prior to the advent of this great expert we have in the hon. member for Wide Bay, almost every hon. member on both sides of the House has been urging upon Ministers the introduction of a Bill of this kind. With other members, I congratulate the Secretary for Agriculture on introducing the Bill. There is no doubt the time has arrived when there should be some measure to prevent diseased meat from being sold in any portion of the colony. We see the result of the want of such a measure from the reports from the different hospitals from time to time. I expected to hear a speech from the hon. member for Wide Bay worthy of the occasion. As we know, that hon. member was scarcely twenty-four hours in the House before he gave notice to introduce a Bill similar to the one before us; but I do think, and I am sure every hon. member will agree with me, that statements made in this House by members should be capable of substantiation. As I said, I am not an expert in the breeding of stock. The hon. member for Wide Bay, who I am sorry is not present, said he believed that this Bill would force the breeders of stock to breed healthy stock. Men who breed stock, I fancy, breed them for a profit, to make money out of the business; and I should not imagine a man who bred unhealthy stock would have at any time any cattle fit for the butcher or the market. The hon. member also stated—and there are several hon. members more conversant with this subject than I am—that at several of the meatworks in the colony the proprietors boiled down diseased cattle and fed the offal to the pigs. I have visited several of the meatworks of the colony, and I do not think pigs are kept at any of them. I have never seen a pig there. And I should be sorry to think that there is any ordinary butcher who would boil down diseased cattle for pigs' meat, and offer the pigs afterwards for sale.

Mr. KERR: It is done, though.

Mr. ANNEAR: I look upon that statement of the hon. member for Wide Bay as nothing less than a libel on those engaged in the meat industry in the colony. I should be very sorry to think I was living in a colony where large companies engaged in sending frozen meat to Great Britain boiled down diseased meat to feed pigs with. I am sure such is not the case.

Mr. KEOGH: They give them the meat without boiling it, and I am aware of it.

Mr. ANNEAR: If the hon. member is aware of it he should stand up in his place and give the names of the men who would do such a dastardly thing as that. My opinion is that such things do not take place in Queensland; and I make the statement, and challenge contradiction, that throughout the whole of the meatworks of the colony there is not a pig kept on one of them. I shall support the second reading of the Bill, and I will only say in conclusion that I was very much disappointed that the hon. member for Wide Bay, from whom we expected so much of a scientific character, so utterly failed in giving us that information in his speech on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. FOGARTY: I had no intention to speak on this subject until I heard the remarks of the hon. member for Maryborough. I think that hon. member is under a misapprehension when he states, in such a positive way, that it is beyond question that butchers do not purchase diseased cattle for the purpose of feeding pigs. I drew the attention of the House a short time ago to a case in point, and that is my chief complaint. It is true that that is not done at the large meat-preserving establishments which have Government inspectors connected with them, but it is done in butchering establishments where there is no inspection. In the case I mentioned, the butcher in question endeavoured to evade the matter by saying that the cattle were purchased as "potters," or to be boiled down, but if boiled down there is no doubt the flesh would have gone to the pigs. It is also well known to anyone with a knowledge of the butchering business that pigs are a very large source of revenue in connection with that particular trade; and I am inclined to think that the butchers may object to the establishment of abattoirs, as it will do away with a large slice of their profits. The hon. member for Rockhampton North said the working of the measure would be much better in the hands of the Government. I agree with him. He also gave a reason with which I disagree—namely, that local authorities are indifferent, are negligent, and refuse to perform the work even now imposed upon them. I say without fear of contradiction that the local authorities as a whole—of course there are exceptions—are as anxious to preserve the health of the people as the Government are. But there is the matter of expense to be considered. The salaries of the various inspectors will have to be provided, and the revenue of many of the local authorities is so small that they can ill afford the cost. In fact I would venture to say that they could not afford the cost of first-class men. With all due respect to my friend, the hon. member for Wide Bay, I am pleased that the Government have taken this matter in hand, because short as my experience in the House has been it has shown me that a measure of this kind is much more likely to be passed if it is introduced by the Government than it would if brought forward by a private member. I congratulate the Secretary for Agriculture on his having moved in this direction. He has certainly not done so before there was a great clamour and demand for legislation of this sort, but when the Government come to appoint inspectors I am inclined to think that they will have considerable difficulty in getting a sufficient number of expert men. The Colonial Secretary of New South Wales, in a speech in the Legislative Assembly of that colony, stated that the chief objection to a measure of this sort was the difficulty in getting capable men as inspectors, and he said he thought that not more than three competent men could be obtained in New South Wales. If that is the case in a colony which has considerably over

double the population of Queensland, the Government here will have a very difficult task before them in getting suitable persons.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We have more men serving in that capacity in Queensland than they have in New South Wales.

Mr. FOGARTY: Well, I hope the difficulty I have mentioned may not be experienced. My colleague pointed out that there is no provision made in the Bill for granting slaughtering licenses, and took exception to the small fee of 2s. 6d. now charged for a license. That certainly is a very small fee, but it must be borne in mind that in addition to that butchers have to pay a sum of 3d. per head, which comes to a very large amount where a man does a large trade. The hon. member for North Rockhampton stated that in his opinion cattle should be carefully examined before they are slaughtered, and I agree with him that they should be examined both in the market yards and in the slaughter yards. But that is not going far enough. An inspector should be present when the cattle are slaughtered so as to be able to detect any inward disease which would not be otherwise discoverable, and to act accordingly. The provisions of the Bill are fairly stringent, and I hope that when the measure becomes law the Government, whatever party it may represent, will see that it is carried out to the very letter. The first duty of a Government is to watch over the health of the people; and I have not the shadow of a doubt that a number of very valuable lives have been sacrificed by the sale of diseased meat. If cattle are slaughtered for the purpose of boiling down, and the flesh is then thrown to pigs, that may be the means of communicating disease to the consumer of pork or bacon. Some persons may say that the flesh of cattle is valueless after the fat is extracted from it. I do not think that is the case; but whether it is or not—and I am not sufficiently expert in the matter to give an authoritative opinion—I would point out that there is nothing done with the blood, which is allowed to filter probably through an asphalt channel, and then be consumed by pigs, and by this means disease may be communicated to the human subject. I know that the proprietors of at least one bacon factory in Queensland will not purchase pigs raised by butchers, and the consequence is that farmers are receiving a remarkably fair price for their pigs. If those people, as I anticipate they will in a very short time, get the whole of the pork and bacon trade in their hands, that will probably have a tendency to compel butchers to discontinue pig-breeding, and that will be all the better for the health of the colony. I trust that the Government will not allow this measure to drop after it has passed its second reading, but that they will pass it into law as speedily as possible, for if there is any measure that is required in the interests of humanity it is this Bill. I believe it is the Minister's intention to go on with the matter until the Government are placed in a position to safeguard the public health. The only supervision exercised in regard to cattle hitherto, outside meat-preserving establishments, has been an inspection in a shadowy way under an old Act passed a very long time ago, and it is time that a radical change in that respect was effected. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill with pleasure, and if my vote is required in committee I shall be prepared to give it at any personal inconvenience in order to further this proposal.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE, in reply: I should like to say a few words in reply to what has been said by various members, as two or three points have been touched upon which merit some attention. The first is that made by

the leader of the Opposition, who pointed out that the 4th subsection of clause 8, which empowers an inspector to order the removal or isolation of any person "affected with disease so that any meat is likely to be contaminated," places too big a responsibility on an inspector. I am not sure that he is not right, and I will look into the matter. I dare say I can find something that will meet his views. The hon. member for Lockyer complained that there is no appeal except to the Minister from the inspector's order, and that the inspector's powers are very wide. In the Diseases in Plants Bill last year several members on both sides thought there should be an appeal to a court of competent jurisdiction, and I dare say I shall be able to look into this matter and see if it can be arranged. The hon. member for Rosewood thought the provisions relating to the prevention of theft were too arbitrary, but I can assure him that the clauses are only a reproduction of the existing law. The important point raised by the senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba about the granting of licenses I shall have much pleasure in looking into before the Bill reaches the committee stage. With regard to the introduction of so many regulations, as a matter of fact in our legislation all through we have not nearly so many regulations as they have in New South Wales. The advantage of having regulations is that regulations are elastic—they can be recalled and reframed as we find the work requires.

