

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 15 AUGUST 1911

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. T. Paget, *Mackay*) replied—

" 1 and 2. The proposed route being covered with heavy scrub, and the country difficult, the trial survey will not be completed before the close of the session."

ACCOMMODATION AT CAIRNS COURTHOUSE.

Mr. MANN asked the Chief Secretary, for the Attorney-General—

" 1. Has any complaint been received by the Department of Justice *re* lack of accommodation at the Cairns Courthouse, the newspaper reporters being unable to find a seat during court proceedings on the 28th July of this year?"

" 2. If no complaint has come to hand, will he cause inquiry to be made?"

" 3. If inquiry shows that more accommodation is required, will the department take immediate steps to provide same?"

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) replied—

" 1. No.

" 2. Yes.

" 3. Yes."

WORK ON CORDALBA RAILWAY.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Charters Towers*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

" 1. Is it a fact that work is at a standstill on some sections of the Cordalba Railway?"

" 2. Is he aware that the engineer not only refuses to put men on from the strike camp, but also men from other districts?"

" 3. Is it a fact that he refers them to the adjoining sugar-mill, where the men are on strike?"

" 4. Is it the duty of railway engineers to act as labour agents?"

" 5. Will he cause inquiries to be made, and, if the facts are as stated, put a stop to such methods?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

" 1. No.

" 2. The resident engineer has all the men he can profitably employ, as he had before the strike of sugar-workers commenced.

" 3. No.

" 4. No.

" 5. The replies given above render further action unnecessary."

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 15 AUGUST, 1911.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. D. Armstrong, *Lockyer*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS.

The SPEAKER: There being present two members of the British House of Commons—Mr. Richard Hazelton, member for North Galway, and Mr. William Archer Redmond, member for East Tyrone—I have extended to them your courtesies of offering them seats on the dais.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PAPERS.

The following papers, laid on the table, were ordered to be printed:—

Report of the secretary to the Commissioner for Railways upon his tour abroad.

Return in accordance with section 9 of the Mining Machinery Advances Act of 1906.

QUESTIONS.

SURVEY OF TOLGA-JOHNSTONE TO MILLA MILLA RAILWAY.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

" 1. When does he anticipate that the survey of the continuation of the Tolga-Johnstone Railway to Milla Milla will be completed?"

" 2. If completed before the end of the present session, will he ask the House to sanction the construction of the said extension during this session?"

STRIKE ON RAILWAY AT SELWYN.

Mr. MAY (*Flinders*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

" 1. Is he aware that there is a strike amongst a certain gang of navvies (or railway employees) at Selwyn?"

" 2. Is he aware that an overseer named McSherry sacked the ganger for refusing to give the men orders to shift camp twenty-five minutes before knock-off time, consequently the men went on strike in support of the ganger?"

" 3. Does he not deem the men are in the right and justified in their action, and that the ganger was unjustly sacked?"

" 4. Will he give instructions to the officer in charge to reinstate the ganger (Cameron by name), and all those men who went out on strike?"

" 5. Will he also give instructions that the overseer (McSherry) be reprimanded for his excessive zeal in the foregoing matter?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

- "1. Yes; there was a strike.
- "2 and 3. No; the ganger was not discharged, but was suspended.
- "4. The ganger has been reinstated, and the men have resumed work.
- "5. No."

SITE FOR TECHNICAL COLLEGE AT CAIRNS.

Mr. MANN asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"Seeing that there is grave dissatisfaction in Cairns in connection with the proposed site selected for the technical college, will he submit his proposal as modified from his predecessor's to a vote of either of the following, and abide by the result:—

- "(a) The parents of the children attending the State school;
- "(b) The ratepayers within the municipality of Cairns;
- "(c) The parents and ratepayers combined?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. K. M. Grant, Rockhampton) replied—

"It is not intended to proceed further at present in regard to a site for a technical college at Cairns."

LOAN TO ROCKHAMPTON HARBOUR BOARD.

Mr. FOLEY (*Townsville*), for Mr. Adamson, asked the Treasurer—

"1. With regard to the recent loan granted to the Rockhampton Harbour Board, partly to dredge the southern channel in the estuary of the Fitzroy River, did the Government receive a petition from certain residents of Rockhampton and district, asking the Government, before sanctioning the abandonment of the middle channel and the adoption of the southern channel, to call for a report thereon by the chief officer of the Harbours and Rivers Department?"

"2. Did the Government call for and obtain such a report?"

"3. If so, will the Government lay the report on the table of the House for the perusal of hon. members?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

- "1. The petition was received.
- "2. A report from the officer concerned was obtained, who expressed himself in favour of the south channel.
- "3. The papers can be inspected at the Treasury."

RATES OF PAY TO CARPENTERS, MOUNT MORGAN DISTRICT.

Mr. CRAWFORD (*Fitzroy*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

- "1. Is he aware that the Mount Morgan district rate of wages for carpenters is 12s. 6d. per day?
- "2. Is he aware that the rates prevailing in the railway construction branch in that district are 10s. and 10s. 6d. per day?
- "3. Will he take steps to bring these latter rates up to those prevailing in the Mount Morgan district?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

- "1. Yes; 12s. 6d. for first-class and 11s. for second-class men.
- "2. Resident engineer has three carpenters employed—two are receiving 11s. and one 10s.

"3. Resident engineer is paying these men the rates he considers they are worth."

STATISTICS *re* CERTAIN CLASSES OF TEACHERS.

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

- "1. How many married assistant teachers, with their classification, and in order of seniority, were eligible for appointment to the charge of State schools in January, 1909?
- "2. What teachers have been appointed to the charge of Class IX. State schools since 1st January, 1909?
- "3. What was their classification at the time of appointment, and were they married or unmarried?
- "4. What teachers have been appointed to the charge of Class X. State schools, with residences, since 1st January, 1909?
- "5. What was their classification at time of appointment—were they married or unmarried?
- "6. Will he continue the practice begun in 1909, of appointing married teachers to the charge of Class IX. schools at present in charge of unclassified teachers, and so carry out the promise given to the married assistant teachers in the "Education Office Gazette" for January, 1909?
- "7. If he cannot carry out this promise, will he increase the salaries of the married assistants by an amount equivalent to that which they would receive (including rent allowance) if the promise referred to could be kept?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION replied—

"1.	II. 1	4
	II. 3	1
	III. 1	21
	III. 2	14
	III. 3	3
	Total	53

"2 and 3.—

	Married.	Not Married.	Unmarried Teachers with Mothers or Relatives dependent upon them.	Widow or Widower.	Total.
II. 2	2
II. 3	5	5
III. 1	18	2*	5	1	26
III. 2	3	1*	4
					37

* Places not suitable for married teachers.

(4 and 5).—

III. 1	14	..	1	..	15
III. 2	8	8
III. 3	3	3
Unclassified	2	2*	1	1	6
							32

* Places not suitable for married teachers.

"6 and 7. It has been the policy of the department for some years to replace unclassified teachers who are in charge of Class IX. schools with married classified teachers as soon as suitable places can be found for the unclassified teachers. In some of the places, however, residences are not available, and married teachers cannot therefore be appointed."

ADVERTISEMENT APPEARING IN SYDNEY
NEWSPAPERS re SUGAR-WORKERS.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*) asked the Premier, without notice—

“Is he aware that the following advertisement appeared in the Sydney daily newspapers:—

“Wanted for Queensland sugar plantation, cane-cutters on contract, also mill hands; fares paid by employers. Apply 10 a.m., Thursday, 3rd August, to W. J. McGowen, care of Queensland Intelligence and Tourist Bureau, 116 Pitt street.”

The PREMIER replied—

“I am not aware of such an advertisement.”

(Opposition laughter.)

At a subsequent stage Mr. RYLAND proceeded to ask a further question in reference to this subject.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not in order in asking, without notice, a question following upon a question without notice to which an answer has already been given.

Mr. RYLAND: I give notice for to-morrow.

THE CONSOLIDATED STATUTES.

Mr. MCLACHLAN (*Fortitude Valley*) asked the Treasurer, without notice—

“When are copies of the consolidated statutes to be supplied to members of this House? If any of the volumes are already completed, will the Minister have members furnished with copies of same?”

The TREASURER replied—

“In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would like to say that the matters put before me by him will receive consideration.”

MEAT EXPORT TRADE.

On the motion of Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*), it was formally resolved—

“That there be laid on the table of the House copies of the whole of the correspondence that passed between the Federal Government and the Queensland Government in reference to the meat export trade.”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. J. Tolmie, *Drayton and Toowoomba*): I beg to lay on the table the papers asked for by the hon. gentleman.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*), who was greeted with “Hear, hears,” said: In rising to move this Order of the Day, I do so with extreme gratification on account of the fact that it should have fallen to my lot to initiate so important a measure—a measure of such great importance to the democracy of this State, involving, as it does, the health of that democracy. (Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.)

Mr. LENNON: That is good from a Conservative Government.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not intend to be drawn from the thread of my remarks; I am speaking for the democracy of this State, which is represented by members on this side of the House. (Loud Opposition laughter.) Is it not a fundamental principle of democracy to bring in legislation to promote the health, happiness, and

[*Hon. J. G. Appel.*]

comfort of the people? And is not that a principal object of our line of policy? (Hear, hear!) What can better promote the happiness and prosperity of the people than legislation which has for its purpose the protection of the health of the people? As the world goes on physical and scientific research has advanced, and the Health Act of 1900 which now stands on the statute-book is to a large extent obsolete to-day. (Hear, hear!) At the time that measure became law it was undoubtedly considered an up-to-date measure. In the same way the Food and Drugs Act of 1882, which was the first legislation in connection with that matter, was considered at that particular time a measure which dealt fully with all that concerns the health of the people of the State in respect of the food and drugs consumed. Since then physical, scientific, and chemical research has discovered dyes, make-weights, and adulterants which enable the fraudulent manufacturer and the fraudulent dealer to give inferior substances the appearance of genuine articles. The result has been that there has been deterioration, so far as the health and condition of the people are concerned, among the consumers of those adulterated articles. There has been keen competition in the manufacture of foodstuffs, owing to the increased consumption of those articles, and owing to the absence of proper restrictions with regard to the production of impure foods.

Mr. FOLEY: Which you would not give the Federal Government power to deal with.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is not often that I ask hon. members to desist from interjections, but I do so on this occasion. If the hon. member has the interest of the people at heart in connection with this legislation, and which he surely should have, he should not interrupt me in the endeavour which I propose to make to explain the measure which is now before the House. (Hear, hear!) It is hardly possible, if I am interrupted from time to time by senseless interjections from members who apparently are not interested in the matter, to make the provisions of the measure clear to the House. In the United States of America, more especially since the revelations in connection with the notorious Chicago meat frauds, the importance of supplying pure foods has been more fully recognised. Many chemicals by which food is adulterated are distinctly unfitted for human consumption. (Hear, hear!) In other cases where they are not deleterious, it is certainly right that the purchaser and the consumer should know the nature and character of the foods which he purchases and consumes. A mixture such as farine, or flour, may not have any ill effect upon the health of the purchaser when mixed with pepper, yet it is only right that the person who desires to purchase pepper should know whether he is purchasing the pure article or three parts farine, or flour, and one part pepper. The objects of this measure are in the first place to obviate the sale of deleterious adulterants, and in the second place to require dealers to state distinctly and openly the component parts of the articles which they sell. As hon. members are aware, a Bill dealing with this subject was prepared for presentation to the House last session. It was undoubtedly an up-to-date measure. But just prior to the House assembling for the session of 1910 a confer-

ence of medical and health authorities was called in Sydney during the months of May and June, and, on the earnest representations of our Health Commissioner, it was decided to withhold that measure for the purpose of recasting it, if necessary, as a result of the resolutions arrived at by that conference. The conference sat in Sydney between the 23rd May and the 8th June last year, and the result proved the wisdom of our action in withholding the Bill prepared for presentation to the House last year. The result of the work of that conference is a decided improvement in the measure which is now submitted to the House. The conference passed seventeen resolutions in connection with a uniform standard of foods and drugs, and drafted seventy-eight provisions in connection with standards, regulations, and labelling of foods and drugs. The object of passing those resolutions and clauses was to secure uniform legislation on this subject throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. NEVITT: Were the whole of the States represented at that conference?

The HOME SECRETARY: All the States, including the Commonwealth, with the exception of Western Australia, were represented at the conference. It was decided that not only should the medical authorities of the different States be represented at the conference, but also that trade representatives should take part in the conference. Accordingly representatives of different trades attended, and took part in the deliberations, so that they had every opportunity of placing their case before the conference for discussion. The decisions approved were arrived at with the consent of members representing different trades throughout the States. The resolutions with regard to regulations and standards have been carefully considered in the drafting of this measure, and have been carefully cross-checked so as to secure the complete inclusion of those suggestions, either by direct enactment or under regulations to be framed under the Bill. The experience of other States which have already got up-to-date legislation on this subject has also been drawn upon and embodied in this measure. The whole measure, as members will see if they carefully peruse and consider it, is fundamentally just and fair in its conception and in its application. When the present Health Act of 1900 was passed, legislation of this character was practically in its infancy. Although food administrators were aware of the fact that adulteration was taking place, yet they had not sufficient data before them at that time upon which to found the necessary restrictive legislation. But, as I have already pointed out during the time which has elapsed since then—during the last eleven or twelve years—sufficient data has been collected to enable food administrators to arrive at the conclusions which are presented to members in this Bill. The whole object of legislation of this character must naturally be the protection of the user.

Mr. NEVITT: The consumer.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; the consumer. The consideration of the interest of the retailer and manufacturer is only a secondary matter. The onus and duty of supplying good, wholesome, and bona fide articles is cast upon the manufacturer and retailer. I have not the slightest doubt that, in the course of the passage of this measure,

more especially when it is before the House in Committee, we shall hear wails and groans from this one and that one who will say that their particular businesses are being affected by the duties imposed upon them by this measure.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is always the case.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; it is always the case, as the hon. member interjects, and I have not the slightest doubt that the House will ever bear in mind the fact which I have already stated—that the principal object of this Bill is the protection of the consumer, and not the protection of the manufacturer who is carrying on a nefarious trade for the purpose of committing a fraud upon the general public and the consumer. During the last eleven years the progress of science has further revealed the grave dangers which exist in connection with faulty and filthy methods of preparing, storing, and conveying food material from one place to another. These matters are dealt with in the measure now submitted to the House, which introduces safeguards in respect of those matters. In this Bill we have considered not only the interests of the invalid and the infant, but, as members will see when the Bill is in its Committee stage, the interests of those members of the community who are healthy. In every way the interests of the fair dealer and the honest manufacturer are completely safeguarded by the measure which we are now discussing. I would once more impress upon hon. members this fact in connection with the dealer who is not prepared to do that which is

honest and right—does that [4 p.m.] dealer for one moment contemplate, when retailing an article adulterated, the injury which he is doing to his fellow men and women by retailing and selling that to them which is practically equal in its effects to an insidious poison?

Mr. MURPHY: You must not forget that the retailer may buy it from a manufacturer as a purely wholesome article.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is provided for in the measure. But does the milk-seller, who reduces the standard of his milk, and not only reduces it but adds filthy water, in many instances swarming with microbes—does he contemplate the damage which he will do to the infant life, to the life which should be nourished by the milk at the threshold of its existence?

Mr. BARBER: No; all he contemplates is the profit.

The HOME SECRETARY: Does he contemplate when selling that milk, and gaining a few pounds thereby, the damage that he is doing? How many an infant loses its life?

Mr. LENNON: In that case he is a murderer.

The HOME SECRETARY: That infant is a valuable asset to the State. How many a poor mother is rendered childless. (Hear, hear!) I only trust that, in considering the different clauses which deal with these particular matters, hon. members will bear them in mind. For the credit of our common humanity I trust that those contemplations are not within the minds of those fraudulent retailers of adulterated food, or of those fraudulent sellers of impure and watered milk. But they do it, and the object of this measure is to prevent

them doing it—to check their nefarious practices, and, if they continue to carry on such a business, to punish them for so doing. (Hear, hear!) Now, this question being one of national concern—a matter affecting the people as a whole—its administration has been entrusted to the Health Department, but power is still given to the local authorities to work side by side with the central authority; they have also power to purchase articles of food and drugs, or the articles which come within the category or scope of this Bill, and to carry out analyses of those articles and to take the necessary action in case of adulteration. We have not taken any power whatever from them, but the sole power to carry out this Act is vested in the central authority—(hear, hear!)—because, as I have said already, this is a matter of national moment, and where there are so many different local authorities there cannot be that combined action which should exist in connection with this particular matter. (Hear, hear!) That action, as I have already pointed out, can only be taken by the central authority, who must be, and by this measure is, vested with all the necessary powers to carry into effect the different provisions of the Bill.

Mr. HARDACRE: You say the local authorities still have the power.

The HOME SECRETARY: They still have the power; they can co-ordinate with the central authority.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Board of Health is practically all over Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: Quite so; power is left to the local authorities, but the central power is vested in the Health Department.

Mr. LENNON: If you leave too much power to the local authorities, God help the Act! (Hear, hear!)