Mr. LEAHY: And people far away know nothing of them.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is the disadvantage; but the advantage is that if you draft a Bill it gets into unalterable law, no so regulations. A Bill containing all these regulations would have between 300 and 400 clauses; many of these regulations are not required in the immediate future, and would probably not be drafted for a year or two. In these matters we must go slowly. You cannot start with a fully equipped department to do the whole thing, and it is found in New South Wales that the elastic character of regulations enables them to alter them when they find they do not suit the circumstances. Their elastic character has made them more desirable than hon. members might seem to think at first sight. The hon. member for Clermont asked that we should deal gently with outside places. That is what will have to be done at first. In the first administration of the Bill we must deal almost solely with the more densely settled parts of the colony, and the outside places will, for the present, have to look after themselves. We shall administer the Act mainly on the lines laid down in England and Germany. I may say that as a matter of fact these Acts are far more stringent where there is no democracy at all. Germany and Denmark are the great places of inspection of slaughterhouses and inspection of meat. There is nothing democratic about it at all; it is simply something done in the interests of public health. The administration of the Act, as regards the inspection and condemnation of meat, will be carried out on the lines laid down in England, and in Denmark and Germany, not exactly on the lines followed in New South Wales, which, of all countries in the world, are the most harsh and rigid. I think it was the hon. member for Clermont who referred to the condemnation of whole carcasses where only parts are affected by disease. In this country already, in the inspection of meat for export where the tubercle is localised, only that part is condemned which contains the tubercle; where the disease is general the whole carcass is condemned. In New South Wales there was

considerable trouble lately because in the passages of the throat there were some small tubercles which do not affect the rest of the meat, and the whole carcass was condemned. The difficulty of getting first-class inspectors was referred to by the junior member for Drayton and Toowoomba, and I quite realise the truth of what he says. As a matter of fact we have in the employ of the Government now five certificated veterinary surgeons holding London degrees, and we have under them ten or fifteen young fellows now being trained up who, I believe, will turn out first-class inspectors, though they do not hold London degrees. I believe the difficulty of finding capable inspectors will not be nearly so great as the hon. member anticipates. I should like to refer to a few words said by the hon. member for Wide Bay. With regard to the disposal of diseased carcasses in the meat export works, I said they went to the pots, and he said, "They go to the swine."

Mr. JENKINSON: No. I said "sometimes."

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member is making a very serious statement. These meatworks are inspected by inspectors. There is a Meat Export Act, and we guarantee that all meat that leaves the colony is in good order and comes from sound cattle. The hon. member must remember that his words carry far greater weight outside this House than they do inside, because people at the other end of the world do not know the hon. member for Wide Bay. Our meat exporters have very many enemies all over the world, and I can imagine the following paragraph appearing in the *American Provisioner*:—"The following statement was made by Mr. Jenkinson, the member for Wide Bay, who succeeded Sir Horace Tozer, the present Agent-General for Queensland, as member for that important electorate. He said" so and so—quoting the words of the hon. member. We have enemies looking everywhere to find out how they can damage our trade, and unless the hon. member is aware of his own knowledge that at any meat export works pigs are kept, and what he says is done, he has no right to say it in this House. I should not say he has no right to say it. He has a right to say what he likes, but it is very unfair to the colony; it is very unfair to the Stock Department that he should say that at some of the meatworks there are pigs kept, and that the diseased stock is fed to them. It is not only unfair to say it, but he has no right to say it, because it is not true. The hon. member should know very well that in all the meatworks the diseased cattle go to the pots, from there to the drier, and are all turned into manure. The hon. member knows that it is by no means all loss. There is a greater demand now than ever there has been in the history of the colony for this manure. We are exporting manure to Japan and to Mauritius. I believe the statement that some of the meatworks keep pigs is absolutely without foundation. Then, again, why should the hon. member take a delight in saying Queensland is behind all the other colonies? How is Queensland behind the other colonies in this matter? We are only working at the same time as they are. New Zealand has a Bill on the stocks; South Australia has a Bill on the stocks; Victoria has a Bill on the stocks. Western Australia has not got a Bill of this sort at all. I do not see what delight the hon. member can take in constantly running down the colony of Queensland.

Mr. JENKINSON: I am not constantly running it down.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The hon. member makes his living out of the colony that he says is behind all the rest. Queensland is ahead of all the rest—a long way ahead.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I find that it was the hon. member for Wide Bay who spoke of the spirit of democracy. I do not call it a democratic spirit to run down the colony you live off, and crack up other colonies in which you do not live.

Mr. JENKINSON: If there is anything detrimental to the interests of the colony it should be exposed.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If it is true, I am much obliged to hon. members for the kind way in which they have received this Bill. Such remarks as have been made I shall try and give them every attention, and, as far as possible, meet the views of hon. members.

Question put and passed; and committal of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

BRITISH PROBATES BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS, this Bill, received by message from the Council, was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

SUPPLY.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—GOVERNMENT CAUCUS.

The TREASURER: Mr. Speaker,—I move you do now leave the chair.

Mr. LEAHY: Before you leave the chair, Sir, and before we commence to grant Supply to Her Majesty's Government, there are some matters—matters of grievance—which affect myself and some other hon. members on this side, to which I desire to call attention. A report appeared in the *Brisbane Courier* of 5th October last, and a similar report, almost word for word—the same phraseology—appeared in the *Telegraph* of the same date, both of which purported to give a report of a meeting which was held by members of this House, purporting, I may say, to set out certain matters which occurred at that meeting, and at considerable length. The report in itself is not much, but it has been the foundation on which a great many paragraphs and leading articles have appeared in different papers throughout the colony, some of them reflecting very strongly not so much on myself as on other members of the party which was present at the meeting referred to in the report. It is stated in the report—a report which was given to these papers by the hon. gentleman who is Chief Secretary at the present time—

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. gentleman says "No." The hon. gentleman told me in the presence of the Treasurer two days ago, and in the presence of the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Stephens, that he had given the information.

Mr. STEPHENS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I did not.

Mr. STEPHENS: You did.

Mr. LEAHY: The Treasurer is sitting on the front Treasury bench at the present time, and I ask him if he will deny the statement I have just made?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He has taken Tozer's place.

Mr. LEAHY: Yes; he is keeping up the reputation of the department at all events. However, that is beside the question. I shall say what I have to say on the question in as simple a manner as possible, and I shall say nothing offensive if I can manage to avoid it. I simply wish to make certain explanations in justification of myself, and I promise to do the

thing as nicely as I can if hon. members will permit me. In these papers myself and certain other hon. members are charged in the first instance with wishing to elect a Premier—in direct opposition, of course, as everybody who knows anything of constitutional law knows, to the principles of our Constitution. It is made to appear that this little band—or “cave” as they are called—are so extremely ignorant that they are absolutely ignorant of the fundamental provisions of the Constitution of the country in which they live, and on which this House is carried on. That is a very severe reflection in itself. I shall enumerate the various charges first, and then come back and explain exactly what did take place. The next charge is that these members wished to elect a man to the position of Premier or leader who had absolutely refused to take the position at their hands. That is not correct either. I shall return to that also. The third statement is that they attempted to force the views of a small minority of members upon the vast majority of the members sitting on this side of the House. That is not correct either. I shall also return to this later on. The fourth is that this little “cave”—this busybody section—grossly misrepresented the condition of affairs to the other members who signed a certain document, which the hon. gentleman designated as a “round-robin.”

The PREMIER: Who did? I never called it a “round-robin.”

Mr. LEAHY: I heard the hon. gentleman refer to it half-a-dozen times as a “round-robin.”

The PREMIER: Where?

Mr. LEAHY: At a place which I regret to say had not the sacredness of secrecy that it should have had—that traditional sacredness of secrecy which belongs to caucuses throughout the civilised world. It is said that this little party grossly misrepresented matters to the members who signed that document, and that if they had not done so these members would not have signed their names to it. That is not true either. It is grossly untrue. The next statement is that the whole matter was an intrigue on the part of a couple of members, and that they worked members on this side. I tell the House that there was no trouble taken to work anyone—their feelings were not worked upon in any way in order to get their signatures to this document. The next matter is that the names were not got in a straightforward manner, and that these members signed a document in the shape of a “round-robin” not knowing really what it was. They did nothing of the sort. It was a perfectly straightforward document, couched in proper language, and according to proper grammatical construction. All these paragraphs and leading articles were based, as I say, on the reports which were supplied to the daily papers. The Chief Secretary says the report was not supplied by him. Of course, in this House I have to accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but all I can say is that he told me so himself a few days ago in his room with the Treasurer present, who now remains quiet. I make allowance for the hon. gentleman being perhaps a little bit excited over his elevated position. Most people get more or less giddy when they get into elevated positions. I would not do him the injustice of saying that he would wilfully and deliberately state he did not tell me what I say he did, if he thought he had done so. I should be very sorry to think that an hon. gentleman occupying the position of leader of this House would be guilty of such conduct. It is reported, further, that a great majority of members went back on this document after they had signed it. Now, that is not the case. There is not a single man who signed that document who went back upon it. What those members did

was this: The meaning of that document was that they insisted upon having the Hon. Robert Philp as leader.

Mr. KEOGH: Hear, hear!

Mr. LEAHY: Why does the hon. member not come over to this side if he says “hear, hear”?

Mr. KEOGH: I am prepared to support him on this side of the House.

Mr. LEAHY: At all events, not one single man of the thirteen who signed the document went back upon what he signed.

Mr. CORFIELD: Were there thirteen who signed it?

Mr. LEAHY: Yes; the hon. gentleman who interjects did not sign it, but he signed a document which was equal to it with the exception of the last five words. There is one hon. member I am looking at now who did to some extent say that he signed it, not knowing what he was signing, but on the understanding that the Hon. Robert Philp was going to take the position of leader. As a matter of fact that hon. gentleman not only signed it but went round the town canvassing other hon. members to sign it, and I can tell the hon. member who the members were that he tried to convert. What I want to show is that in the position which I and several others took up we succeeded beyond our expectations, and we were not the victims of that gross failure which is attributed to us.

Mr. SIM: Then why these tears?

Mr. LEAHY: There are no tears that I know of. I am unlike the hon. gentleman—I cry neither for joy nor sorrow. I have seen the hon. gentleman do it for both reasons. However, we will let that pass. I hope hon. members will not interrupt me. I am not very nice at any time, but I want to be as nice as possible now. I say again that not one single member went back. Mr. Philp made a pathetic appeal to the meeting. He said that whatever he had done in the past, he would not accept the position of Premier at the present time. He appealed to every member present, and told them that they would be following him in following Mr. Dickson. The hon. members who signed that document are still supporting Mr. Philp, and Mr. Philp is supporting the Government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: What about the secrecy of the caucus now?

Mr. LEAHY: I said to the hon. gentleman leading the Government, “You have given your version of the matter, have I the same right to give my version?” and he said “Yes, you can give your version.”

The PREMIER: I did not give any version of it.

Mr. STUMM: Why don't you give your version through the Press? Don't waste the time of the House.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yours is not the proper version.

Mr. LEAHY: The hon. member who interjects was one of the first to sign the document. I was not the originator of the matter. I was at home when I got a telephone message telling me there was a meeting of members to get up a protest against the Premiership of the Hon. Mr. Dickson, and I was asked to take a hand in it. The hon. member who interrupts me knows well the circumstances of the case.

Mr. STUMM: I was not in Brisbane on the Thursday night.

Mr. LEAHY: I did not refer to the hon. member.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: You certainly cannot mean me.

Mr. LEAHY: I said the hon. member who interjects. There are so many members who interrupt that I cannot answer them all.

Mr. McMASTER: You were misled by someone.

Mr. LEAHY : I was certainly not misled by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, because I have not sufficient confidence in his word.

Mr. McMASTER : You said you were misled.

Mr. LEAHY : I did not, but I may have been. There were a great many members at the meeting who did not speak at all, and some who did speak certainly did not speak as they are reported in the Press. I spoke, and spoke a great deal more moderately than I am speaking at the present time. And I do not think I am saying anything very outrageous even now. What right the Press had to classify—by what right the names of certain members were given who took up a particular stand—I am at a loss to know. I opened my remarks by saying that I regretted that anything which transpired at a caucus where everyone is pledged to secrecy should be published, but when this information is given; when a man admits that he gave the information; when the phraseology in the papers is the same, and when we actually met representatives of the papers coming in as we went out—I do not think the hon. gentleman will deny the source of the information. I do not say that he knew every word that was in the report, but he knew it substantially.

The PREMIER : No.

Mr. STEPHENS : You told us so, Sir.

Mr. LEAHY : Then if the hon. gentleman did not give the information, it is all the more necessary that it should be corrected, because it goes to the country as being the true position of affairs. It is reported that a great majority of old members supported the hon. gentleman. I admit they did; there were four of them, and they were unanimous. So that any attempt made by the hon. gentleman to describe any action taken by myself or other members as anything which was not purely in the interests of the country is, I submit, a misstatement of what took place. I may say that I have not any personal objection in the world to the hon. member. I have said in this House and out of it that he is an excellent Minister; but I say that from his old traditions he is not a proper man to be the ruler of the country. He may disappoint me, and I hope he will, but that is my impression, and I submit that I should not be doing my duty as a politician, and no member for a district would be doing his duty as a politician, if he did not endeavour to get the best man at the head of the State that he possibly could. That is a proper position to take up, and it is all very well for some hon. members to try to get others to pull the chestnuts out of the fire. Another charge has been made against us that we attempted to elect a Premier. We never attempted to do anything of the kind, although under our Constitution, and under constitutional government as it has developed of recent years, it is practically within the right of this House to elect the Premier.

Mr. JACKSON : Hear, hear! It ought to be, anyway.

Mr. LEAHY : The position of Her Majesty or of the Governor is really a position of nomination, and it is for this House to decide, and this House does decide by vote, who shall be the Premier. We did not go that length, but our position was this : We were allowed by the hon. member to state—and he gave us very little time to do it—what the real feelings of the country were. The form of government adopted by this country, by England, and by most countries in the world, is government by party; and it is a proper thing that any hon. member who is going to lead a party should know what the wishes of that party are. No man should really be the leader of a party, except one who has the thorough confidence of that party, or the greater portion

of it. We attempted to do nothing of the kind, but what we attempted to do—and what we succeeded in doing—was to elect a leader. I shall never shrink from any position that I take up, and I do not want anybody to pull chestnuts out of the fire for me. I take up a straightforward position.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : Perhaps the inference is that you are pulling them out for somebody else.

Mr. LEAHY : I should not like to be in the same boat as the hon. gentleman, and I do not think that that is a necessary inference.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : It might be.