The HOME SECRETARY: That is admitted. The matter was discussed at the conference, and it was unanimously resolved that this was a matter which should be administered by a central authority represented by the Health Department. I may mention that in Victoria the general administration of the Act there was entrusted to the local authorities, and it was found that the Act practically broke down, owing to the fact that with all those divisions there was not a sufficiently strong central authority. In addition to the provisions in connection with the food and drugs portion of the Bill, there have been included certain necessary amendments and additions to the general and special sanitary provisions of the Health Act. These have been based upon administrative experience and also upon modern scientific discoveries. Amongst such provisions we have a clause which deals with the obligation of the owner of a vacant piece of land in connection with the expense of what is known as a sectional drain. Under the present Health Act, a householder can be required to lay a sectional drain, for which he is responsible, and yet the owner of a vacant allotment, who benefited equally so far as the drain was concerned, was not compelled to contribute towards the expenditure. The Act has been so amended that the owner of a property through which that sectional drain passes, and which is benefited thereby, whether a house is upon the property or not, must contribute towards

the cost of that sectional drain. (Hear, hear!) Then a further provision has been made in connection with the definition of what is called a sewer. Those hon. members who are acquainted with the Health Act, in connection with the definition of a sewer, are aware that under present conditions an earth formation is defined and regarded as a sewer, and, as hon. members are further aware, in nine cases out of ten the discharge of sewage matter into that earth formation is a menace to the health of those persons who are residing in the vicinity. (Hear, hear!) We have altered the definition of what is now a sewer, and no person is allowed to discharge into such a drain, or into any drain, unless it has been constructed for the special purpose of carrying the sewage, and no person is allowed to connect any drain with that without permission from the local authority.

Mr. FOLEY: Nor into the water-tables.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members will notice that provision has been made in connection with the destruction of insects and vermin. Now, modern science has discovered the fact that many an epidemic is carried from one part to another by means of insects, notably the mosquito. (Hear, hear!) Investigations which have been made by Dr. Breinl, at Townsville, in connection with tropical diseases, have disclosed the fact that in Queensland we have practically the whole of the mosquitoes which are called carriers in connection with the different epidemics. We have the mosquito which carries the yellow fever, we have the mosquito which carries malaria, and we have the mosquito which carries filaria.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Flies carry typhoid.

The HOME SECRETARY: Flies may carry typhoid. This matter of the carriage of malaria is the result of investigation within the last few years. It was considered necessary that provision should be made in the Bill with the object of controlling the matter of insect destruction in that connection, bearing in mind that approximately in the year 1914 the Panama Canal will have been completed, and Queensland will then be within three weeks' sail of those countries where yellow fever exists. It is a fact that yellow fever has been carried to countries which were further distant than we will be when that canal is completed. I think that I am correct in saying that in Spain an epidemic of yellow fever caused the deaths of something like 50,000 persons. At the time when the epidemic raged there, the method of its introduction was unknown, but to-day modern science shows us that it is possibly by means of the mosquito that that disease may be conveyed from one country to the other; and, extraordinary to relate, the mosquito which is the carrier in this connection is a good sea traveller. Now, in connection with malaria, until about seven years ago the matter of the conveyance of malaria epidemic was practically an unknown quantity; to-day medical science has revealed to us that malaria is also introduced by means of the mosquito. We had an instance in our own State only a few months ago of malaria having been conveyed to the Oaks from New Guinea, and during a short and sharp epidemic, until it was checked, a very considerable proportion of those who were taken ill died from its effects. I think I am correct in saying that Burketown some

[Hon. J. G. Appel.]

years ago was practically wiped out by an epidemic of malaria, the cause of it being unknown.

Mr. NEVITT: Called "Yellow Jack."

The HOME SECRETARY: We furthermore have the fact that dengue—with which most of us unfortunately at one time or another have been acquainted—is also conveyed by means of a mosquito; and filaria, which is probably to a certain extent an unknown disease, but a disease which certainly should not receive any encouragement, is also conveyed by means of the mosquito.

Mr. MURPHY: How do you propose to get rid of the mosquito?

The HOME SECRETARY: That is not such a difficult matter, because in Panama, when the French were in charge of the works at the canal, it is a matter of history that to a great extent the abandonment of the works was owing to the great number of persons who suffered from yellow fever. When the Americans took charge they dealt with the matter of mosquito destruction, and to-day the percentage of deaths is infinitesimal.

Mr. MURPHY: You cannot compare that area with the area of Queensland?

The HOME SECRETARY: Quite so; I quite admit that, but we have again an instance at Lagos. When His Excellency Sir William MacGregor was Governor of Lagos, he undertook a crusade against the mosquitoes. Lagos at that time was one of the most unhealthy places in the world. After that campaign it became, likewise, a fairly healthy place. In fact, there is a very small percentage of deaths in connection with mosquito-borne diseases.

Mr. MAUGHAN: All the same, it is pretty bad yet.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes. It is a question of fighting, regulating, and destroying, and we considered it our duty, in preparing this Bill, to make all the necessary provisions so that we can undertake such a fight and such a campaign in connection with those noxious insects which act as carriers for the different epidemics and diseases. Hon. members will also notice that provision has been made for what are known as typhoid carriers.

Mr. HARDACRE: Do these provisions provide the powers proposed at that public meeting commonly known as the "Mosquito Meeting"?

The HOME SECRETARY: They include the necessary clause under which regulations may be made and action may be taken to cope with that particular matter.

Mr. HARDACRE: They asked for certain powers.

The HOME SECRETARY: And they get them. There are certain powers given to the Health Commissioner to deal with those matters.

Mr. RYLAND: Clause 62.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, clause 62 deals with that matter. Referring to what are known as typhoid carriers, hon. members will notice that certain provisions have been included in connection with this particular disease carrier. Ten years ago when an epidemic of typhoid broke out, or a case of typhoid broke out, the cause was generally ascribed to the drain—there must be something wrong with the drain. We

find to-day, as the result of scientific research, that persons who have either had typhoid fever, or, in some cases, who have no history of typhoid fever, may act as carriers—persons who discharge from their bodies thousands of typhoid bacilli. Cases are known where an individual carrier has infected different families—amongst whom that carrier resided. Though, as a matter of fact, such a carrier is not so highly infectious as a person who is suffering from the disease, yet there is a very grave danger indeed, so far as that person is concerned, where they handle food, or in connection with dairy work or the milkers of the herds; and the necessary provision has been made, having regard to what is just and due to those who are so suffering—because I think we may refer to them as sufferers—such necessary provision has been made, so far as they are concerned, having due regard to the interest of the community as a whole. Hon. members will also notice that there is a special provision that no water in a vessel, or otherwise, shall be carried in any milk-cart. To-day, the Department of Public Health is very much handicapped by the fact that a milk-seller may carry in his cart a vessel containing water.

Mr. HAMILTON: He does too.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is known, as a matter of fact, to the officers of the department that a milkman, whose milk is perfectly pure and up to the standard while it is in the cart, may adulterate that milk immediately prior to its delivery, while he is on the premises of the person to whom it is being sold, and in order to defeat that practice, a special clause has been put in providing that no water is permitted to be carried by a milk-seller.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: This Bill is of a highly technical nature indeed, and perhaps it will be as well for the benefit of hon. members if I give a slight résumé of the clauses which will possibly facilitate discussion when it is before the Committee. (Hear, hear!) Clause 2 is formal, and provides for the substitution of clauses in the present Bill for certain parts of the principal Act. Clause 3 is the definition clause. The definitions are practically the same as those approved of in New South Wales and Victoria. That is in accordance with the resolution which was arrived at—that as near as possible the whole of the legislation in connection with this measure should be uniform throughout the Commonwealth, whose representatives took part in the conference.

Mr. LENNON: Is this Bill on all-fours with the Victorian Act?

The HOME SECRETARY: It is an improvement.

Mr. LENNON: We are getting on then?

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so. Section 32 of the principal Act is a set form of certificate which is not applicable or wide enough to cover all kinds of analyses or examinations. Under the clause as amended such separate forms as may be necessary may be used. Clause 5 amends the section regarding sectional sewers. I have already explained that. Clause 6 gives power to the Governor in Council, by Order in Council, to prohibit or regulate the discharge from any house or premises of any waste water or house drainage into any street, except into a sewer in or upon such streets.

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

The definition of "sewer" has been amended. I also explained that particular provision. Clause 7 amplifies the present law regarding scavenging and sanitary conveniences, and the removal of house refuse. Clauses 8 and 9 set forth what will be deemed articles falsely described or adulterated, and may be regarded as the backbone of the Bill. Those are the clauses which deal entirely and fully with all matters of adulteration. It is modelled on the provisions of the Act passed in the United States in 1906 in consequence of the serious disclosures which were made in connection with what are known as the Chicago meat frauds. I might mention in connection with the United States Act, which was considered by the health authorities to be practically the most up-to-date one, that a recent case which came before the Supreme Court of the States proved that owing to a technical error, or a matter of technicality, the Act is now less operative than it otherwise would be. That matter has been duly considered in the draft of this particular Bill, and all necessary precautions have been taken to avoid that technicality. (Hear, hear!) Clause 10 deals more particularly with drugs which must, unless exempted, comply with the British Pharmacopœia. Clause 11 is important inasmuch as the agent or servant is made responsible. It is no new principle of law. The proprietor of a business is supposed to employ persons who obey the law. Section 12 is consequential on section 9. Section 13 is closely related to, and should be read with, clause 9. It prohibits the mixing of food so as to be injurious to health, the mixing of drugs so as to injure quality, the mixing of food to increase bulk, the selling of goods not of the nature demanded. I gave a slight explanation of that a few minutes ago, and mentioned the fact of farina being mixed with pepper. Section 14 deals with mixtures. The clause first provides that the mixture of which food is composed shall be pure and in an undeteriorated and sound condition. The package in which the mixture is contained must show on a label the names of the ingredients and, if it is a food, the proportion of the ingredients. For instance, take an article sold as pepper. I have given a definition of that already, and I dare say hon. members may have noticed the correspondence that has already appeared in the Press in connection with this matter.

Mr. HARDACRE: Does that apply to what might be called "patent foods"?

The HOME SECRETARY: The whole particulars are given there. They must give the formula. Every provision is made to deal with these matters. There is no doubt that different persons, however honest they may be, are required, in the interests of the public, to disclose the article which they are manufacturing, where the seller is not absolutely aware what is there. We are bound to have complaints that this one's business is being affected and that one's business is being affected. I once more desire to point out the whole object of the Bill is to protect the consumer and not the seller.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: We will help you to do that.

The HOME SECRETARY: Clause 16 provides for the examination of articles advertised, and the comparison of the examination with the advertisements referring to such article. If the article is injurious to health,

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

further advertising or the sale of such article may be prohibited, and no action will be taken against any newspaper which publishes any report referring to same. I think that is a very satisfactory provision, because at the present time, in many instances, a newspaper was liable to an action for libel if it published what was a matter of fact. The clause confers wide and drastic powers, but the powers will not be exercised without giving the manufacturer, importer, vendor, or owner an opportunity of placing his objections to the proposed prohibition before the Commissioner. Section 17 gives power to prohibit the advertising or sale of foods which, in the opinion of the Commissioner, are injurious to life and health. It is provided that this may be done by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Commissioner, but before such recommendation is made, the manufacturer, importer, or vendor must be given a reasonable opportunity to place his objections to the proposed prohibition before the Commissioner, so that he has every opportunity, if he thinks that an injustice is being done to him, to make his side of the case clear. The provisions of sections 16 and 17 will apply to the sale of any article or apparatus alleged to be useful or efficacious in relieving human suffering or in curing, overcoming, or alleviating physical defect. As hon. members know, there are a number of articles sold which are warranted to cure this form of malady or that form of malady; while in many instances, in fact, in every case, they are frauds which are designed to take down the purchaser of the particular article. This clause gives the necessary power to deal with that matter for the protection of the public.

Mr. MURPHY: Can you insert a clause guaranteeing that doctors will cure you?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am sure if it is possible to do that, we will have a unanimous vote on it. (Laughter.) Sections 19 and 20 deal with disinfectants. It is within the knowledge of the Health Department that disinfectants were prepared and sold which were utterly useless for the purpose for which they were intended. This particular clause deals with that matter. Sections 21 and 22 deal with sale of milk. They are of the greatest importance, inasmuch as they deal with an article of food which has a direct relation to infant life and mortality. No person shall be allowed to sell the milk from a cow suffering from any disease, and if a diseased cow is in the milking herd it will be *primâ facie* evidence that the milk of such cow has been sold for the food of man.

Mr. HAMILTON: Will a man be allowed to keep a diseased cow on his premises?

The HOME SECRETARY: No. It is an offence to keep a diseased cow, and there is *primâ facie* evidence that the milk of that cow is being sold for human consumption. Sections 23, 24, and 25 simplify the law with regard to short weight in bread. Section 26 is new. It provides for inspection of foods in course of delivery with a view to detecting short weight. It is considered that in its operation the clause will give protection to customers against unscrupulous vendors. The clause will apply to bread, etc. Section 27 deals with the sale of olive oil, the intention being to prohibit the blending of imported

oil with the Australian article. (Hear, hear!) Section 28 deals with the adulteration of beer. (Hear, hear!) I thought [4.30 p.m.] that would appeal to hon. members. It prohibits the use of certain substances, and provides that in drawing beer from any receptacle leaden pipes shall not be used.

Mr. LENNON: What about salicylic acid?

The HOME SECRETARY: It is all provided for. Section 29 is designed to guard against the injurious effects caused by the use of cooking utensils containing lead. Similar provisions are, I believe, in force in France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Belgium. Section 30 prohibits the use in respect to toys, wall-paper, or other decorative paper, paper serviettes, or paper used in the enclosure of any food, of paints, colours, etc., containing arsenic, lead, or antimony in excess of the quantity prescribed by the regulations. The clause is designed principally for the protection of children. Wall-papers, more especially those which are of a green colour, very often contain arsenic. Lollies also are often wrapped up in paper that is coloured with injurious matter. Arsenic is also used for colouring many articles of clothing; lead and antimony are used for weighting clothing, and there is the danger of poisoning by absorption of these substances through the skin. Section 31 provides that "water" used in the manufacture of what is generally known as "soft drinks" shall be passed through an approved filter or sterilised. (Hear, hear!) Section 32 makes clear the procedure in dealing with the inspection, removal, sampling, and analysis of foodstuffs. Subsection (4) is important inasmuch as it deals with the procedure in wholesale seizures. Section 33 gives power to demand, select, and take samples of any foodstuff, and for the purchase of sample at current market value. If such a provision were not inserted in the Bill it might happen that when an officer demanded a sample the owner might place a fictitious price upon the article.

Mr. FOLEY: Can you insert a clause providing for the cost of these articles to the consumer?

The HOME SECRETARY: No. It would be practically impossible to lay down a hard-and-fast rule that such-and-such an article should be sold at such-and-such a price; and it does not come within the scope of this measure. Section 34 provides for the method of dealing with samples. It is provided that when an officer obtains an article with the intention of submitting it to analysis he shall at once notify his intention to any person then present—that is the owner, agent, or servant, or other person apparently in charge of such article. The article must be divided into three parts, and if there is not sufficient quantity in each part for the purpose of analysis, similar articles under the same label may be obtained, and so mixed that a sufficient quantity will be available for analysis. One part shall be kept, one part shall be offered to the person from whom it was obtained, and the other part shall be sent to the analyst. The person from whom the article was obtained has the opportunity of obtaining a separate analysis, and thereby checking the result with that obtained by the officer who submitted the sample for analysis. Section 35 provides that any per-

son who is agreeable to pay the cost of a sample and the prescribed fee for its analysis, may require an officer to purchase a sample of any food and submit it for analysis. Section 36 gives the Commissioner power to require a local authority to submit at least a minimum number of samples or portions of articles of foods or drugs for analysis. The minimum fixed is three samples for every 3,000 persons living in the area. Section 37 provides that if any particular method has been prescribed for the analysis, the analyst must certify that he has followed the method prescribed, but in defence evidence may be tendered to show that the prescribed method is not correct. The section further provides that the person from whom the article was obtained may obtain from the analyst who analysed the sample submitted by an officer, on payment of 2s. 6d., a copy of the result of his analysis. It is important to note that the copy of such analysis must not be used for trade purposes as an advertisement, and that any person so using it shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £50. It may be urged that the section will be harsh in its application, inasmuch as if a trader's goods are subjected to analysis and were found to be pure, and if he paid for the certificate stating the fact, he should be able to use such information for the benefit of himself and his clients. It is not, of course, intended to prevent the trader advertising his goods in any way he thinks fit. He can have an analysis made at his own expense, and he can make the result known to the public in any way he thinks fit. The only restriction imposed is that the analysis made for the purposes of the Bill must not be used for the purpose of booming a trader's business. Under clause 25, a retailer himself would be entitled to demand that a Government official should take a sample of his goods for analysis. The retailer would select his own goods, and he might hand over for analysis one sample of good quality, whereas a great proportion of his stock might be of very inferior character. Thus he might, by virtue of the certificate of a Government analyst, give a false value to his goods. It is considered, therefore, that if traders use the machinery of the Bill for the purpose of having an analysis made by a Government analyst, they must not use the result for the purpose of advertising their business. As a matter of fact, there would be nothing to guarantee that the analysis obtained by preferring one small sample would offer any criterion as to the character of the general stock. Section 38 provides that any person interfering with an officer in the discharge of his duties under this Act, or who interferes with marks or seals, is guilty of an offence. Section 39 provides that in cases where any ingredient or mixture is found, and which is adjudged by the police magistrate to have been deposited or kept there for the purpose of being used as an adulterant, the person in possession of such ingredient shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £5. Sections 40 and 41 deal with the liability of agents or servants in addition to the principal. The servant will not be liable if he proves that the offence was committed in a place which was under the personal superintendence of the owner of the business or some manager or other person representing such owner, and that the offence was committed with the knowledge of the owner or the representative. The servant can also

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

recover in any competent court or jurisdiction the amount of any penalty inflicted upon him, and the court may suspend the operation of the conviction for three months to enable the employee to recover from the employer the amount of penalty which was inflicted. Section 42 deals with the liability of the importer. Section 43 deals with defences, and provides that a person shall be discharged from prosecution upon proving that he had received from the person from whom he purchased an article a guarantee in writing that the articles were not falsely described or mixed, etc., but such guarantee is subject to the conditions set forth in detail in subclauses (a) and (b), the principle of which is that the person giving the guarantee must be resident in Queensland, or, if a company, must have a registered office in Queensland. If it were otherwise, persons might produce bogus guarantees for which nobody was responsible.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Is not that a Commonwealth matter?