Mr. LEAHY : Perhaps it was; but that would be worse still, and it is all the more necessary that the thing should be explained at once. I resent it very strongly; and what I hold to be unconstitutional was that the small minority swayed the large majority; that the large majority allowed themselves to be swayed rather than burst up the party, more especially when they were assisted in that direction by a threat of dissolution, and seeing Mr. Glassey on this side of the House.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : The bogie

Mr. LEAHY : I do not know that I need say any more. The position I and those who were with me took up—because I was not the leader—has been fully justified, and what appeared in the Press was entirely the reverse of the actual facts—whether they were inspired by the Premier or not, and he denies it. Nobody regrets more than I do that occasion should have arisen for me to speak on this matter to-night, and I have been very careful not to commit any breach of faith. I asked the Premier in his room a few days ago in the presence of the Treasurer and the hon. member for South Brisbane if he had any objection to my giving my version of the facts, and he replied that he had none whatever, so that there is no breach of faith in what I say now. I have his fullest permission.

The PREMIER : You didn't want my permission.

Mr. LEAHY : I submit that if we are not prepared to respect the sacredness of what takes place in private meetings—in caucus—the proper thing to do is to admit the Press, and let the public know everything. I do not know that it matters to me, because I do not think I shall be at any caucus in future if this is what they are to be like. I think I have now put myself fairly right, and I only wish to say that—notwithstanding I and several other hon. members have been charged with being irreconcilables—that will not prevent me from supporting a measure which the hon. member introduces which I believe to be good for the country. Public men should not base their public actions upon their own little private feelings. A man would be unworthy of a position in this House if he allowed the manner in which he allowed his vote to be cast to be influenced by the action of any other person. I have nothing more to say except to express my regret that the necessity should have arisen for me to make this explanation to the House.

Mr. CORFIELD : I think it is incumbent upon myself to say that my name was put down upon a document which I had refused to sign. I wrote a letter myself and signed it, leaving out that portion to which I took exception in the other document which some other hon. members had signed. The letter I wrote was likewise signed by the hon. member for Bundamba, Mr. Thomas, and although my name appeared upon this "round-robin," which is now in the possession of the Premier, I did not sign it. I consider it is due to myself to make this explanation.

The Hon. G. THORN : You are letting the world know too much.

Mr. DANIELS: It appears that the effect of the remarks of the Premier was that if they did not follow him he would go to the country, and they would lose their £300 a year. In other words he said, "You recognise the fact that if we go to the country we have not the confidence of the people; we cannot get returned again, and the Labour party will be in power." If they were sure they had the confidence of the country they would have gone to the country and would have got back their seats.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I quite agree with the hon. member for Bulloo that hon. members should not base their public actions upon their private feelings. The hon. member has expressed regret at the necessity for bringing this matter forward, but it is not a matter for Parliament at all. If the hon. member considers himself wronged, I sympathise with him, but there is a right and a wrong method of obtaining a remedy for that wrong. In private matters, which affect a party or which affect individuals, to bring them before the attention of Parliament is to proceed on an entirely wrong method. If every hon. member who feels dissatisfied with a Press report of a caucus meeting occupies the time of the House—which should be devoted to much greater issues—with the ventilation of his grievances, we shall never be able to get along with the proper business of Parliament. I think I remember reading a paragraph in one of the papers on this subject which said their report had been put together from a variety of different sources.

Mr. LEAHY: All the reports are exactly alike.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Even so, it does not at all follow that they have not been obtained from various sources. But from whatever source or sources the reports have been compiled, and any hon. member feels himself aggrieved, the remedy is perfectly clear—appeal to the caucus or write to the papers and contradict it. That is the course which would have recommended itself to most hon. members. Is this House going to make itself into a court consisting of seventy-two judges to inquire into what members do at any private meeting they may choose to attend? As I said, the proper way to remedy this evil, if evil there be, was for the hon. member for Bulloo to simply write a letter to the Press and give his version of the matter, and not take up the time of the House which ought to be devoted to public business.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

INSANITY—HOSPITALS FOR THE INSANE.

The PREMIER moved that £42,967 be granted for insanity and hospitals for the insane. The item appeared to exceed by £1,852 the provision which was made in the preceding year, and some explanation was required concerning it. During last year the scale of remuneration to the attendants and nurses was under consideration by his predecessor, and a certain scale of payment was framed for the first six months of the year ending on the 31st December last, when, on a different basis, the provision of these officers was provided for. The consequence was that some of the largest items in the vote were expended in a way which would somewhat mislead hon. members if he did not give them some explanation. For instance, the fifty-eight attendants, representing £6,880, was not a correct extension, and, therefore, the amount now asked for, £7,890, looked an enormous increase on the item as it stood last year. The correct extension of those fifty-eight attendants last year would represent £7,430, instead of £6,880, the latter being only an approximate sum supposed to be sufficient to cover the two scales of remuneration—six months on one basis

and six months on another. The estimate for last year was £41,115, which, to bring it into a line of comparison with the present year must be augmented by £1,419, making a total for last year of £42,534; so that the amount asked for this year was only some £100 in excess of what was actually required for last year. In connection with the vote he might mention that Dr. Hogg, the medical superintendent, was absent from the colony at the time the estimate was framed. There was some idea that he might possibly not be inclined to return to resume duty, owing to the state of his health. He was glad to say that Dr. Hogg's health had now been re-established, and that he had returned to the colony and taken charge of the Goodna Asylum, and been appointed inspector of asylums. Dr. Hogg's salary would be £700, and not £600, as appeared on the vote, or £100 less than that of Dr. Scholes. There had been an increase to the steward of £20, to the chief attendant of £20, and various small increases to the attendants, according to length of service. The fifty-eight attendants last year should be extended, as he had explained, from £6,880 to £7,430; the thirty-two nurses, from £1,900 to £2,044; and the nine attendants at Sandy Gallop, from £1,077 to £1,188. At Toowoomba there was an additional medical superintendent, and the twenty-five attendants extended as £1,910 should have been £2,440, and the nurses extended as £670 should have been £726, so that that vote actually showed a decrease of £10. That explained what would appear to be an enlarged provision for the present year. With regard to the staff arrangements, as he had mentioned, Dr. Hogg would be Medical Superintendent and Inspector of Asylums. Dr. Nicoll, who had rendered most loyal and excellent service in the absence of his chief, would very likely be promoted to Toowoomba, and there would be occasion to provide for an assistant medical superintendent at Goodna, and also for an assistant medical superintendent at Toowoomba, but provision for those was made in those Estimates.

Mr. GLASSEY very deeply regretted that the medical superintendent who had officiated at Goodna for so many years was, unfortunately, no more. With regard to the attendants and nurses, who had very precarious and unpleasant duties to perform, whose hours were long, and who had to deal with persons afflicted with sad ailments, he thought no one would begrudge them the little classification and the little extra remuneration they had been accorded. It was rather to be regretted that the gentleman who had been performing the duties of medical superintendent at Goodna during the absence of his chief in such a manner as to call forth encomiums from the Premier, had not been promoted to the position, and arrangements made to induce Dr. Hogg to remain at Toowoomba. He had not a word to say against Dr. Hogg, but Dr. Nicoll had been at Goodna for a number of years, and had got acquainted with the place and its people. He believed it was no exaggeration to say that in no branch of the Government service was there a more efficient officer than Dr. Nicoll, a gentleman who had given entire satisfaction to the staff and to the patients. The Minister had mentioned the salary that was to be paid to Dr. Hogg as medical superintendent, but had said nothing about the amount previously paid for the supposed inspection of asylums.

The PREMIER: Oh, yes; I did. I said that Dr. Scholes received altogether £900, and that Dr. Hogg will receive £300 a year.

Mr. GLASSEY declined to be a party to voting the sum of £100 for inspection, because there had never been any inspection worthy of

the name, and he objected to voting money for services which were not rendered. If any inspection were necessary it should be done by an outsider, for it could scarcely be expected that a man holding the important position of medical superintendent would make an inspection and report adversely on his own work. But he contended that no such inspection was necessary.

The PREMIER: You have not objected to it in former years.