THE HOME SECRETARY: That is a matter we shall be open to discuss when the question is before us in Committee. Section 44 provides for the infliction of penalties and the nature of such penalties. The object of the clause is to prevent the necessity of specifying the penalty for each specific case. There is a corresponding section in the English Act. The section also provides for imprisonment in certain cases for a period not exceeding six months. That may seem somewhat severe; but, when we consider the importance of the subject-matter with which we are dealing, I think it will be admitted that it is a good thing to provide that the penalty of imprisonment may be inflicted.

MR. LENNON: We will support very much more severe penalties than you have here.

THE HOME SECRETARY: Section 45 provides that any food, drug, etc., in respect of which a conviction relates may be forfeited, and articles forfeited may be disposed of in such manner as the Minister directs. Section 46 provides that all proceedings in respect of this Act shall be taken in a summary manner before a police magistrate sitting alone.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

THE HOME SECRETARY: The reason of that is obvious; I need not dilate upon that. Section 47 provides that the production by the prosecutor of an analyst's certificate shall be sufficient evidence of the facts mentioned therein unless the defendant required the analyst to be called as a witness. In that case the defendant is required to give the prosecutor three clear days' notice. Similar procedure would be followed if the prosecutor required the attendance of an analyst who supplied an analysis to the defendant in any action. Section 48 provides for an independent analysis to be made. It will be remembered that under section 34 when an officer takes a sample for analysis that he is required to divide it into three parts—one to be given to the person from whom the purchase was made, one to be sent to the analyst, and one to be kept by himself. The part given to the seller can be sent by him to an analyst, and as circumstances might arise rendering it necessary to get the opinion of a third analyst, section 48 gives the court the necessary power to do so. Section 49 provides that payment of all fees and expenses incident to the analysis

[*Hon. J. G. Appel.*]

of food, etc., shall be paid by offenders on conviction. Expenses would involve travelling expenses and proportionate part of salary while engaged. Section 50 is important as it provides that the onus of proof shall in every case be on the defendant. It is important to note that the mere presence of food in any place shall be evidence that it was intended for sale and use for consumption by man. Section 51 provides that the source of information need not be divulged. There is a similar clause—namely, 255—in the Customs Act. The question to be decided is not the source of information but whether the party accused is guilty or not. Section 52 is important. If the Health Commissioner has reasonable grounds for suspecting that any person is in possession of foods, drugs, etc., in breach of this Act, he may require such person to produce for his inspection any books or documents of the nature of store records, or which deal with the reception, possession, etc., of any such food or article. He may make or cause to be made copies of extracts, and any person who refuses or neglects to comply with any requisition under this section is liable to a penalty not exceeding £50. All these provisions, however stringent they may seem, are absolutely necessary.

MR. LENNON: Don't apologise for their stringency.

THE HOME SECRETARY: On the other hand, any officer who does not maintain secrecy on all matters which come to his knowledge in the performance of his official duties under this section is liable to a penalty of £50 and dismissal from his office.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Is he to get the benefit of the Offenders Probation Act?

THE HOME SECRETARY: That is a matter I do not propose to discuss at this moment. Section 53 provides that the names of persons who have been twice convicted of offences against this Act may be published in the *Gazette* and in any newspaper circulating in Queensland. The name of supplier of the goods may also be included in the notification. There is little doubt that the application of this section will also act as a deterrent in committing offences against the Act. Section 54 provides for making regulations prescribing standards for the composition or strength or purity of quality of any article of food, so that there may be a plain definition of what constitutes impurity. Under the same section regulations may be framed prohibiting the addition of foreign substances, modes of manufacture, use of appliances in manufacture, storing, preservation, containing any substance which may be specified, securing the cleanliness and freedom from contamination of any food in the course of manufacture, prescribing the mode of labelling food sold in packages, requiring the destruction of articles of food that have become deteriorated, dealing with the carriage, storage, etc., of perishable food, registration of premises where ice-cream, ginger beer, etc., are manufactured or prepared for sale, methods of analysis, etc. I think those latter provisions are very necessary in view of the disclosures made at different times in connection with the manufacture of ice-cream.

MR. MAUGHAN: What about pure water?

THE HOME SECRETARY: Water is to be distilled or sterilised. Section 54 also deals

with articles in respect of which an attempt might be made to evade the law by selling them under some fancy names. For instance, it will provide for such cases as those in which the name "Limeade" is used for "Lime Juice." The use of the word "Limeade" would not exempt the preparation from coming under the operation of the Bill. Similarly, the use of the word "Salad" would not evade the results of analysis. Section 56 provides that where proprietary foods contain no unwholesome added ingredient, manufacturers need not disclose their trade formulæ. Section 57 provides that proceedings by indictment and contracts between individuals are not to be affected. If a person brings an action against another for a breach of contract on the sale of any food, drug, or other article, he may receive the amount of any penalty which has been imposed on conviction under the Bill, if he proves that the food, drug, or other article, the subject of such conviction, was sold to him as an article of the nature, substance, and quality demanded, and that he purchased it not knowing it to be otherwise. That provision protects the retailer who purchases from the wholesale dealer without knowing that the article purchased was adulterated. Section 58 repeals sections 69 and 80 of the principal Act, the matters referred to therein being dealt with under this Bill. Section 59 provides that the site, size, and plans of every hospital or temporary place provided by a local authority for the reception and treatment of infectious diseases shall be subject to the approval of the Commissioner. Hon. members are probably aware that under our present law each local authority is compelled to provide a hospital within its area for the reception and treatment of infectious diseases, or to join with other local authorities in the erection of a joint hospital for that purpose.

Mr. MURPHY: You cannot compel outside local authorities to do it; some of them cannot keep an ordinary hospital going.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, they have to do it.

Mr. MURPHY: There will be a revolution.

The HOME SECRETARY: Section 59 further provides that the reasonable expenses of maintenance are to be borne by the patient. Section 60 amplifies the present procedure with regard to disinfection of bedding, etc. Section 61 provides that no person shall send a child to school if he knows that the child is suffering, or within a space of eight weeks has suffered, from scarlet fever, diphtheria, etc., and that no teacher shall knowingly admit a child suffering from infectious disease. For acting in contravention to this section a fine of £5 may be inflicted. Sections 62, 63, and 64 set forth the procedure to be followed in reporting cases and preventing and checking the spread of infectious disease. The necessity for such action is quite obvious. Power is given to make regulations for the cleansing and disinfection of clothing and other articles which have been exposed to infection, cleansing and disinfection of houses, disinfection of second-hand wearing apparel, cleansing and sterilisation of implements and utensils of barbers and hairdressers, proper isolation of the sick, details of construction of sanitary conveniences, the protection and purification of domestic water supplies, etc., etc. I dare say that hon. members have observed that in the metropolis especially a

large number of shops are now being opened for the sale of second-hand wearing apparel. Under the clause I am referring to, all second-hand clothing must be disinfected before it can be exposed for sale.

Mr. RYLAND: Not any portion of it?

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know what the hon. member would do under general circumstances, but I imagine that he would act like anyone else if a member of his family died of some disease or another—he would sell the clothes of the deceased person to the first second-hand dealer who came along. (Laughter.) This clause provides that all articles of second-hand clothing must be disinfected before they are retailed to the public. Then we have provisions dealing with private hospitals. It is considered desirable that local authorities should have some control over private hospitals and nurses, and that both should be registered. Sections 65 and 66 define the meaning of private hospitals and registered nurses. Sections 67, 68, and 69. The provisions of the Bill allow of registration of private hospitals in use at commencement of this Act if such registration is effected within three months after that date, but no person will be entitled to hold a certificate of registration of a private hospital unless a medical practitioner or a registered nurse. Private hospitals may be of two kinds—namely, hospitals where cases of any kind, including midwifery cases, may be treated, and hospitals for midwifery cases only. Sections 70, 71, and 72. It is proposed that persons applying for the registration of private hospitals shall apply to the local authority, who shall make certain inquiries with a view to ascertaining whether the applicant and the premises are suitable for registration, and shall grant or refuse such applications as they deem fit. If granted, the certificate shall be for one year only; the fee for registration shall be for a general hospital £5, for a lying-in hospital £2. Section 73 provides that nurses shall have sufficient accommodation. Regulations may prescribe the class of accommodation. Section 74 provides that if alterations or additions are made, the work shall be done with the consent of the local authority. Section 75 provides that an applicant under certain conditions must reside continuously on the premises, and if a certificate of registration is transferred it must be with the approval of the local authority. Section 76 provides that every private hospital and the records thereof must be open to inspection by the medical officer of health. Section 77 provides that proof that any house, apartment, or premises was or were let, hired, engaged, or used by any person for the accommodation of a female during her lying-in or confinement shall be *prima facie* evidence that such house is a lying-in hospital. Section 78 deals with the interment of still-born children, and provides for the infliction of a very heavy penalty on persons disposing of the bodies of such children without written certificate of a medical practitioner, medical officer of health, or police magistrate. Section 79 provides that if an inmate of a private hospital is found to be suffering from infectious disease, and is removed to an infectious diseases hospital, the hospital from which the patient was removed shall be liable for the cost of treatment in a public hospital. Sections 80 and 81 provide for the registration of nurses. It is provided that they shall be registered by the Queensland Medical Board, and that the

Hon. J. G. Appel.

board shall keep a register of such nurses, and that a list of names of such nurses be published in the *Gazette* annually. Section 82 more particularly sets out who may be registered as general nurses, and a three years' previous experience in nursing is made a necessary qualification. Section 83 deals more particularly with nurses who may be registered as midwifery nurses. In these cases the person claiming to be registered must hold a certificate of midwifery from some hospital or other institution recognised under this Act. Persons over the age of twenty-one who hold certain certificates and pass the prescribed examination will be entitled to registration. Section 84 provides that when a nurse is registered she shall receive a certificate and badge. Sections 85 and 86 provide penalties for false or fraudulent representations, and provide also for the cancellation of certificates in cases in which nurses are convicted of an indictable offence. Section 87 provides that nurses so registered are to have preference in all hospitals, subject to the Hospitals Acts, 1847 to 1891. Section 88 provides that fees and penalties in respect of private hospitals shall be paid into a local fund, and in respect of nurses into the consolidated revenue. Section 89 gives power to make regulations with regard to this part of the Act. Under section 90, in cases where a nuisance or a condition injurious to health is caused by any act or default of a local authority, the Commissioner may take proceedings against the local authority, and section 160 of the principal Act will not apply to such proceedings. In cases of emergency the clerk may cause to be carried out such work as is necessary to prevent or remove a nuisance. Section 91 gives a local authority power to borrow money for the purpose of constructing drainage and sewerage works, etc., without taking a poll of the ratepayers. Taking into consideration the fact that we have profited by the results of the conference held in Sydney, and that we have also drawn upon the experience of other States in preparing this measure, I think it may safely be concluded that members have before them the last word in pure food legislation in this Bill.

Mr. NEVITT: You mean up to date?

The HOME SECRETARY: Up to date.

Mr. NEVITT: Not the last word, I hope.

The HOME SECRETARY: Quite so. In my introductory remarks I pointed out that owing to the steady advance of scientific research, legislation which may be good to-day may not meet the needs of to-morrow. But in this up-to-date Bill you have what may be called the last word in pure food legislation at the present time.

Mr. MAUGHAN: As far as your Ministry is concerned.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am sure that if the hon. member would only take a portion of our politically pure democratic food, it would not do him any harm. (Laughter.) However, I can give hon. members the assurance that the Bill now before them is a more perfect measure than the measure in operation in New South Wales, in Victoria, in South Australia, or in Tasmania; and that it is a decided improvement upon the measure which is law in Great Britain at the present time. I ask hon. members to assist me to make the measure law at the earliest possible opportunity, as I am con-

fidant that it will make for improvement in the health, happiness, and prosperity of the people of this State. Let us show by making this measure law as soon as possible that we are not unmindful of those democratic principles which we profess, but that we are honest and genuine in our professions of democracy, and that our ears have not been deaf to the complaints of those sufferers who have had imposed upon them impure food and impure milk. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*): In his introductory remarks, the Home Secretary said he was very proud to have the privilege of bringing forward a measure such as this, and he also said that was the attitude of the great democracy of which he is a supporter. The hon. gentleman further said that the Government had not had sufficient data previously on which to draft a Pure Food and Drugs Bill. Before I sit down I shall endeavour to show that the last remark is not in accordance with fact. Every session since I have had the honour of a seat in this House I have brought under the notice of the Government the absolute necessity for a better administration of the existing Act, and the want of sufficient power under that Act to do all that was necessary to insure a pure supply of food and drugs. The Home Secretary also said that this Government intended to do their best for the welfare of the community and the happiness of the people. I would like to call his attention once more

to the fact that the Premier, [5 p.m.] only some eighteen months ago, made use of an expression on the floor of this House, that the primary function of a Government was not to promote the happiness of its people. I say that the remarks of the Home Secretary and those of the Premier come into conflict with each other. There is another matter I would like to bring under the notice of the Minister. When introducing Bills of this kind, where we are repealing sections of existing Acts, the clauses of the Bill should be in parallel columns with the sections of the Act, so that hon. members could clearly follow the new clauses which are inserted to take the place of the old sections. That would have simplified matters to a considerable extent, and then hon. members would have been able to compare the clauses without looking up the original Acts. It must be remembered that hon. members are not in possession of the statutes, and have to come to the House to see them, and when they come they find that someone else is using them. They should either be supplied with the statutes at an early date, or else when Bills are introduced the repealed sections should be placed in parallel columns with the new clauses. The Home Secretary also said that it was intended to protect the honest manufacturer, but I question whether it goes far in that direction. There are many ways at present where the dishonest manufacturer is on a better footing than the honest manufacturer. I will give a case in point. In our fruit-preserving industry of to-day there is the method of peeling fruit by what is known as the caustic soda and arsenic treatment.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is provided for in the measure.

[*Hon. J. G. Appel.*]

Mr. NEVITT: I am saying that I question whether it goes far enough. I have read the clauses very carefully. I admit that in a Bill of this kind a good deal has to be done by regulation, as it is impossible to put in the standard of every article of food and drug in a Bill when it comes before the House. However, I sincerely hope that the Home Secretary is right in his remarks when he states that the honest manufacturer will be placed at a better advantage than the dishonest manufacturer will be. There is another direction in which this Bill could have gone, and that is to deal with the number of quack medical men we have in the city of Brisbane to-day, men who hold no qualification whatever—magnetic healers.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is dealt with in a Medical Bill which I hope to lay on the table in a few days.

Mr. NEVITT: I question if it would not have been better to put it in here.

The HOME SECRETARY: We could not put it in here: we will put it in the Medical Bill.

Mr. NEVITT: You have left other things which could have been inserted, such as public abattoirs.

Mr. LENNON: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: However, I shall come to that later on. The object of this Bill, the Home Secretary says, is to protect the consumer; it is also to prevent injury to the public by stopping the sale of bad, unwholesome, inferior, and adulterated foods. We have been advocating that for a considerable time. As I have already said, every session since I have been here I have mentioned where the health of the public was being undermined by inferior foods, drugs, and beverages placed upon the market, and before I have done I will give a few samples of these things and the necessity for the introduction of a Bill such as this. In my estimation there is only one method by which you can guarantee that the people will get pure food and drugs, and that is by nationalising health. Let us nationalise our doctors, our hospitals, our dispensaries—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: I go so far as to say even our food supply, because commercial morality to-day is at such a low ebb as has never been known in the history of the world to fall so low as it is to-day, and that is the only way that the public can get the protection that they are entitled to.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: There are many honest traders.

Mr. NEVITT: I grant you that, but it is not the honest trader that we have to legislate against. The dishonest trader is on an equal plane with the honest trader; unfortunately, he is in a better position than the honest trader, because he can sell in so many directions. The honest trader cannot put his article on the market at the price the dishonest trader sells it. If it is necessary to nationalise our asylums and our gaols—which I think every member will admit—I say it is equally necessary to legislate so that the community should be supplied with a pure food and drug, and be sure when they go into a shop to ask for an article that they will be certain of getting the article they ask for; but under our system of commercial

morality to-day it is almost impossible to get a pure article of food, or you do not know that you are getting it, if you do happen to get it. It would be a splendid investment for this Government if they would spend a few thousand pounds in the nationalisation of health; it would be a better way than spending it on immigration as they are doing now. Would it not be far better to look after and protect people already here, rather than bring out hundreds of others to be victims of the conditions in which, as the Hon. the Home Secretary has already remarked, some of the food is being placed on the market? It would be money well spent if they diverted £10,000 or £20,000 from immigration for the purpose of nationalising the health of the community. By that means you would preserve the efficiency of the race. Medical science has proved that our race, in many instances in the lower walks of life—the hardworking classes of the community—are not in a position to go to the best class of shops and get a pure food. They have to go to the smaller shops, where food is sold at a lower rate, and the result is that their health has been undermined, and the death rate, not only of Queensland, but of Australia, is a great deal higher than it should be.