Mr. GLASSEY: That might be true, but he thought he did object to it some few years ago, though he had subsequently let it pass without objection, hoping that some tangible result would follow. Now, experience had shown that there was no tangible result from the supposed inspection, and later on he should move the reduction of the vote by the £100 set down for that service. He wished now to refer to the case of a young man, who was twenty-two years of age, and had been a few years in the service, but was only receiving £40 per annum. He respectfully suggested to the Chief Secretary to increase his salary substantially, or, if it was necessary to keep a boy, to employ one at boy's wages, and give this young man the first opportunity of promotion. According to the schedule to the Estimates in Chief a few years ago, the then clerk at £100 a year was entitled to £18 additional for quarters, fuel, and light, but he understood, from reliable information, that this additional amount was never paid. The officer now occupied the position of clerk and storekeeper, and performed his duties in an admirable manner, and he respectfully suggested that certain remuneration should be allowed him. He mentioned these matters, not perhaps so much for the Chief Secretary as for his successor in the Home Secretary's Department, because he understood that there would shortly be another hon. gentleman in the Home Office, and he did not want any confusion to take place or any injustice to be done. He believed that £700 a year all told was ample for the work performed, more especially as there had been a considerable addition to the medical staff within the last few years. He had no word to say with regard to the promotion of Dr. Hogg, only that it was a pity to have any change in the chief superintendent.

The PREMIER: Before the discussion proceeded further he might as well clear the ground a little, so that hon. members might understand what was meant by the hon. member threatening to reduce the salary of such a responsible officer as the chief medical superintendent. For many years Dr. Scholes filled the position, drawing £800 a year and also £100 for visiting not only the asylums but also the reception-houses. He was not aware that the duty of inspection had been neglected, but it would be performed in future, whoever assumed the rôle of chief superintendent. Not only were there the lunatic asylums to inspect, but also the reception-houses at Cooktown and other places along the coast, and a large amount of responsibility devolved upon the inspector if he did his work thoroughly. With regard to Dr. Hogg, not only had he been impressed with that gentleman's ability at Toowoomba, and formerly at Goodna, but he had received the strongest recommendation in his favour from Sir Horace Tozer, his predecessor in office, who had a long experience of the manner in which Dr. Hogg performed his duties. It would not do to appoint a new man to conduct a large institution like Goodna, with its great number of patients, and also to have a governing voice at Toowoomba and Sandy Gallop.

Mr. KEOGH: Dr. Nicoll is not a new man.

The PREMIER: Dr. Nicoll is an excellent man, but he has not such a large experience as

Dr. Hogg. He had great esteem for Dr. Nicoll and had Dr. Hogg not been returning to the colony it is possible that he would have seen his way to have appointed Dr. Nicoll, but in the face of the seniority of Dr. Hogg and the strong recommendation made by his predecessor in office he would not have been acting in the interests of the institution by appointing Dr. Nicoll over the head of Dr. Hogg. And Dr. Nicoll would have a very responsible office at Toowoomba, where, next to Goodna, he would have the position second in responsibility for which he was well qualified, and he would be none the worse for the probation and service there. Considering that Dr. Hogg had been receiving £600 a year at Toowoomba, it was not too much to give him an additional £100 for the much larger institution at Goodna, accompanied with an honorarium of £100 as inspector of the various reception-houses throughout the colony. He trusted the hon. member would see his way to withdraw his objection. He desired to impress upon the Committee that where they placed a man in a position of such responsibility as that of chief medical superintendent, a matter of a few pounds was not so much to be regarded as having a man with humane instincts and a man of prudence and judgment. Without those qualifications, a man placed in such an autocratic position could do a great deal of injury. He hoped that Dr. Hogg's health would enable him to carry through his work satisfactorily, but it would be a marked discouragement if at the outset of his career in the position held for so many years by Dr. Scholes his salary was cut down to what it had been at Toowoomba.

Mr. KEOGH: He would then get £100 a year more.

The PREMIER: That was as inspector of reception-houses, which imposed duties which were quite worth the £100. From conversations he had had with Dr. Hogg he was convinced that the work would be properly done.

Mr. KEOGH: It never has been done.

The PREMIER: He did not want to load a dead man's memory with reproaches, but his successor in office would see that no salary was paid unless the State received a return for it. Dr. Hogg was a conscientious officer, and he was sure that the duty of inspection would be satisfactorily carried out. With regard to the messenger and the storekeeper, he frankly admitted that owing to the absence of Dr. Hogg matters connected with salaries had not up to the present been brought before him as satisfactorily as he could wish, but he was quite prepared to consult the chief medical superintendent, and if he found that any injustice had been done at any of the institutions, he could promise the Committee that they would be revised, and the dissatisfaction removed.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: As a layman, he could say that the work of inspection was something more than nominal. He had visited Goodna and Sandy Gallop, which was excellently conducted but, having no medical superintendent, it required close attention and inspection on that very account. Then the growing asylum at Toowoomba required very close attention. The work required a man of great force of character, and also of humane disposition, so that the unfortunate inmates should not be harshly treated. It was intended to build a new ward at Goodna and another at Toowoomba. The demand for increased accommodation, unfortunately, was inexorable, and under all those circumstances it was necessary that there should be some man invested with supreme authority, and that there should not be two medical superintendents with equal authority. With that explanation, he trusted that hon. members would see the justice

of giving Dr. Hogg fair remuneration, and thus show that the country had confidence in him and recognised the important position he occupied.

Mr. GROOM could not altogether agree with the hon. member for Bundaberg in saying that there had been no inspection. He did not know whether Dr. Scholes had visited the reception-houses along the coast, but he knew that Dr. Scholes had paid frequent visits to Toowoomba. Where patients were removed from one asylum to another in order to ascertain if the change of climate effected any change in their condition, it was necessary that there should be a frequent interchange of opinion between the two medical superintendents, and he knew that that had been done in the past. But even if there had been *laches* in regard to inspection in the past, it would be wrong to refuse to grant the allowance for the purpose of inspection on the appointment of a new officer. He could endorse all that the Premier had said about Dr. Hogg. He very much questioned whether in the whole of Australia there was a gentleman so thoroughly versed in the disease of insanity as Dr. Hogg, in addition to which it had to be borne in mind that during his recent visit to Great Britain and Europe he had visited some of the largest asylums in the world with a view to ascertaining the modes of treatment and the kind of buildings and everything in connection with them. He regretted that the Premier had not seen his way to give Dr. Hogg the £300 per annum previously paid to Dr. Scholes. When he (Mr. Groom) was in Edinburgh, Mr. Kinnaid Rose had taken him to see an asylum near that city which contained 900 patients. The superintendent of that institution received £2,000 a year, while, although Goodna contained 1,200 inmates, the superintendent was only to receive £700 a year. The salary was altogether inadequate. An ordinary surgeon could not fill such a position as medical superintendent of a lunatic asylum. It required a specialist. If a first-class barrister was required to conduct a case in the Supreme Court he had to be paid a high fee, otherwise his services could not be secured. In England, in one case, the present Chief Justice had had his brief endorsed 10,000 guineas to appear on behalf of the British nation in a case of international importance. It was only justice to give the full salary of £800, in addition to £100 for inspection duties. At Goodna there were no less than 1,200 patients, 500 or 600 at Toowoomba, 150 at Sandy Gallop, in addition to the asylums along the coast which had to be inspected periodically, and the salary paid should be commensurate with the extent of the duties performed. The hon. member for Toowong would bear him out that in the old country very large salaries were paid to officers of this class. The asylums there were of course largely endowed by private benefactions, but at the same time it was not true economy in State-managed institutions such as lunatic asylums to pay low salaries. He hoped the hon. gentleman would give some consideration to the question, because when they had a man whom they knew to be fully qualified for the position it was a dangerous policy to practise indiscriminate economy and reduce his salary to the lowest possible limit.