Mr. TROUT: Do you mean to say that the smaller men are the dishonest men?

Mr. NEVITT: I did not say anything of the kind. If you would listen you would not take that inference from my remarks. I said that a man with a small salary of £1 10s. or £1 15s. a week, on which he has to support a family, is not in a position to go to a better class of shop at which a fairly good article can invariably be got.

Mr. TROUT: You can get a good article from the better class of shops.

Mr. NEVITT: Quite possible, providing the trader is an honest one. I do not say that because a man is in a small way of business he is necessarily a dishonest trader—I do not intend that that inference should be drawn from my remarks. There are equally honest traders amongst the small men; in fact, I question whether they are not, in some instances, more honest than the large traders. The deaths last year from phthisis in Queensland were 342. I believe this Bill will have a tendency to reduce the death rate in that direction.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: Because, as I have remarked, the preservatives that are placed in foods undermine the system, and make the individual so much more liable to pick up the bacilli of phthisis, and not only to pick it up, but the system then becomes a fertile ground for the purpose of disseminating the bacilli. Unfortunately, our Health Act in the past, and during the time the present Home Secretary has occupied that position, has not been administered as it should have been.

The HOME SECRETARY: I beg to differ. As far as our powers went we did everything that was necessary.

Mr. NEVITT: I shall come to that part. At the present time under the Dairy Produce Act it is provided that the premises used as a dairy or factory or milk shop shall be registered under the Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: We do not administer that.

Mr. Nevitt.]

Mr. NEVITT: But it is administered by the present Government, and not one-twentieth of them are registered in Brisbane. If the Government have these powers at present and do not administer the Act, what guarantee have we that they will administer the measure we have before us? If they had administered the Act in the past as it should have been there would not have been the necessity for the further legislation which is being introduced to-day. I am extremely pleased that we have such a Bill introduced to-day. While on this matter, I would call attention to the fact that section 5 of the Dairy Produce Act requires dairies to be registered. The interpretation clause defines "dairy" as including land, premises, and buildings used in connection with the production of milk, and also any premises where cream is separated for the purpose of being supplied to a factory. We have scores of milk vendors in the city of Brisbane to-day who are not registered. The milk is being produced under the most unwholesome conditions, and disseminated through the city, with the result that the Commissioner of Health in some of his reports has told us that the infantile mortality to a very large extent was due to the rotten condition of the milk supply of the city of Brisbane.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is why we have provided under the Bill that dairies must be registered by the Health Department.

Mr. NEVITT: I am telling you that you have already powers under another Act to do so, and it is not being administered, and I want to know what guarantee we have got that when this measure is placed on the statute-book it is going to be administered. Another enactment to which I wish to draw attention is that providing that pure and wholesome water should be supplied to stock from which the milk is consumed by the people in the community. Three years ago I brought under the notice of the House the fact that three or four dairy herds were running about in Victoria Park, and there was a sewer going through it, and the same conditions prevail to-day. The dairy stock are getting water from waterholes in Victoria Park which are contaminated by a sewer running through it, and yet they have had powers under the Act in the past and have never even attempted to enforce them. Coming to the question of the medical man, a medical man should be more than a money-making machine, and if the Government would nationalise a fair number of the medical men, so that every person would have an opportunity of getting the best medical skill, it would be the means of reducing our death rate to a very considerable extent. What is more, one healthy subject to a State is a good asset. Are we not now paying something like £20 a head to bring people from the old country, and we are not looking after the people that we already have here to the extent we should. A healthy individual, from twenty-five to thirty years of age, is considered to be worth, at the very least, in a community such as Queensland, £400. Nationalising the doctors would be one of the means of reducing the death rate, and thereby reducing the number that are continually in our hospitals, and instead of being a drain on the market they would become assets. That is one reason why I maintain that the Government are not going far enough in their legislation. It is frequently seen by anyone

[Mr. Nevitt.

who travels throughout Queensland that it is absolutely impossible for a large number of people in Queensland to get medical attention, and if the Government nationalised our doctors, there would be means devised by which those people would be able to get the advantages of medical skill. The same thing applies, as I mentioned on the Address in Reply, to some of our nurses. They should be nationalised, or the State should provide a thorough system of bush nursing, and those nurses should be trained in the midwifery branch of that profession, so that a number of our people would be able to get the benefits of that attention at the time it is most needed. As I stated on the Address in Reply, two cases came under my observation, and in one case I am absolutely convinced that had that woman been able to get skilled nursing and attention, she and her child would have been alive to-day. Her husband was not in a position to send her where she could get skilled nursing, and the result was, although she was only a young woman, from twenty-five to twenty-seven years of age, she and her child were sacrificed. These are things that want impressing on the Government so that they can make provision as far as possible in their power; and I say there are many ways by which they could do such as I suggest. I do not believe there is a class of people in our community that do a greater amount of work for nothing than our medical men. The majority of the medical men, I am pleased to say, are of a humanitarian nature, but, unfortunately, there are a few that are not possessed of that milk of human kindness that men in that profession should possess, and that is a further reason why I think it is the duty of the Government to nationalise our doctors when introducing a Health Bill, so that they would be able to render more effective service to those who need their services. In some respects the present Government are doing a fair amount of work in connection with our schools, but I maintain it is not sufficient for the Government to only provide a doctor to diagnose a particular complaint. I maintain they should go further. If they diagnose a case, and the parents of the child are not in a position to provide the skilled attention required, I say it is the duty of the State to step in and assist them. At the present time our Government consider it necessary, when a prisoner is placed upon his trial, and he is not in a position to provide counsel for defence—the Government come along and say, for the honour of the State, that they will provide that counsel for the prisoner at the bar. Frequently these people are of the worst class, yet the Government realise the necessity and importance of providing counsel to defend those people, and, if possible, save their lives; yet the Government do not consider it necessary to provide medical attention to save the lives of a great number of the better class in our community. I say it is a great reflection on our present day civilisation that such a state of things should be allowed. Coming more closely to the Bill, the Home Secretary stated that in other parts of Australia they had had a considerable amount of trouble where the power of authority was placed in the hands of the local authorities. The same thing has been experienced almost everywhere where the power of enforcing legislation such as this has been placed in the hands of the local authority. It has invariably been a failure, for the simple

reason that invariably the members of the local authorities are interested in some form or other in commerce. If they are not directly interested in a particular trade of the community, they are interested from a social standpoint, or from some other standpoint, with the result that it has invariably been found that it was absolutely impossible to enforce legislation. I have given instances already where we have Acts on our statute-book, and for some reason or other the local authorities or the Government have not considered it necessary to enforce the same. I sincerely hope, if this Bill is passed, that the Home Department will instruct the Commissioner for Public Health to carry out its provisions in the most stringent manner, because there is no Act on our statute-book to-day that requires more close supervision than an Act of this kind, in order, as I have already stated, if it is for no other reason than to protect the honest producer against the dishonest one. Of course, that is not the only object we have in view. The main object, as stated, should be for the protection of the consumer, and if it is not administered in a proper manner the consumer will not get the protection that he is supposed to get under this Bill. The definition clause covers a very wide range, and I do not think it is possible to apply a better test than the test of the British Pharmacopoeia to our products. There are proprietary articles that I am afraid it will be a very difficult matter to deal with. As has already been remarked, some of our chemists are complaining of some of the clauses in the Bill. They complain that it is not just that they should be called upon to place the formula of their goods on each bottle as it is distributed over the counter. There may be a certain amount of reason in that request providing it did not include noxious or poisonous drugs. We may be able to get over the difficulty in Committee by specifying proprietary articles that do not contain what is known as noxious drugs, or drugs of a sedative nature, may be exempted. There is not the slightest doubt that the chemists have a good deal on their side. A man who has spent a considerable number of years in his profession, and by careful study has been able to produce a proprietary article which is of benefit to the community, and if this clause is passed in its present form, it means that every person in the community would have the benefit of that particular individual's brains. Whether that is a good thing or otherwise, I will not commit myself to say at this stage, but I say it is a matter which requires a good deal of careful consideration. Clause 16 gives the Commissioner power to take possession and analyse a number of these proprietary or so-called patent medicines. That is a very excellent clause. If it is found that the articles are of a useless or fraudulent nature, the Commissioner has the power to prevent that article being placed on the market. It is a very useful clause always providing it is administered in the way it should be administered. Coming to the clause dealing with adulterated drinks. Even this week I have heard people say that there was no necessity for this Bill. Some years ago a case came before the court in Brisbane when schnapps was found to contain 28 grains of sulphuric acid per gallon. I think anyone will admit that a £2 penalty is not sufficient for anyone who is vile enough to put sulphuric acid in a beverage.

The HOME SECRETARY: Can you say how we could increase the penalty?

Mr. NEVITT: The way I would increase it would be not to have a money fine at all. It should be imprisonment, and as a further penalty he should not be allowed in that particular trade afterwards. A man who is guilty of an action of that kind is a danger and a menace to the community. A quantity of rum was taken some few years ago which contained an enormous quantity of tobacco. When that rum was analysed it was found to contain a large percentage of nicotine. I say no penalty is great enough or severe enough for a man who is capable of actions of that nature. The same argument applies to any individual who adulterates foods with ingredients which have a deleterious effect upon the community. We have had cases, as shown in the annual report of the Commissioner for Public Health, where milk has been adulterated up to 40 per cent. Raspberry syrup has contained as high as 28 per cent. of proof spirit. This was termed a teetotal drink. I am very pleased to find that the Bill provides that aerated waters shall not contain more than 2 per cent. of proof spirit. We have had on the market raspberry jam adulterated up to 60 per cent. with apple pulp. That is a case where the consumer or dealer was being robbed. He is charged with the value of a rather expensive and scarce fruit which has been adulterated up to the extent of 60 per cent., and yet is charged a price at which he should have got the genuine article. These are cases which show the necessity of a Bill of this kind. Thirty-seven samples of tea were taken, and twenty-six were found to be not up to standard and were fictitious in some form or other. Mustard contained as high as 70 per cent. of starch, and pepper up to as high as 20 per cent. of sand, not farina, as the Home Secretary remarked. These figures are from the Government Analyst's report.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That shows some attention is being paid to the administration, does it not?

Mr. NEVITT: It shows some attention has been paid, and, as I remarked in reply to a similar interjection some twelve months ago, the Health Commissioner stated he had not sufficient officers to collect samples and to enforce the powers he had already under the existing Act. As to the necessity of further supervision, the Minister for Customs in Melbourne—I have had to go to Melbourne to get some of these reports, as I could not get them in my own State—the Home Secretary promised the other night to try and get the Commissioner for Health's report laid on the table before the present Bill was proceeded with.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am just going through a draft of it now.

Mr. NEVITT: I would very much have liked to have gone through it before I spoke on this Bill. However, I have had to go to Melbourne to get a few samples in woollen textiles. The Customs officer in

Melbourne took twenty-five samples [5.30 p.m.] of woollen goods, and found seven only genuine, eighteen of them being mixed with cotton to the extent of from 5 per cent. to 66 per cent. There was an average of 44 per cent. of adulterant in the woollen goods. It is a well-known fact that we have to import the majority of our textile goods from the same places as

Mr. Nevitt.]

the Melbourne people import theirs from; so that the same conditions as to adulteration prevail in Queensland. He took eleven samples of linen goods, and found nine of them adulterated with cotton and two with flax, not one of them being up to the supposed quality. And we know that some time ago the Federal Government had to take action against some fraudulent tanners in Australia. The British Government went so far as to refuse to take Australian made goods for the army remounts, because the leather was adulterated with glucose and chloride of barium to the extent of 16 per cent. The average cost of the adulterant is 1d. per lb., and the average price of the leather submitted to the British Government was 10d. per lb.; so that the fraudulent manufacturers were making a profit of 9d. per lb., or £13 8s. 9d. per ton. It was not so much a matter of the British Government being taken down, but the goods placed on the market in England got such a name that now people will not accept our goods. That is why I say this Bill, when it becomes law, should be administered in the most stringent manner. Now I intend to quote a rather lengthy article in order to show people how they are robbed in various ways. This is an article that appeared in *The World's Work and Play* on patent medicines, by Mr. Adams. What I am going to quote has reference to the patent medicine known as "peruna," and I may state that it is sold in Australia, and not long ago was advertised very largely in our Brisbane papers. In one of our papers I saw a full page advocating the use of this article. This is what Mr. Adams says—

"Another ostensible cure for catarrh is peruna, which is described as the most prominent proprietary nostrum in America (also sold in Australia). Anyone wishing to make peruna for home consumption, says Mr. Adams, may do so by mixing half a pint of Cologne spirit, 90 proof, with a pint and a-half of water, adding thereto a little cubeb for flavour and a little burnt sugar for colour. It will cost in small quantities about 3½d. or 4d. a quart; manufactured in bulk, it costs, including bottle and wrapper, about 4½d., and sold at 4s. At this rate, of course, peruna has many imitators; but its popularity does not depend upon the numerous complaints, from mumps to consumption, which they profess to cure, but upon the alcohol it contains. A compound of seven drugs with Cologne spirit is the authenticated formula of peruna, but the total of the seven drugs is less than half of 1 per cent. of the product, and Cologne spirit, the commercial term for alcohol. To the owners' argument that nobody could get drunk on the prescribed dose of peruna, Mr. Adams replies that what makes it a curse to the community is the fact that the minimum dose first ceases to satisfy, then the moderate dose, and finally the maximum dose; and the unsuspecting patron, who began with it as a medicine, goes on to use it as a beverage, and finally to be enslaved by it as a habit. The American Government forbids the sale of this medicine to Indians, because, says the Treasury Department, it leads to intoxication. A druggist in a Southern non-license town remarks upon the large sale of peruna there. I have seen, he says, persons thoroughly intoxicated from taking peruna. The common remark in this place when a drunken party is particularly obstreperous is that he is on a peruna drunk. It is a notorious fact that a great many do use peruna to get the alcoholic effect; and they certainly do get it good and strong."

I maintain that is a case in point where the people should be made acquainted with the nature of the article, and where the

Commissioner of Public Health, finding such a patent medicine placed on the market, should immediately take power to compel it to be taken off the market, and to prosecute the people responsible for placing it on the market. Another patent medicine on the market is aquamiel, which contains 97.35 per cent. of water and 2 per cent. of alcohol; and the concluding remarks of an analyst on this medicine are that it is absolutely worthless, and that the representations made concerning it are false and fraudulent. The Government did not come into possession of these facts yesterday; they have had them in their possession for years; so that very little credit is due to them for introducing this Bill at so late a period. It should have been introduced years ago, but, on the principle of "better late than never," I welcome the Bill.

The TREASURER: Don't scold them for bringing it in now.

Mr. NEVITT: I am not doing that; I am scolding you for being so lax as to the public welfare in the past; and I think the cases I have quoted are a sufficient answer to the people who say there is no need for the introduction of such a Bill. I have not found any allusion in the Bill to methylated spirit, which is very cheap, and which offers no temptation to the average individual. But when the alcoholic craving becomes a mania, people will get alcohol somehow or other; and if they can get it in no other way, they will fly to methylated spirit to satisfy the craving. I therefore think there should be provision made in the regulations for putting some ingredient into methylated spirit that will make it absolutely obnoxious to even the most depraved taste. Coming to the question of milksellers and their premises, I do not see any provision with respect to diseased cows found on the premises of dairymen—with respect to destroying or otherwise dealing with them. There are cows with tuberculosis of the milk-glands; and there should be some method to overcome that particular trouble, because it is well known that the bacilli of tuberculosis will live through the process of butter-making and cheese-making, so that the danger is just as great from eating the butter or the cheese as from drinking the milk. Some people say that bovine tuberculosis is not communicable from cattle to the human being; but I have here a little article from the Tuberculosis Commission that sat in England some time ago. This is from the final report of the commission, and is dated from London, 13th July of the present year—

"The Royal Commission on tuberculosis has brought up its final report. The commission concludes that bovine tuberculosis is readily communicable to infants and children with fatal results, and is particularly communicable to the abdominal organs and cervical glands. Cows' milk, it is stated, is a large source of infection, and one-half of the cases of children dying from abdominal tuberculosis are generally traceable to the human germ, but cases of bovine tuberculosis in adults are sufficiently extensive to incapacitate the patients for life. The commissioners recommend the adoption of stringent regulations and Government supervision over supplies of meat and milk, irrespective of whether the bovine disease occurs in the udders or in the internal organs. The cost of the inquiries made by the commission for the past ten years amounts to £75,557. Seven more volumes of reports are promised by

[Mr. Nevitt.]

the Commission, and will contain chiefly details of the experiments carried out on Lord Blythe's farm."

That is the conclusion to which they came after giving the matter very careful consideration; so it is absolutely essential that supervision of a very strict nature over all classes of dairy cattle should be made. The latter part of clause 30 deals with the faulty construction of boots, and provides that no person shall keep for sale or supply any boots of which the soles contain cardboard or paper. I have looked for a similar provision dealing with textile goods, but have not been able to find one. From facts which have come under my observation, I think it is equally necessary to protect the purchaser in regard to textile goods, and I hope that some stringent provision dealing with the matter will yet be inserted in the Bill. Clause 32 provides for the testing of alcohol, but it does not say what strength alcohol sold to the public shall be. I do not know whether that is a matter which will be dealt with in the regulations, but it appears to me that the strength should be stated in the Bill. Alcohol is consumed to a large extent, and I maintain that the public are entitled to get the beverage they ask for as pure as it possibly can be. A number of dealers purchase a very good class of spirits in bond. The spirit is then overproof, and they break it down themselves.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is quite a common practice.

Mr. NEVITT: Yes, I am aware of that, and it is necessary; but the point I wish to make is that some unscrupulous traders reduce spirit of a good class which is 20 or 30 overproof down to 20 degrees under proof, and then bring it back to a higher strength by adding raw spirit. No more deleterious thing can be taken into the human system than raw spirit, and that should not be permitted, so that I think it would be better to state in the Bill what strength spirit must be than to leave the matter to regulations. Clause 43, dealing with the defence which a person prosecuted for selling adulterated food or drugs may offer, is a very necessary one indeed. Under that provision a retail trader can clear himself if he has purchased the goods under certain conditions, which are specified. A great proportion of our goods to-day are put up in parcels or packets, and the ordinary retailer will have no difficulty in protecting himself if he observes the conditions laid down in this clause, as by so doing he will throw the onus on the manufacturer. Coming now to the provisions dealing with infectious diseases. I notice that one clause distinctly states that the site, plan, and specifications of a hospital for infectious diseases shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Health for his approval. When we go into Committee I shall endeavour to get inserted a similar provision dealing with private hospitals. The question of what are infectious diseases is to be left to regulations. I think it is high time the Government took the gloves off and took action with regard to the disease of syphilis. (Hear, hear!) The stamina of our race is being undermined to a large extent by the ravages of this dread disease. The other week the *Sydney Bulletin* spoke out very strongly on this matter in an article which should be read and digested by every member of this House. The statements contained in that

article may surprise a good many members of this Chamber, and I propose to read it to the House. It is as follows:—

"Just how deeply Australia is scored with one of the grimmest diseases known to mankind, it is impossible to say. In the nature of things there are no reliable figures available. A line may possibly be got from Maoriland, where, in the words of Dr. Findlay, Minister for Justice in the Dominion—

"According to the best calculations that can be made on the statistics and other figures obtainable, 60 per cent. of all males contract sexual disorders before they reach thirty; while from 65 per cent. to 80 per cent. of the abdominal and pelvic operations on women are due to the infection that ensues.

Australia may not be in such a bad way as Maoriland; on the other hand, it may be in a considerably worse way. In the Universities of Germany, where sexual troubles have been handled with the gloves off, it is on record that 25 per cent. of the students become infected *every term*; and according to Havelock Ellis, in the German army—where supervision is particularly careful—"the yearly number of men invalided equals a third of the total number wounded in the Franco-Prussian War." Let it be again insisted that the trouble by which a vast number of these men are laid low is no comparative triviality like smallpox or typhoid fever. It bears a fairly close analogy to leprosy. A great authority has said that without it there would be no nervous diseases in the world. It is certainly responsible for 95 per cent. of cases of general paralysis and locomotor ataxia. A big proportion of cases of brain softening and dementia, and innumerable skin, nose, and eye complaints are due to it. In its final manifestations it is indescribable. The highest order of Right Thinking Person may contract it. It may be inherited. A son may unwittingly transmit it to his mother by kissing her on the cheek. Doctors and nurses stand in daily peril of it. It may lurk on the rim of any glass or cup in any hotel or tearoom; on any towel or fork or roll of bread or bunch of grapes or tram or pawn ticket. And each person who is infected becomes immediately a distributing-focus for the ruin of innumerable others. In Manchuria, at the present moment, Japan is pouring out money like water, with the object of suppressing pneumonic plague. Sydney did the same, a decade ago, in order to banish bubonic plague. All over the Commonwealth hundreds of thousands sterling are expended yearly in the fight with the White Death. Yet against a disease which is more loathsome than plague, and perhaps as disastrous, nationally speaking, as tuberculosis itself, not a finger is being raised. Australia, with an army and navy in the making, is inert in the presence of that which has for centuries done deadly damage to armies. And for no more rational cause than that which precludes the really genteel Yankee from mentioning the word "stomach" in the hearing of his lady friends."

The subject is a delicate one, but it is a subject that we should deal with as effectively as possible. It should be included as an infectious disease to be dealt with under this Bill. During the recent visit of some University professors from the South I had the privilege of conversing with some of those gentlemen, and one of them told me that if the medical profession had the power they would like to possess to deal with this disease, they could stamp it out in two or three generations. That is the conclusion arrived at by those who have pursued scientific investigations, and I say it behoves the Government to take up this matter, and deal with it as it should be dealt with. Referring now to the typhoid carrier, I should like to know what would be done in the

Mr. Nevitt.]

case of a man who is a fairly healthy subject, but who may be declared to be a typhoid carrier. I presume that if such a man is a member of a friendly society the medical officer will put the cost of his isolation on the community as a whole. At any rate, this is a matter which we should consider between now and the Committee stage of the Bill. Clauses 67 to 69 deal with private hospitals, and state who shall be allowed to conduct such institutions. At present anyone can put up a signboard and say that his place is a private hospital. There has been no supervision over such institutions, and the proprietors have not been compelled to make returns of patients treated in them. I am glad to notice that this Bill provides that they shall be placed on the same footing in that respect as public hospitals, and that the proprietors shall be compelled to make periodical returns showing the number of patients in such a hospital and the deaths which have occurred. It is also provided that proper accommodation shall be provided for the nurses. There are many of our general hospitals in which the accommodation for nurses is not satisfactory, and I think that the Commissioner of Public Health, when travelling through the country, should visit our public hospitals and report on the sleeping accommodation provided for the staff. The place in which the staff sleep should be as good as that in which the patients are housed. While on duty, nurses come in contact with the patients and breathe a vitiated atmosphere, and they should have proper sleeping accommodation when they go off duty. I find that while the plans and site of an hospital for infectious diseases have to be submitted to and approved by the Commissioner of Public Health, the plans of a general hospital have to be approved by the local authority. If it is considered necessary to obtain the approval of the Commissioner of Public Health in the case of hospitals for the treatment of infectious diseases, I think it is equally necessary for him to determine whether the accommodation proposed to be provided in a public hospital comes up to the required standard. The same conditions should apply to both kinds of hospital. I do not altogether follow clause 59. I cannot understand the Home Secretary

[7 p.m.] repealing that section of the Act which provides for free disinfection of clothing, etc. I do not think that is a step in the right direction. I think it would be far better if that provision was retained, because if clothing or any other article requires disinfecting, it would be much better for the protection of the community if that was retained in the Bill. Then there is another clause for the insertion of which I do not understand the reason—that is clause 79, which states that a patient in a private hospital, if found to be suffering from an infectious disease, must be removed from that private hospital and taken to the infectious hospital, and the private hospital is responsible for all charges and expenses.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, at the present time local authorities are responsible for the infectious diseases hospital for the maintenance of the cases from their area. In a private hospital people are brought from outside the area, and yet the local authority is responsible as if they were resident in that area—it is to obviate that injustice.

[Mr. Nevitt.

Mr. NEVITT: It does not appear to me to be a just clause. Whilst I am with the Home Secretary in trying to put upon the statute-book stringent legislation for the control of these matters, I think at the same time we should try to be just.

Mr. MURPHY: I think that is very fair.

Mr. NEVITT: I question whether it is fair to throw the responsibility for the keeping of a patient taken from a private to an infectious hospital. However, it is a question which will be considered in Committee. The Bill, speaking generally, is more a Bill for Committee than for second reading, because we all agree with the general principles of the Bill. At the same time, I considered it was my duty to bring a few matters which struck me most forcibly before the House so that hon. members will be able to look them up. Another very good clause in the Bill is the compulsory possession of a birth certificate for the disposal of a stillborn child, and I think that that will be productive of good. Another good clause is that providing that all premises where the manufacture of food is taking place shall be registered, and I hope that that will also be administered in a proper manner. There is a very important omission in the Bill—that is, a provision for public abattoirs. I think this is a place where a question of that kind could be better dealt with than under any other Bill. There are certain powers given under the Slaughtering Act, but to a large extent that Act is to-day a dead letter. I ask anyone whether it is possible for the limited number of officers or police to go and inspect the whole of the slaughter-houses within the Brisbane district? It is absolutely impossible. Government abattoirs should be erected. In South Australia the Government have erected them, and if a man in the country has a consignment of fat lambs and sheep which he wants to send to Europe, all he has to do is to put them on the train at the nearest railway station to his farm and send them to Adelaide, and the Government do the rest.

Mr. TROUT: What does he do in a small place?

Mr. NEVITT: In a small place there is no necessity. But in a place like Brisbane, the hon. member for Enoggera must know perfectly well that provision for the killing and dressing of meat is a fair thing, and I am sure he as a fair-minded man would welcome public abattoirs.

The HOME SECRETARY: All these matters are dealt with in the Dairy Produce Act, which is administered by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. NEVITT: I beg to differ from the Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am only stating a fact.

Mr. NEVITT: You are stating the powers which are given to the Agricultural Department; but I am also stating a fact when I say the Act is not administered as it should be.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am only concerned about the administration of my own department.

Mr. NEVITT: I am quite satisfied that anyone who knows anything about the subject, knows the Act is not administered.

The HOME SECRETARY: I only mention that as one of the reasons why it is not introduced in this measure.

Mr. NEVITT: Meat is one of our most important articles of diet, and yet, for all practical purposes, it goes without supervision. It should have been placed under this Bill, under which it could have been administered, instead of by the Agricultural Department. Why does the Agricultural Department administer a portion of our food supply—because that is what it means? There is no place so well adapted for its inclusion as this particular Bill.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Commonwealth likewise, in connection with meat for export, takes part in it.

Mr. NEVITT: I know they do, but they have no connection with meat for home consumption. I was told the other day that the Commonwealth Government, possibly in the coming session, intend to introduce a Pure Food and Drugs Bill. I hope that is true, because being a national question, it is the duty of the Commonwealth Government to undertake it. I believe we will be more likely to get administration without favouritism.

The HOME SECRETARY: The representative of the Commonwealth Government was present at the conference I have mentioned, at which the whole of the resolutions, which are embodied in this Bill, were submitted, discussed, and passed.

Mr. NEVITT: I saw it stated in one of the papers recently that it was the intention of the Federal Government to introduce legislation on this matter during the coming session. The Home Secretary remarked that the Agricultural Department have powers of administration in regard to the export of meat. The Federal Government realised that the supervision which took place under the State Act was not sufficient, and they had to step in to preserve the good name of the fair exporter of meat in Australia.

The PREMIER: No, no!

Mr. NEVITT: That was practically what it amounted to.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: Take another article—butter, for instance. The Federal Government insisted that it should not contain more than 16 per cent. of moisture, but the butter manufactured in Queensland can contain as much moisture as the article can take.

The PREMIER: It is under the Federal Act.

Mr. NEVITT: Only for export.

The PREMIER: But they do not manufacture separately for each—one manufacture covers the whole.

Mr. NEVITT: I have been in factories where they were manufacturing butter for export and butter for local consumption, and the butter manufactured for export was drier and better butter than that for local consumption.

The PREMIER: The local consumer requires the best.

Mr. NEVITT: The expert in charge of the factory pointed out the difference, and anyone could see that one butter was worked considerably more than the other, with the result that the moisture was extracted, and the colour of the butter itself conveyed to any

ordinary individual that there was some difference, although they might not have been able to state the cause of it. As I said, I will welcome the time when the Federal Government takes over this matter, because the health of the people is a national subject, and I believe the National Parliament would administer it without favour to any one, and I am rather inclined to think that in the past some of the Acts of the State have not been administered as they should have been. I remarked that in one of the departments over which the Home Secretary had presided, the Act had not been carried out as it should have been, and he corrected me and said that in the case I was speaking of the Act was under another department, but I can give him a case, which I quoted on the Address in Reply, where the officers of his own department had gone into court and said to the presiding magistrate, "The department does not want to be vindictive," and yet that was the second offence of that man for adulteration of milk. I say that if a man of that kind adulterates milk his license should be cancelled, and yet that was a case in which the officers of his own department said they had no desire to be vindictive, and a paltry fine of £3 or £4 was inflicted.

The HOME SECRETARY: The maximum provided by the Act was not sufficient.

Mr. NEVITT: The officers of the department did not ask for the infliction of the maximum penalty, but practically said that they were not pressing this case. The point I wish to make is that there was a second conviction. I realise that a good deal will have to be done by regulation, and I sincerely hope that the regulations will be placed upon the table of the House before the session concludes, so that we will have an opportunity of going through them and making any alterations we see fit. There should be provision made for flies and dust-proof covers for a number of ordinary articles of diet such as milk, meat, jam, confectionery, etc. I welcome the Bill. It is certainly a step in the right direction, but as I previously remarked, the commercial morality of to-day is at a lower ebb than ever before in the world's history, and it has created a class of people whose God is greed, whose devil is need, and whose Paradise is to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market irrespective of the cost to anybody. This is a Bill in the right direction, and it will have a tendency to put down that avaricious, good-for-nothing individual that I think we all have a desire to do. But I am forced to this conclusion—the same conclusion that Lady Warwick has come to. Lady Warwick is one of the old nobility in England, and in speaking on this and other allied matters some time ago, she said "Every intelligent person admits to-day that socialism offers the only remedy for poverty, over-crowding, food adulteration, unemployment, and physical deterioration." I am forced to the same conclusion, because men, or bodies of men, are game to do and do anything in order to make a big banking account, and until you eradicate that selfishness that is in human nature, I do not think under commercial life it is possible to have such a community as we desire. That was my reason, in the early part of my remarks, for advocating the nationalisation of doctors and hospitals, and, if necessary, all classes of food. If we did nationalise all the doctors, hospitals, and foods, we would, in a very short time, have a much better race than we have to-day.

Mr. Nevitt.]

As I have already stated on that very delicate subject, what have the Government done in connection with it? I am not only speaking of this Government, but of all Governments. Very very few have taken it in hand and dealt with the matter as they should have done. However, I welcome the Bill and I sincerely thank hon. members for the very kind and patient hearing they have given me.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): It is not my intention to dwell at any length on this Bill. I think the Government have done a very wise thing in bringing in an amendment of the Health Act. There are many things in connection with this Bill that I think we, as a Parliament, have a right to rectify. We are here to see that the health of the community is looked after, but I should like to point out to the Home Secretary that, perhaps, he might be going too far in this legislation. (Opposition laughter.) We are getting spoon-fed too much, in my opinion, and so far as the chemists are concerned, I believe every member of the House has received a memorandum from the chemists stating that a serious injury is being done to their craft. I have received a letter pointing out that clause 14 of this Bill, subsection (1), provides—

“He shall deliver the mixture to the purchaser in a package, on or attached to which is a label stating that the food or drug is a mixture and the names of the ingredients; and, if the mixture is a food, the proportions of ingredients when so prescribed.”

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not discuss details of the Bill at this stage.

Mr. PETRIE: I am only pointing out one clause. The clause further provides—

“But it shall not be necessary so to supply a label in the case of—

“(a) A food or drug generally known to users as a compounded article or a drug not recognised by the British Pharmacopœia, if such food or drug is mixed with any ingredient or material not injurious and not intended fraudulently to increase its bulk, weight, or measure, or to conceal its inferior quality; or”

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the hon. member to proceed in this way. He is reading the clauses of the Bill. He may refer to them in a general way, but he is not in order in reading them.

Mr. MULLAN: No; it is a letter. He is reading a letter.

Mr. PETRIE: I will not read this. It is unfortunate that under this Bill the chemists—

Mr. MULLAN: Read the remainder of the letter.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PETRIE: I could read several letters, Mr. Speaker, but I won't read them. There is a clause in this Bill which says any chemist who makes up a prescription of his own, which is supposed to be a certain cure for a certain complaint, must state the ingredients of that prescription on the package. I think it is very unfair to those men, because, notwithstanding all the doctors and everybody else, we know very well there are certain chemists, not only in Brisbane and suburbs, but elsewhere, who make up prescriptions of their own that are supposed to be certain cures

[*Mr. Nevitt.*

for colds, rheumatism, or other complaints, and under this Bill they will have to give the ingredients of those prescriptions away.

Mr. MURPHY: You are not going to make the doctors state their prescriptions—only the chemists.

Mr. PETRIE: Only the chemists. I think the chemists should be allowed to make up prescriptions for the benefit of the public, and they should not be asked to submit the ingredients to the Home Secretary or to anybody else. The Bill is a very good one, and I trust for the sake of the community that it will be passed, but I would not like to see the Home Secretary or anybody else unduly harass a certain section of the community. The Home Secretary is not listening, but I believe he is with me, and I trust we will be able to put this matter right. I will not detain the House any longer. I trust when we get into Committee we will give fair play, not only to the chemists, but to everybody concerned.

Mr. ADAMSON (*Rockhampton*): I want to say a few words on this Bill on the second reading stage. In the first place I want to commend the Administration in bringing in this Bill. Whether we are agreed on all matters of detail or not, I think every member of the House will recognise that this is an important Bill, and that both sides of the House will proceed as far as possible to make it as good a measure as possible, and the best measure in the Commonwealth to-day. (Hear, hear!) The party to which I have the honour to belong have always stood for the best kind of Health Bill. They have always been in the forefront in advocating pure foods, and everybody who knows anything about this legislation at all in the Commonwealth, knows that the South Australian Act, passed by a Labour Government, was up to this date at any rate, the best Pure Food Bill and the best Health Bill in the Australian Commonwealth. I just wish to read a quotation here which shows how this subject was regarded in South Australia, and how important men have considered it and consider it to be to-day. This is a quotation from the *Sydney Bulletin* of 9th March, 1911, and it begins this way—

“Adelaide is lucky in many ways. Colonel Light took the “office” from Nature, and established the capital on a site which charms every visitor. That is good. But there is something better. The site and the design lend themselves with rare facility to a faultless system of sanitation. That is excellent. But there is something better still. Adelaide is a city whose skirts trail wide sweeps of lawn, colour-splashed by gardens. That is delightful. But there is something even more important still: Adelaide's fine effort to secure pure food for its citizens.”