The Hon. G. THORN was astonished at the hon. member for Bundaberg suggesting the amendment, and he could endorse what had fallen from the Chief Secretary. It had been mentioned that the inspector of asylums would also have to inspect reception-houses, and he would further point out that the inebriate asylums would probably come under his jurisdiction—seeing that inebriety was a species of insanity. He would not go into the relative merits of Drs. Hogg and Nicoll. The latter gentleman he knew well, and could say that a more humane

doctor did not exist in the colony. It must be recollected that doctors of asylums had difficult tasks to perform. They had to please the Government first, then the attendants, and then the public. He would call to hon. members' recollection the fact that up to the time of the appointment of Dr. Scholes no officer connected with Goodna gave satisfaction; there were repeated difficulties, and inquiries were necessitated every three or four months. He trusted there would be no repetition of that state of affairs, which was unsatisfactory to everyone concerned. The hon. member for Bundaberg was to be greatly commended for the way in which he looked after the asylum attendants. This was the electioneering session, and the hon. member was now looking after himself as well. The asylum attendants had rewarded the hon. member to the extent of about £150 by way of testimonial, and of course all those people would vote the Labour vote. He regretted that the hon. member did not also look after those people who had no votes, such as the police.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that he is wandering away from the question before the Committee.

The Hon. G. THORN: He was just going to draw a parallel, but of course he had no desire to infringe the rules. He was pointing out that the hon. member for Bundaberg looked after his friends, and he hoped the Government would look after their friends. He certainly could not see his way to support the suggested amendment of the hon. member for Bundaberg, which he trusted he would withdraw. He should be glad to know from the Chief Secretary what salary it was proposed to give Dr. Nicoll if he was promoted to Toowoomba—was it intended to give him the £600 a year? The work there was almost as great as at Goodna, and he was astonished that the hon. member for Toowoomba had not asked that question, which concerned his own electorate. If the officer appointed to Toowoomba was fit to perform the duties, there should be no reduction of salary.

Mr. KEOGH thought it a very strange coincidence, but it was, nevertheless, true, that those hon. members who had already spoken were always on the side of the man who drew a large salary, and were always willing to increase it. But it had been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition that there were some officers connected with this department who received very small salaries indeed. There was one who was receiving £40 a year, and although there had not been a black mark against him for the last five years, his salary during that time had only been increased by £5. The hon. member for Toowoomba carefully avoided saying a word about that.

Mr. GROOM: We do not want to repeat everything.

Mr. KEOGH: The hon. member for Bundaberg pointed out that it was not necessary to pay this officer an extra £100 a year, and he agreed with him, although he did not know either Dr. Nicoll or Dr. Hogg. He might point out that the hospitals at Townsville, Rockhampton, and Maryborough had not been visited for the last four years, but yet the officer in question now received £100 a year for that work. Although it seemed as if the Committee intended to grant this increase, he should certainly vote against it on the ground that the work had not been performed, and the Committee had no guarantee that it would be performed in future. Another subject he wished to refer to was the contracting, of which he could speak painfully, because he had had something to do with contracting in connection with these asylums. A contract had been let to certain persons in Brisbane for

the supply of potatoes, maize, maize meal, butter, chaff, onions, spirits, and beer. Should any contractor not be able to carry out his contract or any portion of it, then that contract should be rescinded, but such had not been the case in this instance. Potatoes, maize, and maize meal had gone up in the market, and this tenderer had been allowed to let them go and retain the rest of the contract, which he contended was illegal. There must have been some underhand work to allow this contractor to retain the part of the contract he could make something out of, whilst the Government went on the open market for the rest. When he was a contractor and was not able to carry out any part of it, the institution bought such articles in the market at his risk, and that was the proper course to have adopted in this instance, and it was not fair to those who had been carrying out their contracts in a manner consistent with the regulations. If the leader of the Opposition were prepared to press the matter of this extra £100 to a division, he should support him, although the hon. member for Fassfern had tried to break new ground in regard to other institutions. All he had to add was that the gentleman proposed to be appointed to this position had not the confidence of those who would be his colleagues, while the gentleman in charge there at present had.

Mr. FOGARTY: He was not an advocate for high salaries except in special cases, and the case of Dr. Hogg was a very special one. He knew Dr. Hogg very well, and could say that under his *regime* at Toowoomba he had saved the country thousands of pounds. The people at Goodna were to be congratulated on having a man of Dr. Hogg's skill placed over them. With regard to the contracts referred to by the hon. member for Rosewood, it would be better to cancel them if any redress or relief was to be given, and to invite fresh tenders. In a former discussion, Sir Horace Tozer gave the House to understand that if relief was given at all it should be given in that direction. His hon. colleague had referred to the large salaries received by medical men controlling hospitals for the insane in the old country. He ventured to say there were few who had had a larger experience than Dr. Hogg, and perhaps none superior to him anywhere in skill and humanity. The present officer in charge at Goodna he had not the pleasure of knowing. The late superintendent he had met on several occasions, and he believed he had done yeoman service to the State, and that he should be held in kindly remembrance. Of Dr. Hogg he had already expressed his opinion. He was pledged to his constituents to oppose increases to the higher paid officials, and had hitherto kept his promise. But the present was the exception that proved the rule, and if a division was called for on the amendment he should vote for the salary as proposed by the Home Secretary, believing, as he did, that Dr. Hogg's services were remarkably cheap at the money.

The PREMIER was rather surprised that there should have been a single dissident with regard to Dr. Hogg, because if that officer had not taken leave of absence on account of ill-health he would, in the ordinary course of events, have assumed the administration when Dr. Scholes died. It was simply owing to his absence that Dr. Nicoll occupied the position as *locum tenens*, and it by no means gave him, a subordinate officer to Dr. Hogg, the right to promotion over Dr. Hogg's head. He was glad to hear the encomiums passed upon that officer by the hon. members for Toowoomba, who were in a position to judge, and he himself believed that Dr. Hogg was the right man in the right place. He could not for a moment admit that the officers at the asylum had the right to say who

the medical superintendent should be; that would be subversive of all discipline and order. With regard to Dr. Nicoll, he was not certain whether he would go to Toowoomba, but it was in contemplation to offer him the position, and probably he would succeed Dr. Hogg there. With regard to the tenders, representations were made simultaneously from Government contractors at Toowoomba—he was not certain about Ipswich—and Brisbane, arising from the fact that owing to the large advance in the price of potatoes, they could not fulfil their contracts except at a ruinous loss. They continued to supply them for some months until the difference in price, beyond the normal market value, became so great that it meant an exceedingly heavy loss. It would have been a cruel thing for the Government to have insisted upon the fulfilment of the contract under such abnormal conditions. There should be fair play between man and man, and especially between the Government and their contractors. It was not the function of the Government to ruin any man if he was honestly endeavouring to carry out his contract, and in that particular case the contractor was given the option of cancelling the whole contract or of excluding from his contract all perishable products. Personally, he thought that in the matter of perishable products which fluctuated in value the Government would do well to purchase in the open market, and he doubted very much whether long contracts by the Government were very beneficial. There might be some reason for making long contracts in regard to lines which had to be imported from Great Britain, but in other cases he was inclined to think that a distribution of Government patronage would be beneficial to the Government and to the community as a whole. At any rate there was nothing to be ashamed of in this particular matter; there had been no partisanship shown; the man was relieved from a chance of ruin, and the Government were purchasing the perishable products in the open market. That was the whole head and front of their offending, and until this evening not a single voice had been raised against their action.

The HON. G. THORN was astonished at the Premier acting in the way he had done. He had established a most dangerous precedent, which contractors would no doubt quote in future abnormal seasons, and if such an innovation was permitted in one case it would have to be adopted in all cases. Then the hon. gentleman suggested squaring business people all round by giving contracts to everyone.

The PREMIER: I did not say contracts; I said buy in the open market.