And so, while it is admitted a very desirable thing to have a beautiful city, a very desirable thing to have many things about it of importance, to have food which will sustain life and promote vigorous life in every way is still more important. While the clothing of a man is great, his body is greater still, and the scriptural phrase is still true—

“The body is more than food, and the life is more than raiment.”

In South Australia long ago they recognised this, and the Labour party in that State had a great deal to do in passing their Pure Foods Bill. I would like to congratulate my

friend, the hon. member for Carpentaria, on the very fine speech he has made. Of course, in some respects, this is a special subject so far as he is concerned. Having had to do with hospitals for so long, and having had to do with many matters that are dealt with in this Bill, to my mind, it is a fortunate thing for this House—at any rate for this party—that we have a member so well acquainted with the subject to deal with the Bill on its second reading stage. This Bill to my mind is, in the main, a Bill for experts. It is in the main a Committee Bill, and I believe that the best work that will be done so far as this Bill is concerned will be done in Committee. (Hear, hear!) I do not claim any expert knowledge, so I am not going to speak here as an expert. If I attempted to do that, I would simply make myself foolish, and I try, as far as I can, to avoid that kind of thing. Not alone the adulteration of food, mixtures, and medical matters, not alone the deterioration of food-stuffs, but in relation to the adulteration of milk, there are men here who are experts and who can speak on these matters in a way I cannot speak, and I do not intend to trench upon their domain in my speech. But I want to make another quotation from this article in relation to the matter of the adulteration of food. I think there are some things in this article which it would be well to disseminate as widely as possible. This article goes on to say—

“The food adulterer is a contemptible and cowardly thief. The burglar gives you a sporting chance of catching him. He is a brute of audacious enterprise. But the man who waters your milk, “doctors” your bread, or crams a pound of butter with hidden lies is a mean, sneaking rascal who robs the invalid in the hospital and the baby in the cradle. Adelaide was late in beginning its campaign against this reptile. For one thing, the business had not been quite as bad there as in many other places; indeed, in many directions the record had been singularly happy. But Adelaide had not been free from the fraud by any means, and the crime was growing. So the authorities decided to delve seriously into the iniquity of food-faking. In 1908 the Government introduced a Food and Drugs Bill, to repeal existing laws which for many years had been dead as Scrooge. The officials could have been as dead as him, too, for all the influence they had.

“Yet, in the face of this historic farce, the Government measure actually provided for “voluntary” co-operation on the part of the local bodies.”

In South Australia they found that kind of thing did not work to the advantage of carrying out the Act, and this article goes on to say—

“Dr. Borthwick, Officer of Health, and Mr. T. E. Ellery, Town Clerk, of Adelaide, long-sighted and long-headed men, saw that it would not do. Very few do anything voluntarily when it hurts; and, as this was going to hurt, the law required provisions with hooks on them. Dr. Borthwick and Mr. Ellery seized the skirt of opportunity, and, with the powerful aid of the Adelaide City Council, got the voluntary clauses knocked out; and, before many were aware of it, Adelaide and suburbs had been fixed with an amendment embodying the principle of compulsion. Most of the local institutions had been asleep for twenty years, and they woke up with a yawn. That was the birth of the Metropolitan County Board, and Dr. Borthwick and Mr. Ellery are its proud parents. Who is the father and who is the mother need not be fought out. There is the child, sixteen months old, a healthy, progressive, useful infant.”

This Act is doing very useful work in

South Australia to-day; and it will be well to see that the Commissioner of Public Health and those associated with him

[7.30 p.m.] keep the local bodies up to the mark. I hope the measure will be administered in such a way as to promote the highest welfare of the community. While the Bill is a technical one, we are all agreed as to its value, because we all suffer from the evils which it seeks to remedy. Ruskin said there is no wealth but life; and I want to say, by parity of reasoning, that there is no life worth anything unless it is accompanied by health. When a man is sick or a woman is unwell, whatever duties they have to perform are irksome, and sometimes they feel as if they would not be sorry to “shuffie off this mortal coil.” And seeing that good food, pure drink, and good wearing apparel are necessary to health, whatever will provide these things and prevent their adulteration is a kind of legislation that will be welcomed by all right-thinking men. I am glad that medicines, drugs, aerated waters, and other drinks are to be dealt with in the same manner as foodstuffs. If we are to take into our bodies certain poisons to counteract the effect of other poisons, we ought, at any rate, to have these poisons mixed in such proportions as to do their work effectively—which is more likely to be done by people of experience than by amateurs. There will be some possibility of getting at the men who offend intentionally, and perhaps excusing the men who unintentionally make a mistake. This will do no harm to respectable men getting their living in the medical profession or as chemists. If they, as a class, are doing harm to the general community their powers ought to be curtailed; but if they are doing their work honestly and fairly, we should do nothing to injure them or to prevent them from getting their living in an honest way. In this article again we have some things with regard to the matter of milk. It says—

“Not yet, but by-and-by, the authorities intend to deal with everything you swallow. When you read the results of analyses, it makes you shudder to think what you have passed down your throat since the food-faker got abroad in the land—so many frauds that we can thank Heaven we started off scratch with our mothers anyway! The most elusive food-thief is the milk vendor; and Adelaide quickly found it must get a motor-car to catch him. Dishonesty goes on fleet foot, and the inspectors can tell of many exciting captures of these offenders against the confidence of the purchasing public. Samples are bought from the carts every day, Sundays included. The municipal policeman carries a supply of small bottles. He takes out three, and has them filled from the big can. The milk-vender may have one for a check analysis if he pleases. Another is sent to the Government Analyst, the third is kept in the office. Of course, the milk adulterer usually says he is as innocent of fraud as the baby he is starving. But, humanly speaking, the analysis cannot lie; and there are the figures. Then excuses trip on the vendors' tongue. The cow was not up to the mark, and he had been going to get rid of her for a long time. Or a boy had turned the tap into the can while he (the vendor) was in the hospital—and he never explains how the boy learned the trick. Occasionally the dairymen stands up and argues that the analysis is a liar. A fine settles the dispute. Under the county board law £20 is asked for the first offence; after that, £50 and £100. If the initial fraud be a particularly flagrant one, the magistrate may make the fine £50, and the next time the milkman goes to gaol for six months to think it over. Where there has been a second conviction the

Mr. Adamson.]

name of the individual is published right throughout the metropolitan area as a malefactor. And this means that 180,000 people or more, scattered over 155 square miles, hear about him. It is the brand of Cain."

And I hold that the man who as a milk vendor sells adulterated milk has a right to have the brand of Cain stamped on him—

"This step has already been taken in one instance, following a heavy fine. The policy of "no quarter" has had excellent results. Before the county board began its campaign for honest food, milk adulteration, fed by official ineptitude and administrative inefficiency, was common. Now, according to the chief inspector—

"In no metropolitan area of equal population in any part of the world is a purer milk supply, as a whole, guaranteed to the consumer than is supplied in this metropolitan county district.

There is every reason to believe that these big words are true. The authorities go back to the source. Dairies are inspected and kept up to the mark. The board has the handle of the whip—it issues the licenses. The habits and history of the vendors of the milk are noted, and a person with a communicable disease is promptly dismissed from the business. No detail is too small, since it relates to the people's food. In the first year of the board's operations 1,800 inspections of dairies were made. It was a busy twelve months for dairymen. This year the chief inspector has a bolder scheme still. He is going to make a bacteriological examination of the milk. As a matter of fact, arrangements have been made already for examining it for tubercle bacilli. Dr. Borthwick's object is to secure such a supply as shall be safe enough without the pasteurisation and sterilisation, which destroy useful bacteria. An eye is kept on all consignments of country cream and butter. As a rule, the merchants heartily cooperate, and say where the stuff comes from; and, hand in hand with a powerful body like the Central Board of Health, whose operations extend far afield, no time is lost in tracing the suppliers who are in need of a few earnest words of advice. Samples are constantly being obtained, and these tell the tale. Butter or cream that is obviously "off colour" is promptly destroyed."

I hope that this measure will be administered as effectively and do the same amount of good as has been the case with the South Australian Act. Now, I would like to say a word in regard to hospitals, and I am sorry it was not possible for the Home Secretary to show his great democracy, which he emphasised so strikingly at the beginning of his speech, by giving us an example of the State socialism he professed when he first came to this House, in the shape of making our hospitals State hospitals. Personally, I am convinced that our hospitals will never be as good as they ought to be under private enterprise, and what we want as far as the medical men are concerned, and as far as the nurses are concerned, is that the hospitals shall be made State hospitals, and that the medical men shall be State trained and State paid, and that the very best medical men shall be available to the poorest patient, and that people should not go to the hospital with the stigma of pauper on them, but simply because it is the best place. And I think our hospital nurses ought to be State servants, trained by the State, housed comfortably by the State, and paid a living wage. In some of the hospitals in Queensland—in some of the hospitals in Brisbane—the food is not what it ought to be, and so far as the housing is concerned, I hold that it is altogether behind the times. And in-

Mr. Adamson.

stead of four women sleeping in one room, there should be a room provided for each, or there should be no more than two sleeping in a room at the same time. And it should be impossible in any institution for one woman to get out of a bed and another woman turn into the same bed before it is cool. In some institutions the nurses are working thirteen hours a day, starting with 5s. a week, and finding their own uniform.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: And they are learning a good business.

Mr. ADAMSON: I hold this to be true concerning many of our hospitals—that only those nurses who have fathers and mothers who can look after them and help them can possibly get positions in those institutions; and the result is that there is a lot of snobbery, which is altogether undesirable. I hold that the nursing profession is an honourable profession, and it should be possible for the poorest girl to get there, and keep herself there and be honest there.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: So 'she can.

Mr. ADAMSON: I will not say that the hon. gentleman is deliberately making a misstatement, but I want to say that the hon. member is not informed as he might be informed when he makes a statement of that kind.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: I do know something about it.

Mr. ADAMSON: I believe the hon. member does know something about it, but I should not like to say that he knows everything about it.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: And you don't know everything.

Mr. ADAMSON: There are nurses in some of our institutions in Brisbane who cannot pay for their uniform, and I hold that that ought to be impossible, that those who are working in those institutions ought to have a living wage from the beginning, and that they should not be a burden on their parents. I am glad to notice that there is a tendency in the Education Department to raise the salaries of the lower-paid teachers. I hope that the Minister for Public Instruction will take a leaf out of the book of New South Wales, and make the minimum wage in that department £110 instead of £70 a year.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member in his remarks, but he must know that he is offending the sense of the House, and is not making a speech on the second reading of this Bill, which should be confined to principles rather than to details.

Mr. ADAMSON: I do not wish to offend the sense of the House or to hurt the feelings of any individual in the House, and I hope the Speaker will give me credit for that feeling. I was simply using this matter affecting the Education Department as an illustration of my argument as to what might be done in our hospitals if they were State institutions.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not misinterpret what I said. When I mentioned that he was offending the sense of the House, I was not speaking in any personal sense, but merely indicated that the hon. member was digressing from the subject before the House to a large extent. I have perhaps allowed the hon. member more latitude than I should have done, and unless he curtails his remarks on the subject, and

comes within what I consider a discussion of the principles contained in the Bill, I shall have to again call him to order.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am very sorry if I have given you any reason for making those remarks. If I have given you any reason for doing so I am perfectly unconscious of it. I was simply arguing that the hospitals should be State institutions, and if I was out of order in saying what I did I am exceedingly sorry. I hold that it would be a good thing if the Government made such provision as would insure that such wages shall be paid in private hospitals as will enable nurses and others employed there to keep themselves, and to keep themselves respectably.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is provided for in this Bill, because nurses have to be paid the rates arranged by the association.

Mr. ADAMSON: I hope that something will be done in that direction.

The HOME SECRETARY: It will be the law.

Mr. ADAMSON: That is one thing that I wished to emphasise. I recognise that a Bill of this kind is an exceedingly valuable one as far as the life of the State is concerned. It commences with the infant, and it seems to me that if by supplying pure food and seeing that our hospitals are properly attended to, we can save the infant life of the State, we shall do a great deal for Queensland. Here I should like to give a quotation from the "Review of Reviews" for June, 1911:—

RACE SUICIDE OR HIGHER ETHICS.

"According to the Registrar-General's returns for 1910, the inhabitants of these islands have resolutely decided to limit their numbers. There were as many marriages as ever, but the baby crop showed another shortage. In 1878 the birth-rate in England and Wales was 36.3 per 1,000. In 1910 it was 24.80, the lowest on record. A drop of one-third in thirty-two years is significant. Nor is it likely that we have yet touched bottom. The death-rate is also down, standing now at 13.33. Our population is increasing at the rate of over 1 per cent. per annum. Is this dwindling of the baby crop from one baby for twenty-seven of the population to one baby in forty race suicide, and therefore criminal, or does it indicate the dawn of a higher ethical conception of the moral obligations of parentage? Whether it be one or the other, we shall see the birth-rate down to twenty as soon as the masses of the working population learn to follow the example of the upper and middle classes. If the death-rate could drop to ten that would not so much matter. Babies cost their mothers too much trouble and anguish for anyone to wish a single infant to be born into the world unless it had at least a good chance of growing up."

I hold that legislation of this kind tends to make it possible for the babies that are born to grow up and increase our population, and thus contribute to the health and wealth of the country. I hope that the administration of the provisions of the Bill relating to the supply of milk and other foods will make it possible for us to have a more rapid increase in our population than we have had in Queensland and Australia during recent years. Now I wish to say a word or two about the penalties proposed in this measure. I hold that the penalties are not any too heavy. While some of them are no doubt severe, they are not too severe for persons who engage in a process of slow murder, which results in infant mortality and deteriorates the strength of the adult population. Men who do that kind of thing are worse than the man who kills another straight off in a moment of passion. These men act deliber-

ately in order to get gain, and it is through greed that they do this thing. They grow wealthy on it, and are regarded as respectable men in society, while the man who in a moment of passion sends another into eternity is dealt with in a very much severer way. I am not going to labour the subject any further. I just wish to add that, while I think that legislation of this character is one of the best ways of promoting the health and wealth of the community, and while I congratulate the Home Secretary on having the chance of introducing such a measure, I am of opinion that there are other things which ought to be done to help in that direction. We should give our workmen short hours of labour, good food, good conditions, and plenty of leisure, if we would produce a healthy, happy, prosperous, and contented community. One more quotation I shall make from the article already cited—

"Practically the same vigilance is applied to other food and drink stuffs—meat, fruit, fish, ice cream, sweets, beer, whisky, and even Judkin's lemonade. The municipal policemen are always on the beat. No warning is given. The regulations and the date when they will come into operation are notified, and that is all. The man who has bought a pound of sausages may be an inspector for all the butcher knows. Slaughter-houses, butchers' shops and carts, produce markets and cold stores, ice cream carts, hotels, jam and sauce factories, restaurants, grocers' shops, fruit shops—the inspectors go to all these places and more, fossicking after impurities in the people's food, buying samples and taking them to laboratories.

"The picture is not all drab. There are bright patches. On the whole, the campaign has not been extensively resisted. The county board showed it meant business, and, if necessary, fight; and, after inspecting its powers, the vendor of foods and drinks mostly saw that for the future it would pay him to go straight, just as in the past it may have paid him to go crooked. Take a few of the analyses, and the tale need not be adorned. The adulteration of milk is becoming very rare. Last year no bad marks could be found against butter, sweets, spirits, and glucose. Of fourteen specimens of olive oil only one gave evidence of interference. The county board has conquered, and is still conquering; and its record is beckoning other cities to come along the same road."

I am glad that the Home Secretary has been in communication with some of those South Australian men who are exerting an influence in this matter, and I am pleased to note that the influence of the Labour party in that State is spreading throughout the Commonwealth a desire for pure food, showing that they are actuated by a wish to better the conditions of humanity in every respect. If I have in any way transgressed the rules of the House in the remarks I have made, I have done so unconsciously, and I regret it very much. I hope the Bill will pass—of course we know that it will pass—and I trust in Committee we will be able to make it one of the best measures of the kind in the Commonwealth.

Mr. BOOKER (*Maryborough*): I wish to touch upon one section of the Bill only this evening. I was pleased to hear the compliments paid to the Home Secretary for having introduced the Bill, as I think he deserves the thanks of the House and the country for bringing it before the House, as it means so much to the people of Queensland. It is very pleasant to hear members on the other side of the House pay their tributes of praise to the Minister. I desire to pay a tribute to the hon. member for *Carpentaria*, who I

Mr. Booker.]

assume was put up by hon. members opposite to speak upon this measure, seeing that he knows so much about it. I listened with pleasure to his remarks, and I must say that they were very instructive. The part of the Bill that I wish to refer to this evening is clause 14. I hope in all sincerity that the Minister will see his way to accept an amendment on that clause when we go into Committee on the Bill—an amendment dealing with the portion of the clause which relates to the proprietary formulæ of chemists. In Great Britain the profession of chemist is on the same plane as that of the medical practitioner. The chemist is a highly cultured man who devotes his life to his profession, and I say unreservedly that chemists are often in a better position to formulate some healing medicine than the average medical practitioner, and it would be a very great injustice to force those men to have their formulæ stated on their packets or bottles. I shall read two letters which I have received on this subject. One is from a chemist who for eighteen years has practised in a country town where for many years there was no medical practitioner, and who will feel the pinch of that provision in clause 14. He says—

“Permit me to draw your attention to section 14 of the Health Act Amendment Bill, which, if passed, will be a serious menace to every chemist in the State. Under the provisions of this Bill every chemist will be compelled to divulge the composition of any proprietary article he makes up and give the formula of every mixture prescribed. I need only mention this to you for you to see that my formulæ are my private property and part of my stock in trade, and if the good or health of the public is the chief consideration of the Bill, there is no reason why an exemption should be granted to articles prescribed by medical men.”

The hon. member for Carpentaria dealt rather well with that aspect of the case, and I hope that the Minister will see his way to accept the suggestion of the hon. member. The next letter deals with the matter in this way—

“I am, along with my brother chemists, much exercised by the Health Act Amendment Bill, now before the House. If this Act is passed it means that all my proprietary preparations, which are the result of years of study, will have to have their formulæ printed on the package or bottle. These are valuable assets of my business, and it would be a monstrous injustice to us if the Bill passed.”

As I said previously, any Bill submitted to this House should carry with it no unnecessary injustice, and I think in connection with clause 56, if the Minister can see his way to deal with this clause in the direction indicated by the hon. member for Carpentaria, it will guard against committing any injustice, and will not in any sense whatever damage the health of the people of Queensland. Where a chemist passes his examination and receives his diploma he shows that he is qualified to deal with prescriptions, and the very fact of the board having confidence in him to give him a diploma should be an indication that he is a fit and proper person to make up proprietary medicines. That is all I have to say, and I hope the Minister will fall into line with the suggestion of the hon. member for Carpentaria.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*): I wish to say a few words on the second reading of the Bill. We find here the opponents of

[*Mr Booker.*

progress, most particularly those who are opposed to the Labour party, saying that you cannot improve the people by legislation. This is a Bill which, if it is improved in Committee—which it will be if the Minister will accept the amendments foreshadowed from this side—will improve, not only the morals of the people, but the health of the people. I hope those who are making special pleading for those who may be hurt will take into consideration that we are legislating for the whole of the people, we are going to improve the people, and it may be unfortunately at the expense of a few. I welcome the Bill. When I first spoke in the House, I impressed on the Minister of the day to bring legislation up to date with regard to pure food and drugs. We must be more particularly in the forefront of all sanitary legislation because we are in a tropical country. I say this feelingly, because I represent a constituency in the more Northern part of the State, where it is more necessary for us to have an Act such as this. I ask, on behalf of the Northern section of the State, that an analytical chemist be appointed in Townsville, so that opportunity will be afforded for analyses to be made of food or milk, because it is in many cases impossible for us in the North to get any assistance from a State department in Brisbane. I hope that an honest effort will be made to put down the mosquito pest. We should thank those medical gentlemen who gave such a fine exposition a few weeks ago on the need for the suppression of the mosquito. I think myself that if this is taken in hand in a proper manner we will get a great benefit from it. I thoroughly agree with the Bill where it gives powers to the Commissioner for Health to take over matters such as sewerage or sanitary work for the better health of the people in any town or local authority, if those local authorities do not do their duty. I know that our local authorities undoubtedly represent the property owners, who in many cases resent any great expense in the direction of proper sanitary conditions. That is a good clause in the Bill. I am sure that this measure will get every assistance from this side to make it a better Bill than it is as presented to us by the Home Secretary.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): It is not my intention to-night to make a long second reading speech on this Bill, but I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to one clause which is very important so far as districts situated a long way from any town where a qualified medical practitioner may be practising—that is clause 33, referring to midwifery nurses. It gives certain qualifications that a woman must possess in order to be able to practise as a midwife. Four qualifications are set out. I think that if any one of those qualifications were possessed it would be sufficient. We who represent districts far away from towns where doctors reside know that there are women practising who are qualified in every respect; they have proved themselves capable of dealing with cases of this sort and have been very successful, yet they are not able to pass examinations as required by this clause. It would be inflicting a serious hardship on the people in these districts if these women were prevented from practising. I hope the Home Secretary will give this clause particular attention, and when the Bill gets into Committee, try to see if he

cannot make the qualification easier, or provide that any one of them only is necessary in order that a woman who is already practising as a midwife may become a registered midwife.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*): The Home Secretary told us that it was necessary to take power out of the hands of the local authorities, as there are so many divisions, and that is provided by giving the Commissioner more power. In my opinion it would be better if a good many of the things which the Bill regulates were taken over by the Federal Parliament. There are a good many items in this Bill that are manufactured in places outside Queensland, and the result will be that you will want different labels for every State in the Commonwealth. That is one reason why I regret that the Federal Parliament did not get the power they recently asked for of dealing more effectively with the adulteration of foods generally. Of course the State Parliament can do its little bit, but I think the Federal Parliament could do it much better. I think the Minister should be prepared to accept reasonable amendments and suggestions from this side when the Bill goes into Committee. It is practically a Committee Bill. In connection with this matter I might mention that if the Minister in charge of the Health Bill of 1900 had taken the suggestions which were offered from this side at that time, there would be no need to amend the Health Act in two or three directions in which it is proposed to do it to-night. The interpretation of "sewer" was fully debated when the Act of 1900 was going through the House, and the definition which the Minister is taking out of the present Health Act was practically an amendment moved by Mr. Stephens, the then member for South Brisbane, and included in the Bill—although it was opposed by members on this side—that is, making an open channel a sewer. It is here exempted in the new interpretation. That is a reason why the Government should be more attentive to suggestions made from the Opposition side of the House.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows that I have always considered every reasonable suggestion.

Mr. RYLAND: I give the hon. gentleman credit for that. I remember that he gave us some show last session in connection with the Mining Bill, but not to the extent which was necessary, and he would have had a better Bill if he had taken more of our suggestions. (Hear, hear!) In support of this I will just quote what did happen when that Act was going through in 1900. It is eleven years ago, and now I am pleased to congratulate the Minister, even after the expiration of eleven years, in coming forward and practically putting a measure before this House that I advocated in 1900.

"Mr. STEPHENS moved the insertion after the word "applies," on line 28, of the words "also water channels constructed of stone, brick, or concrete, the property of a local authority."

That is, that this would be a "sewer" under the interpretation of the Health Act.

"Mr. RYLAND said that a water channel was a channel running alongside the street; a sewer was generally understood to be a big drain carrying away the sewage of a town. If the definition said that a water channel was a sewer, how would it apply as regards municipal-

palities and towns? If the amendment was accepted, it would make a great change in the local government law as regards water channels and sewers. In looking over the Bill he found that the local authorities had to make sewers, and the householders had to make drains to connect with those sewers. If a water channel was made a sewer under the Bill, the householder would simply have to connect his drain with the water channel at the edge of the footpath."

That is just the difficulty that has come along. Again, my colleague at that time, Mr. Fisher, said—

"It had also been ruled from the bench that it was sufficient for a property holder to run matter into one of those open channels, and it was the duty of the local authority to take it away; so if both those decisions were good people could simply let their sewage go into the water channels, and the position would be worse than ever."

That is just the position that the local authorities and the Health Commissioner find themselves in as regards making an open channel a sewer. It has practically polluted the town. They run all their sewage right out in the channel because of their interpretation under Mr. Stephens's amendment. If the Government of the day had assisted us to resist the amendment, there would have been no need to amend the Act in this direction. All the pollution that the local authorities have suffered for these eleven years would have been prevented. I will not mention the filth that has been brought about in that town. I have seen towns in the most filthy circumstances simply because of that interpretation of the word "sewer."

The HOME SECRETARY: You see that Minister was not a State socialist like I am. That accounts for it. (Laughter.)

Mr. RYLAND: The amendment was put in by 34 to 16, and the Labour vote was against having an open channel a sewer.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is not the whole matter the hon. member is now dealing with one for the Committee stages of the Bill?

Mr. RYLAND: This is a big principle in connection with the Bill.

The HOME SECRETARY: It has been a most fruitful source of infection.

Mr. RYLAND: I just simply point out how small matters lead to great ends, and the insertion of that very word caused a lot of sickness and pollution right throughout the State. Another thing in connection with this principle of local government, and it also came up at that particular time, and I am pleased to see that the Bill is going to deal with it.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is the sectional drain.

Mr. RYLAND: There is another clause in the Bill which gives the Governor in Council power, when there is no sewer, to otherwise deal with waste waters. When that was going through at that particular time I moved an amendment as follows:—

"Or the local authority may require the drainage of such house to be otherwise disposed of as it directs."

That would have given the local authorities power, where there was no proper drainage system and where there was not a proper sanitary system, to see that the waste water in connection with houses should be otherwise dealt with. The local authorities had

[*Mr. Ryland.*]

not that power and consequently they could not use it. That caused a lot of refuse matter being left about houses that could otherwise have been disposed of. Let me say here that one of the best ways to dispose of waste water about a house is to have a piece of cultivation and plant fruit-trees and use it in that way. That is one of the least expensive ways of disposing of waste water, such as slop water.

The HOME SECRETARY: It increases the production of the fruit trees too.

Mr. RYLAND: If you let the water run without a channel it practically pollutes the whole area. I will just quote from Dr. Parkes, who, in his work on "Practical Sanitation," said—

"Sewage when brought in contact with land in a fresh state is immediately attacked by the minute living germs (bacteria) universally present in the upper strata, and by these its organic matter is split up into various simple constituents, which, with the assistance of the oxygen and carbonic acid gas present in the ground air, unite with certain mineral bases present in the soil, and thus are transformed from organic unstable compounds, liable to putrefactive changes, into more fixed inorganic salts of an innocent nature."

If the Minister of the day had accepted that amendment the local authorities would have been able to dispose of waste water in an inexpensive way and it would practically have been harmless.

The HOME SECRETARY: Sir Wm. MacGregor recommended that to the local authorities the other day. It is really a system of septic tanks.

Mr. RYLAND: Clause 8 of the Bill repeals twenty-seven sections of the principal Act, and it is necessary that we should have time to compare those sections and see what is left out and what is put in. It is very necessary we should know that before we pass the Bill. I also notice in clause 59 the word "pauper" is used as regards patients in our hospitals. I do not think that word should be used, as there is no necessity for it. It is dealing with infectious diseases.

The HOME SECRETARY: If the hon. member suggests any other word that signifies the same thing, I have no objection to alter it.

Mr. RYLAND: In the case of a person suffering from a disease like that I think the whole community should pay.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: It is for the benefit of the public.

Mr. RYLAND: It is for the public good, and he is practically a victim, as it were, in connection with the matter. If a person wanted a special department or a special ward it would be only fair that he should pay.

The HOME SECRETARY: Those who can pay generally do.

Mr. RYLAND: The usual attendance they get under circumstances like that I believe should be absolutely free. I believe we should provide for the sick and afflicted as we provide for the young and the old at the present time. I think if the Minister would accept an amendment in that direction it would improve the Bill. It would be moving on humane lines and it would be moving in the direction of the trend of public thought of the day. With regard to the clause dealing with the killing of rats and vermin and things of that class that

are likely to spread disease, I might say that I believe nothing is a greater carrier of disease than the mosquito. I know a lot of people do not take that seriously.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a fact. It is established.

Mr. RYLAND: I have reason to believe that it is, and I also believe that it is a fairly easy thing, if taken up by the proper authorities, to do away with the mosquito. Even at Gympie, I myself always put a little kerosene on the water tank, and I also put kerosene in the tanks of fifteen or sixteen houses round about my neighbourhood and none of them object, and we are practically without a mosquito, when [8.30 p.m.] that is done, and if it is not done there is a swarm of mosquitos in the afternoon. The mosquito does not travel very far and it is very easy to keep it down so long as you do not leave water lying about the garden. I believe that in the case of such local authorities as Ipswich and Toowoomba the work could be done by one man, using kerosene, in such a way that after a time there would not be a mosquito in the whole area; and I believe that if we had no mosquitoes we should have no dengue or malaria.

Mr. MURPHY: Up North the Government won't give the poor prisoners a mosquito net.

Mr. RYLAND: If we do away with the mosquito, there will be no necessity for mosquito nets. We know that when the Government of the United States undertook the great work of the Panama Canal, the first thing that had to be done was to get rid of the mosquito; and there is one paragraph in this pamphlet by Dr. Jackson which I will read in order that it may get into *Hansard*, and be read by the fireside in the Western country.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are there any mosquitoes there?

Mr. RYLAND: There are some, but not as many as there are near the coast. This is what Dr. Jackson says—

"Malaria, on the other hand, can be practically eradicated in any district where the destruction of mosquitoes is successfully undertaken. It has been done in any number of places elsewhere. It can be done in North Queensland, for instance, and would make an enormous difference not only in the ability of settlers to develop the country, but in the readiness with which white people would be persuaded to undertake residence and work in our tropical latitudes. It would contribute to hasten settlement.

"Dengue would probably be eradicated in a few seasons. This is what E. H. Ross says, writing on the Prevention of Dengue in the *Annals of Tropical Medicine*: In Port Said a vigorous campaign against mosquitoes had been begun. "After two years mosquitoes have become so rare that they can be ignored. Dengue fever has disappeared also, no case having been treated in Port Said since July, 1906. In the early part of that year, before the mosquito work was begun, dengue fever made its appearance as usual. In September, 1906, a severe epidemic raged throughout Egypt, beginning at Assouan and running rife in Cairo and Alexandria. It appeared in all other towns, except Port Said and Ismailia (mosquito destruction was begun in Ismailia in 1902), which remained free from it, no case occurring in either place.

"During the autumn of 1907 it again passed through Cairo and other parts of Egypt, but

[Mr. Ryland.]

again Ismailia and Port Said escaped." Dengue, it would appear, therefore, can be both prevented and eradicated."

When this is placed on the statute book, I hope the Minister will see that it is administered; and if the local authorities do not do their duty in the matter, I hope the Government will administer it with the view of preventing dengue and other diseases which are carried by the mosquito.

The HOME SECRETARY: This Bill provides for that.

Mr. RYLAND: Will this clause give the authority? It simply refers to insect life.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is out of order in asking a question of the Home Secretary, and the Home Secretary is equally out of order in answering him.

Mr. RYLAND: I will not detain the House any longer. I will not speak on that part of the Bill relating to the adulteration of food, as that matter was gone into fully and ably by the hon. member for Carpentaria. We know that in Australia—in Queensland to a limited extent—there is adulteration. Things are made to sell, and not to use; and until we produce for use and not for sale, the practice will continue. Fruits are plentiful enough in Australia, but it has been proved that even jams are adulterated. At one jam factory—I do not suppose anything like it would be done in Queensland—I believe it was in one of the Southern States—large consignments of strawberry jam used to go out, but no strawberries were ever seen to go in, though tons of pumpkins and bags of hayseed went into the factory. When this Bill becomes law I hope the Minister will see that it is administered as it should be; and if that is done it will be a good thing for the people of Queensland. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I have no intention of taking up much time on the second reading, because this Bill is essentially one for the Committee stage. One drawback in most of our legislation is that it is made to apply to certain parts of the State, while other parts are exempt. That is irritating in some instances; and it may be that people for whom legislation is intended do not get the benefit; also that it applies in places where there is less need, while it does not apply where there is more need.

The HOME SECRETARY: How does the hon. member come to that conclusion?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The Factories and Shops Act, for instance, does not apply to the whole of Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: It can be proclaimed in every part of the State.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: It can, but as a matter of fact it is not so proclaimed; and it does not apply to places where it is not proclaimed.

The HOME SECRETARY: This Bill is going to apply to the whole of the State.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That is a great protection. There is some legislation on the statute-book at the present time that is not administered; and, as has been pointed out over and over again, a great deal more depends on administration than legislation. A poor Act well administered will be more effective than a good Act not administered. The safety of the people is the supreme law;

and there is a great deal of improvement as far as the health, food, and sanitation of the people are concerned. It has been said that whatever injures health injures wealth, and whatever injures wealth injures the commonwealth, and whatever injures the commonwealth should be interfered with. Adulteration in its broad and general sense is part and parcel of the system under which we live; it is part and parcel of the competitive system under which we are trying to live and are supposed to live. John Bright on one occasion said in the British House of Commons that adulteration was a part of the competitive system, and argued that he was perfectly justified in using dressing in the manufacture of calico in order to compete with other people in the same trade.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: When did John Bright say that?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He said it in the British House of Commons—there is no question about it. It is a matter of everyday experience, in addition to having been said by him, that when prices are so low that they cannot go lower, people go in for adulteration and substitutes. There is a great deal of room for improved legislation in this direction. For a long time our local authorities have had great difficulty in administering the law because of a bad definition in the provisions of the Health Act. People have been able to do abominable things and could not be convicted because of defective definitions; and I am glad that steps have been taken to make it impossible for people to turn offensive matter into the streets without suffering a penalty. In connection with our hospitals, I may say that there is no class in the community doing a nobler work than the nurses; but there are nurses outside the hospitals, and it is essential that they should be well trained and know their business. There have been cases where the nurse, though perhaps not the carrier of typhoid, has been the carrier of other kinds of fever from one patient to another. I know of one instance where a nurse took puerperal fever to six patients one after another, and every one of them died; and it was only after the matter was investigated that it was found to be the result of ignorance on the part of this one individual. So, while it is necessary to have nurses, it is essential that they should know their business, and that they should be able properly to carry out the duties by which they make their living. Reference has been made to the food that we eat, and particularly to the meat supplied to the public, and I find that under one clause of this Bill that matter can be dealt with. I think the time has arrived when steps should be taken to see that all meat sold—not only that which is exported, but also that which is consumed locally—is killed and dressed under proper conditions, and that it is of the best quality.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is the same rigid inspection of meat killed for home consumption as of meat exported.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: There cannot be the same inspection, because the meat killed for export is killed in a large factory, where an inspector can see that no diseased beast is put on the food market and that all beasts are killed and dressed under proper conditions, whereas in many of the towns in Queensland slaughter-yards are scattered round the town at such distances from one another that it is impossible for an inspector to give proper attention to all of them.