The HON. G. THORN: He did not see what else they could term buying in the open market than squaring business people all round. If the hon. gentleman was going to adopt that policy he might as well apply the same principle to contracts for railway construction and the erection of public buildings, and no doubt the hon. member for Bundaberg would endorse his action, for he did not believe in contractors getting big prices, and paying their workmen small salaries. The Premier was treading on very delicate ground. He did not know that the hon. gentleman had become a socialist, or a Labour man, but he had said enough to convince him that at heart the hon. gentleman was a socialist.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON wished to resurrect a matter of long standing, which involved a matter of decentralisation that he was sure would receive the hearty support of hon. members representing the Northern provinces. Some years ago, when he was sitting in opposition to the late Sir Arthur Palmer, it was suggested that a lunatic asylum should be established at Westwood, thirty miles from Rockhampton, on

the Central Railway, and a *quasi* promise was given that the matter would receive serious consideration by the Government. The question had, however, lain dormant; and in view of the fact that Goodna was now so full that a new ward was to be erected there, and another new ward at Toowoomba, he would now ask the Government to consider the question of establishing an asylum at Westwood. The climate there was quite equal to that of Goodna, the land was a good many feet above the level of the sea at the railway station, the locality was healthy; its surroundings were quite as attractive as those of some other towns in the colony; and would it not be desirable—seeing that unfortunately a very large proportion of the lunatics came from the North—to intercept the flow of these poor creatures at some point 400 or 500 miles north of Brisbane, instead of adding ward after ward to the institutions in the Southern part of the colony? He might say that he had had a conversation on the subject with the hon. member for Fitzroy, who was cordially in favour of the suggestion that the matter should receive the consideration of the Government. He would not refer to the question of salaries or emoluments of the higher officials, or to the matter of appointments, because he thought they might fairly leave those matters to the Executive.

THE HON. G. THORN: What the hon. member had stated with regard to Rockhampton would apply also to Townsville and the Gulf, on whose behalf a demand might also be made for the establishment of asylums. He noticed the hon. member for Toowong in his place, and as that hon. member had just returned from a visit to the old country, where he had no doubt observed the working of many public institutions, he might as well give the Committee the benefit of his observations. The Chief Secretary might get from the hon. member a wrinkle as to how these institutions were managed in other parts of the world.

MR. CRIBB: After the statement made by the hon. member for North Brisbane he trusted that the Treasurer would see that the various financial districts were charged with the cost of maintaining their own insane. He wished to bring under the notice of the Minister the case of the superintendent at Sandy Gallop, who was a most worthy officer. People in similar positions had been increased from £250 to £300, and he hoped this officer's salary also would be increased. Another matter to which he wished to refer was in connection with the death of Dr. Scholes. He believed it was the practice in Government departments—he was not blaming the Chief Secretary or anybody else for this—that when a man died in harness to pay his salary only up to the day of his death, and he understood that the salary of Dr. Scholes was paid only up to the day of his death.

THE PREMIER: To the end of the month.

MR. CRIBB: The salary should be paid at least to the end of the month, and it would not be an unreasonable thing, in such a case, to pay even a month's salary in addition. During the 1893 flood Dr. Scholes was a heavy loser, and further than that he made up out of his own pocket to a considerable extent some of the losses sustained by the warders and others. Another matter to which he had, unfortunately, to refer was the fact that shortly before the death of Dr. Scholes he occupied new quarters, which he had newly furnished. For instance, he laid new linoleums, which, of course, were useless for any other place, and his widow was dependent upon Dr. Hogg's agreement to take over that linoleum and furniture. He did not think she should be humiliated in that way. When a man had served his country faithfully for a long time, some little consideration might

be extended. He knew of another case in which an old servant of the Government died suddenly after spending a considerable amount in improving the property of the State, and his widow had received as little consideration as Mrs. Scholes. He was sure that if a little liberality was displayed in such cases, it would be approved of by hon. members. The hon. member for Fassifern had referred to one matter which he wished to allude to; he did so with reluctance, but it was desirable that the matter should be cleared up. If he had been instrumental in securing an increase in salary for any officer, either in Parliament or out of Parliament—but especially in Parliament—it would put him in a very invidious position to afterwards receive any testimonial or acknowledgment in the way of money from the person for whom he had used his influence. It was claimed that the hon. member for Bundaberg had been instrumental in getting increases for the attendants at the Goodna asylum, and, in consequence of that, those attendants had been canvassed and asked to contribute an amount equal to the increase they received for one month to a testimonial to be presented to the hon. member. He understood that, with one or two exceptions, the warders had contributed on that scale, and a very large testimonial had been given to the hon. member for Bundaberg. He did not mean to say that the hon. member had received it as a bribe, but it was a most improper thing to receive any such testimonial for his services, and he protested against it.

THE PREMIER: It was a matter of ancient history concerning the erection of an asylum at Westwood, and it had been lost sight of during recent years. He believed the reason why it had not been proceeded with was that, while it was formerly considered undesirable to have more than 500 or 600 patients in one asylum, it had been found that, under competent management and in buildings on the most modern lines, better medical attention could be given to a couple of thousands. It was considered that Goodna, Sandy Gallop, and Toowoomba provided sufficient accommodation for the unfortunate lunatics of the colony. There was provision on the Loan Estimates for additional wards at Goodna and Toowoomba. The Toowoomba asylum had been built on the latest principles adopted in the most approved institutions in Great Britain, and was admirably adapted for future extensions. It had been considered by medical men that patients coming from the tropical portions of Queensland would have a better chance of recovery in the cooler climate of Toowoomba. With reference to the superintendent at Sandy Gallop, he was a very excellent and worthy officer. Although not a medical man, he performed his duties very satisfactorily, and he had not heard that he was dissatisfied with his remuneration. At the same time, when the revision he had referred to was made, possibly further action might be taken. Of course it was a very delicate matter to speak of the private affairs of Dr. Scholes, whose death they all deeply deplored, and they were extremely sorry if those he had left behind were in an impoverished condition. But at the same time the State had its duty to perform, and he could not exactly see that it was incumbent on the State—however much they might regret the expenditure which was undertaken in furnishing the new house recently built for Dr. Scholes—to take over that furniture. He had intimated to Mrs. Scholes that he would endeavour to induce her husband's successor to come to some arrangement satisfactory to her; and in the meantime she had been allowed to occupy the house without charge. He was

surprised to learn that salary to the end of the month in which Dr. Scholes died had not been drawn, and had representations been made to him he should have felt inclined to allow it, subject, of course, to the Auditor-General being consulted, as he had been in one or two other cases. He mentioned this in order to show that there had been no intention to act harshly or unkindly to those who survived Dr. Scholes.

Mr. GLASSEY regretted that the members for Fassifern and Ipswich had seen fit to introduce matters personal to himself. He had been thirty-five years in public life, and this was the first time he had ever been charged with selfishness. It was not for him to take notice of aspersions of that character; and he did not know that he should have defended himself were it not for the fact that he was not known to everyone in the colony, and statements such as those which had been made might leave a wrong impression. Without going into details, he might say that the hon. member for Fassifern had been completely misinformed. The hon. member said that for certain reasons he had obtained a large sum of money amounting to £150 from the employees at Goodna. That was not the case. The hon. member for Ipswich also referred to the matter, and expressed the opinion that persons endeavouring to better the conditions of others, and especially members of Parliament, should not participate in the pecuniary advantage gained by those persons. He would admit that since he had been in the House, and long before it, he had never lost an opportunity of benefiting—in any way he was capable of doing—his fellow-men and women in any part of the world. During the many years he was connected with mining he did his best in a legitimate and legal manner to ameliorate the condition of his class in every part of the world. He had never confined his help to persons in any one part of the colony or to persons engaged in any one branch of employment. Then why raise this question? It must be for some reason, he presumed.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The general elections.

Mr. GLASSEY: He cared nothing about approaching general elections. He laid no claim to perfection—they all had their faults, and he was no exception—but it was a paltry and contemptible thing for any man to accuse him of wishing to gain a pecuniary advantage through his efforts to increase the wages or shorten the hours of any class of labour. What really happened? He had represented for five years the persons engaged at Goodna, and when not their representative he had, by means of ordinary and proper advocacy, induced the authorities to believe that better and more satisfactory conditions were the due of those people. Their hours were long and dreary, their pay was insufficient, their condition generally was not good. He had been successful in his representations, which were of a genuine and *bonâ fide* character—and was that a matter which could be fairly charged as an offence against him? What followed? Wherever in any gaol or asylum in the colony he had seen the warders' hours were too long he had tried to have the matter remedied, and he was pleased to say that the late Home Secretary had made changes where they appeared to be necessary—not on account of his requests, but because the conditions he represented to exist actually did exist. Then those persons in different parts of the colony subscribed a sum of money and purchased the watch which he now wore. They also presented his wife with a tea and coffee service, and they gave him an address, the whole lot costing somewhere about £50 or £60—but no money. If it were wrong to accept a souvenir

of that kind, he confessed that he had done wrong. But whatever political spleen or private feelings hon. members might entertain, it was very improper of them to bring them forward in that Chamber. Could they imagine an hon. gentleman, who was once Premier, lowering himself to such a degree that he actually introduced a paltry matter of that kind, which was enlarged upon by the hon. member for Ipswich, for whom he had always entertained the greatest respect? He did not think a smaller or meaner action could have been resorted to than to injure the reputation of a public man in the manner that had been attempted. But he had no fear of the result. They were near a general election, and he should present himself to the electors without any doubt as to the result. At any rate, the matter would rest with his constituents, and he hoped he would always be man enough to endeavour to assist those who needed assistance without considering whether they had votes or not. He did not appeal for any sympathy, but during the many years he had been in Parliament he had never seen a meaner or more paltry matter brought before the House.

The Hon. G. THORN denied that he had said a word about the hon. member receiving any testimonial from the warders at Woogaroo. What he said was that the hon. member looked well after those who had votes; and he should have been pleased if the hon. member had received twice as much as he did, as he thought he had. He denied that he was jealous, or in any way displeased that the hon. member should have received this testimonial, and he knew he did not receive any pecuniary recognition of his services. However, he did not think the hon. member was entitled to anything, because he had not advocated the cause of the working men any more than several other hon. members had. He claimed to be as thorough a democrat as the hon. member, and to have done just as much for the working classes. He had been in the colonies ever since he was born, which would be sixty years to-morrow, and had always been the friend of the workingman. He and others had had just as much to do with increasing the salaries of those officers as the hon. member.

Mr. KERR noticed that the attendants at Goodna were to receive together £7,890 this year whilst they received only £6,880 last year, and at Toowoomba the amount was increased from £1,910 to £2,620. He wished to know if that represented increases given to the different attendants?

The PREMIER: He had already explained that.

The CHAIRMAN: I trust that hon. members will keep order while the Premier is speaking. While there is so much noise it is impossible to hear what he says.

The PREMIER: He had explained that for the first six months there was a different scale of wages in force, and the amounts for the second period had been wrongly extended. The amount for last year should have been £2,440.

Mr. GLASSEY: No man had a higher regard for Dr. Hogg than himself, and he fully admitted all that had been said about his skill and ability. But if the principle laid down by the Home Secretary—that promotion should not be at once followed by an increased salary—was good in the case of others, it was equally good in the case of Dr. Hogg. He contended that Dr. Hogg was well paid with £700 a year, and moved that the item, "Inspector of Asylums, £100," be omitted.

Mr. KEOGH asked if the £100 included travelling expenses?

The PREMIER: The inspector of asylums was allowed 15s. a day travelling expenses

in addition to the £100. He wished the Committee to clearly understand the position: Dr. Scholes enjoyed a salary of £800; in addition to that he had £100 a year as inspector of asylums and the usual travelling allowance of 15s. per diem when on tour. Dr. Hogg had £600 at Toowoomba. In assuming charge at Goodna he was to receive £700, or £100 less than his predecessor. Therefore, he (the Premier) was carrying out his views; he was placing Dr. Hogg at the foot of the ladder and allowing him a position for further advancement, and he might look forward in the future to enjoying the same salary that Dr. Scholes received. If the amendment was carried there would be no inspector of asylums and reception-houses, which would be exceedingly undesirable, and a very grave responsibility would be incurred by hon. members if they objected to the continuous inspection of them.

Mr. GLASSEY: The Chief Secretary had informed them that the inspector of asylums received 15s. a day travelling expenses. Surely that was enough without the extra £100 of salary for doing work while he was away from his own proper sphere! Holding the views he did—although owing to the absence of some of his supporters he might be in a small minority—he intended to press his amendment to a division.

Mr. STEWART was going to support the amendment. They had heard something of the high salaries paid to medical superintendents of lunatic asylums in the old country, but he did not think the old country was a pattern they should follow in that matter. In New South Wales the medical superintendent of the Callan Park Asylum got £820 per annum, which was exactly the amount proposed to be paid to Dr. Hogg, without the £100 for acting as inspector of asylums, for he was allowed a salary of £700 a year with quarters, fuel, and light, valued at £120. With regard to the inspectorship, he should like to know what Dr. Hogg was going to inspect. Surely he was not going to inspect the Toowoomba Asylum, which was being conducted by a man who was his equal. The only places he had to inspect were the Sandy Gallop Asylum, and a few reception-houses in different portions of the colony, and if he got 15s. a day travelling allowance while performing that duty, he would be very well paid. Even if he had to go to Rockhampton and Townsville, and perhaps further North in the winter season, that would be an excellent holiday—he would have a free passage and all his expenses paid. They had no money to throw away on useless officials, and if they could save £100 in that way it ought to be done.

Question—That the item “Inspector of Asylums, £100,” be omitted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 11.

Messrs. Glassey, Keogh, Maughan, Kerr, Hardacre, Kilston, Turley, Jackson, Dibley, Fitzgerald, and Stewart.

NOES, 40.

Messrs. Dickson, Foxton, Chataway, Philp, Murray, Dalrymple, G. Thorn, McGahan, Cribb, Callan, Collins, Macdonald-Paterson, Stephenson, McMaster, Story, Newell, Lissner, O'Connell, Hamilton, Bridges, Curtis, Finney, Groom, Sim, Jenkinson, Bell, Castling, Leahy, Bartholomew, W. Thorn, Fogarty, Drake, Grimes, Lord, Corfield, Thomas, Smyth, Stumm, Stephens, and Tooth.

Resolved in the negative.

Original question put and passed.

RECEPTION-HOUSES.

The PREMIER moved that £2,962 be granted for reception-houses. The amount was only £54 more than that voted last year, and was distributed in small increases.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that this House do now adjourn. I may mention for the information of hon. members that the Mining Bill, which was to have taken precedence to-morrow, has been—at the desire of hon. members—postponed for a week, and the second reading will be taken next Tuesday. To-morrow, after the formal business has been disposed of, we shall take the second reading of the Rabbit Boards Bill and the Pastoral Leases Extension Bill, and after that Supply.

Mr. JENKINSON: I wish to make a personal explanation. In replying on the Slaughtering Bill, the Secretary for Agriculture said I had made some statement with regard to condemned meat fed to pigs. I was very doubtful about what I had said at the time, and to make sure I have got the words as taken down by the *Hansard* staff. I would not like it to go out that I had made any such reckless assertion as the Secretary for Agriculture attributed to me, and I will read my words as reported—

It would be rather interesting if someone could tell us what becomes of the meat that is condemned at the freezing works—

Then the Secretary for Agriculture makes the interjection—

To the pots.

And I go on with my sentence—

Whether it goes into human consumption, whether it is fed to swine, or whether it is destroyed in the manner it should be. In all probability it is boiled down and fed to pigs.

There is not an assertion about that; and I wish to make the explanation.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-eight minutes past 10 o'clock