Mr. Winstanley.]

In some instances the slaughter-yards are from 6 to 10 miles apart, and therefore no one inspector can supervise the killing and dressing of beasts in all those yards as he ought to supervise that work. I have been told by people who have been on the spot and seen what has taken place, that when a diseased beast is killed and dressed, the diseased part is put away before the inspector can get there.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is an inspector in every large centre of population.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I repeat that no one inspector can inspect those slaughter yards as they ought to be inspected, and see that beasts are killed under proper conditions. I am aware that this matter is in the hands of the local authorities, but they do not deal with it in an efficient manner, and I suppose that as long as they are clefted on the present franchise they will do no better. But if they do not take steps to perform this duty properly, I think the Government should take the matter in hand, and see that abattoirs are erected in one place where all the meat for the district or town can be killed under proper supervision. That would be infinitely better for the butchers as well as for the public than the present system. At any rate such a change might be brought about in large centres of population. With regard to chemists having to place their formulæ of the stuff they sell on the bottles or packets containing the drugs, I notice that there is a distinction drawn between chemists and medical practitioners. Some medical practitioners make up their own prescriptions, but under this measure they will not be required to put the formula on the packet or bottle. If it is a good thing to require a chemist who makes up a prescription to state what are the contents of the mixture, then it is a good thing that the medical practitioner should do the same thing—what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. With reference to the sale of milk, I notice that where there is a diseased cow in a dairy herd, the owner of that cow is prohibited from selling the milk for human consumption as milk, but as far as I can see there is nothing to prevent him using that milk for making butter, or cheese, or any other product. I think some alteration of the provision is required to deal with the matter, so as to prevent the milk from such an animal being used in any form for human consumption. There is also a provision dealing with the quality and weight of bread, in which I think some amendment is necessary. There is no doubt that for many years past the public have been robbed through bread being light weight as well as adulterated, and I think it is time that measures were taken, not only to insure that bakers have scales in their shops, but also to insure that they have them on their carts, because for one loaf sold in a shop thousands are sold from the carts. With regard to the provision dealing with clothing, there is room for a good deal of improvement in that matter. Some time ago I read a statement to the effect that the woollen manufacturers of Australia used in one year 30,000 lb. of cotton, which is evidence that cloths which were supposed to be pure woollens were nothing of the kind. As a matter of fact, we know that our woollen goods are to a

[Mr. Winstanley.

greater or lesser extent adulterated, and we should endeavour in this measure to deal with that matter. There is one part of the Bill which seems to me to be a departure from what we regard as the principle of British justice. In one or two matters, when action is taken against a man the onus of proving that he is not guilty is thrown on the person accused. I have always been given to understand that under British law a man is considered innocent until he is proved guilty, but under this new procedure a man will be considered guilty until he proves that he is innocent. That does not appear to me to be a fair or reasonable proposal. There is one matter that is not dealt with in this Bill, and that is the sale of poisons, but which I think should be dealt with in it, unless the Government are going to introduce an amendment of the Poisons Act. At the present time if a man goes to a chemist and asks for poison, he is asked a number of questions, as, for instance, what purpose does he require it for, and where is he going to use it, and then he has to sign a receipt book for the poison purchased. It is a very good thing to take those precautions. But we know that there are other places besides a chemist's shop where people can buy certain poisons, and buy it by the hundredweight, without any questions being asked or any precautions taken. I hope that the Poisons Act will be administered better than it is at the present time, or that some change will be made in the law so as to deal with this matter more effectively. I was pleased to hear that the Home Secretary is prepared to make a change as far as the word "pauper" is concerned, because I think it is rather a blot on the Bill, and a blot on his idea of democracy, to treat a man as a "pauper" because he has to go to a hospital for the treatment of infectious diseases. It has been the practice in most communities to burn the clothing and bedding of persons who have died from typhoid, or tuberculosis, or other infectious disease, and to disinfect the dwelling in which he had lived, in order to prevent the spread of contagion. That is a very good thing, but it is a hardship to some persons to be compelled to pay for having that work done after the funeral has taken place. I think the charge in such cases might very well be borne by the whole community. I have known some cases of real hardship, where people after they have buried their dead, had their clothes burnt, and their premises disinfected by the ambulance brigade or other public officers, and have then been supplied with a bill for £2 2s. or £2 10s. That charge might very well be abolished, and the expense defrayed from some other source. There are quite a number of amendments that might be made in the Bill, and that will probably be suggested when we go into Committee. I was glad to hear the Home Secretary say that he will accept any reasonable amendment, and I hope he will be as good as his word.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is amendments which will improve the Bill.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: There is plenty of room to make the Bill better without doing anything which will make it worse, and I hope it will be remembered that any amendments proposed by members on this side of the House will be proposed with the idea of making the Bill a better Bill for the people of Queensland.

Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*): I desire to say a few words on the second reading of this Bill, and in saying those few words I do not desire to touch upon anything which should properly be dealt with in Committee. In casting my eye over the provisions of the Bill there is one thing which has struck me, and that is that the protection given to the health of the people under the provisions of this Bill is not co-extensive with the protection given by the Commonwealth Parliament with regard to the importation of goods. It is not so many months ago since we heard from Cape York to Point Danger the question discussed as to whether we should allow the power to deal with the purity of food to be given to the Commonwealth. It was pointed out at public meetings throughout Queensland that a great anomaly arose from the fact that the Commonwealth Government had the power to prohibit the importation of goods, except on certain conditions, but that it ended when the goods were landed. Immediately the goods were landed the restrictions and prohibitions were removed, and the goods could reach the consumer without fulfilling the conditions imposed by the Commonwealth. This Bill does not remedy that state of things. The arguments used on the occasion to which I refer went to show that in the case of food and clothing certain conditions had to be complied with before the goods passed the Customs office, and that compliance with those conditions ceased as soon as the goods were landed. This Bill does not propose to deal with clothing. The hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Winstanley, very properly pointed out that there should be some provision to deal with that matter. But the Government have shelved that, and have confined the Bill to food and drugs. If this Health Act Amendment Bill becomes law we shall have this very striking position: that under the Commonwealth Customs Act certain goods will be prohibited from importation unconditionally, but that after they are imported they can be sold in Queensland. Surely the Government should endeavour to make this Bill fit in as a corollary to the Commonwealth legislation. Now, I will give an example. Section 52 of the Commonwealth Customs Act of 1901 pro-

[9 p.m.] vides that certain things shall be prohibited imports, and amongst other things in subclause (f) it lays down that—

“oleo-margarine, butterine, or any other similar substitute for butter, unless coloured and branded as prescribed, cannot be landed in Australia unless coloured or branded as prescribed.”

But it can be sold to the consumer without being coloured and branded as prescribed.

The PREMIER: That is not so. There is a clause in the Margarine Bill passed last year to deal with that.

Mr. RYAN: Then it is laid down in subclause (h) of section 52 of the Customs Act—

“All goods having thereon or therewith any false suggestion of any warranty, guarantee, or concern in the production or quality thereof by any persons, public officials, Government, or country.”

The HOME SECRETARY: They must be described and sold for what they are.

Mr. RYAN: The Bill says that there shall be no false description, but they may not have any description. All that is laid down in the Bill is that there shall not be

any false description. You can put oleo-margarine out for sale without having any description on it at all. You are not allowed to import it unless it is properly branded, but you can sell it for consumption without that description.

The HOME SECRETARY: Does this Act not provide for that?

Mr. RYAN: No. Then section 56 of the Customs Act provides—

“The power of prohibiting importation of goods shall authorise prohibition subject to any specified condition or restriction, and goods imported contrary to any such condition or restriction shall be prohibited imports.”

This Bill should have in it a sweeping clause under clause 9 dealing with what is adulterated or falsely described, because it should cover what are prohibited imports under the Customs Act of 1901, or which are made prohibited imports under the power of proclamation contained in section 56 of the Customs Act, but the Government do not seem prepared to do that. This Bill only deals with food, but the Customs Act deals with clothing as well. We know that it is laid down again and again that clothing imported into Australia must be properly described. You must say whether it is all wool, whether cotton and wool mixed, or whatever it is. Is there any such prescription here? It may be easily included in this Bill, so that people should know what they are buying, and at least the same description should be given to the buyer as has to be passed by the Customs officer when the goods are landed here.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is the hon. member referring to food now?

Mr. RYAN: Yes; I am referring to food, to both food and clothing.

The HOME SECRETARY: The necessary provision is contained in this Act with regard to food.

Mr. RYAN: I say it is not.

The HOME SECRETARY: I say it is. You think you know all about it.

Mr. RYAN: I do not care what the Home Secretary says. I know it is not.

The HOME SECRETARY: I say it is. (Laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: The mere fact that the hon. gentleman says it is does not make any difference to me. I say that it is not.

The HOME SECRETARY: The mere fact that the hon. gentleman says it is not does not make any difference to me, and I say it is. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the hon. member for Barcoo will be allowed to proceed with his speech without interruption. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. HAMILTON: The Home Secretary is very disorderly.

Mr. RYAN: Those quotations which I give will show that the two Acts are not co-extensive. It was argued during the recent referendum campaign that only one legislative body should have power to deal with these things, and that was the legislative body that had the power to deal with imported goods, and they would be able to see that these goods when landed were given to the consumer having the stamp on them and subject to the same conditions as they were when landed on the shores of Australia. From the sections I have quoted it will be clear to anyone who has the patience

Mr. Ryan.]

and industry to study the question. I hope it will come up again in Committee. I will find instances myself to convince the Home Secretary that this Bill is not co-extensive with the Customs Act, that there is the anomaly of having two legislative bodies dealing with the same subject and dealing with it in such a way that one does not fit in as the complement of the other. The Government, if they have any desire to make the necessary amendment and make the Bill a complement of the Commonwealth Customs Act and the proclamations passed thereon—we will find that they will not do it—but if the Home Secretary is sincere when he says that this Bill covers the ground—and I think he is mistaken in his sincerity—then we will have no difficulty whatever in getting in the amendment which I suggest.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Commonwealth representative was present at the conference upon which this Bill was founded.

Mr. RYAN: That makes no difference to my argument. I am speaking of the Commonwealth Government, not of a representative, and of the Commonwealth Government's Acts, and I say that the anomaly exists now that goods in order to be landed in Queensland have to pass certain conditions and are subject to certain restrictions which the moment they are landed can be done away with, and they can get to the consumer on different conditions, and this Act will not cover it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I say it does.

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, Oxley): Will the hon. gentleman permit me to remind him that last year we passed a Margarine Bill which contained most strenuous provisions, so that it will not be possible for margarine to be passed out as other than what it is.

Mr. RYAN: There are other things besides margarine. I just mentioned that as one example.

The PREMIER: But it could not possibly happen with margarine, and that was one of the articles the hon. gentleman mentioned. No one will be permitted to manufacture margarine unless he is licensed.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: There are other things.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Barcoo referred to the fact that this Bill was incomplete inasmuch as the article of margarine might be passed into consumption without being properly described, and I am pointing out that there is on our statute-book an Act which provides that a person must be licensed to manufacture margarine, he must be licensed to sell it, and he must mix with it certain articles so that it cannot be palmed off as butter. Then it is unlawful to colour the compound with any ingredient to imitate butter.

Mr. FOLEY: How would you deal with margarine brought into the State?

The PREMIER: A man must be licensed to sell it, and he cannot sell it unless he complies with our statutory law. Our statutes are complete in dealing with the sale of that article.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: What about textiles?

The PREMIER: Once textiles are imported and having got into the hands of the retailer, there is no means of dealing with

it and finding out if it is a mixture of cotton and silk. But this Bill is not dealing with textile goods.

Mr. MULLAN: It is a Health Act.

The PREMIER: It is. Even if you desire to follow it, I do not know how you could manage with a piece of woollen goods sold by the yard. Are you going to have it stamped at every yard or two? However, that is entirely apart from the measure. I merely call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that so far as margarine is concerned it is inapplicable. I would like to take this opportunity to correct some slight misapprehension that may arise from the remarks made by the hon. member for Carpentaria in respect to our meat products. The meat products which go into consumption in the cities and larger towns are under careful supervision and inspection.

Mr. NEVITT: By the State.

The PREMIER: By the State. May I tell the House that from the very date that Queensland undertook the inspection of meat right up to the time when the interested people in the trade in England made a fuss about nodule, there was never any rejection of Queensland meat. (Hear, hear!) Queensland meat was exported and accepted at home, and never on one occasion were they able to point to any defects in it. The hon. member was referring to the export and to the local trade; he indicated that the export trade was under such control that only satisfactory meat was exported, and wished to claim some credit for the Commonwealth in that regard, but the only point that they have interested themselves in is the nodule. Now, nodules were in Queensland for many long years, and nobody yet has said that nodules are injurious to the meat. The question was raised in, perhaps, as disreputable a paper as there is in the old country—*John Bull*—the proprietor of which is, I believe, at the present time in gaol, and it was through this disreputable paper, which is ordinarily said to be in the control and pay of the meat trusts of America, that the question of nodules was raised.

Mr. FERRICKS: You had no scruples about quoting *John Bull* regarding the sugar strike. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: I did not catch the interjection. I say that our Queensland meat has always been accepted in the old country as up to standard, and no Act of the Commonwealth has improved our position there.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What do you keep here?

The PREMIER: The meat exposed for sale in Brisbane and large cities is absolutely sound, and guaranteed to be sound. To begin with, our inspectors are at the yards, and if they suspect any animal they note where it is going to, and they are not allowed to handle that beast in any way until the inspector is satisfied. It is quite true that the large meat purveyors in Brisbane pass to the public meat that is certified to by a veterinary surgeon as being absolutely sound. The public of Queensland are protected in their meat products; meat does not come under this Bill at all—we have a Slaughtering Act which deals with that effectually. I dare say if we could carry the extra charge of doubling or quadrupling the inspectors more effective work could be done, but I wish to correct the impression that in the city or in the large

[Mr. Ryan.]

towns the meat is not carefully or fully inspected. There is no need therefore to include meat here, seeing that it is dealt with under the Slaughtering Act. I can hardly conceive that it is necessary in a Bill of this sort to deal with textile manufactures, and I do not know that we could deal with them effectively.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You deal with leather.

The PREMIER: You deal with leather here, because it is a question of public health; they may introduce into the leather some chemicals that would be absorbed into the system through the warmth of the feet, and therefore be injurious. The scope of the Bill is to protect the public in their health, and to see that the food products they have are good.

Mr. MULLAN: Look at the number of people that are burnt to death with flannelette.

The PREMIER: We have not got control of imports. The Customs are under the control of the Commonwealth, and they can prohibit anything, and I believe they are very strict indeed as to what is admitted, but, having once been admitted, it can, of course, go on the market. In that the hon. member for Barcoo is quite correct; it is rather awkward mixing up textile fabrics with beef and also dairy products.

Mr. NEVITT: It is no more awkward than it is with boots.

The PREMIER: Except that I have shown that it is possible that chemicals used in the adulteration of leather may be absorbed into the system, and in that regard it is bad. We were particularly asked by the Commonwealth authorities to insert some such provision as this in the Bill that is going through the House, just the same as the Commonwealth asked us to make adequate provision in regard to olive oil. My idea of co-operation and co-ordination is that the State should work as closely and amicably as possible with the Commonwealth, and in framing this Bill we have done so, but it will not be wise for us to blend with a Pure Foods Bill or Health Act the method of how to follow a yard of cloth after once it had gone into the storekeeper's shop. Reference was made to the moisture in butter. The statute placed on the books some four or five years ago provided for 16 per cent. of moisture. More recently it has been decided that 15 per cent. is the correct moisture for butter—that is the maximum allowance in Australia, and the average will go to show that even less than that is the average moisture contained in our butter. I cannot understand how it is possible, except in a factory that is making up merely for town use, how it can be possible for them to prepare one class with 17, 18, or 19 per cent. of moisture, and another with 15 or 16 per cent., because most of our factories are in the country; indeed, with the exception of one or two they are all in the country, and the country manufacturer does not know the destination of his butter when he makes it; therefore he has to make it with not more than 15 per cent., otherwise it cannot go into consumption.

Mr. NEVITT: My information is from the managers of the factories.

The PREMIER: In Brisbane?

Mr. NEVITT: Partly in Brisbane and partly in the country.

The PREMIER: That explains it, because I am quite sure the hon. member does not want to mislead. The position is this—at factories in Beaudesert, or any other place,

when they are making up the butter, they anticipate that it may be exported, and therefore they know quite well it cannot pass unless it be 15 per cent., or a less degree, of moisture. The Brisbane manufacturer can put his stuff straight upon the market here, and take all this kind of risk, but it cannot be in regard to the general product. My notion is that the best quality of products is retained for local consumption. I would like any hon. member who likes to interest himself, to make a tour round the city to-morrow and ascertain for himself as to what are our favourite brands of butter on the market, and he will find that the favourite brands are of the highest quality, because the difference in price is so small that it pays better to have a higher grade article. The Bill is before the Chamber with the object of securing for our people the best that we can do for them in protecting them in their commodities, and I really think the hon. member for Barcoo is not quite correct in the insufficiency or inadequacy of the provision to protect from admixture and from palming off on the public something other than what it is intended; there have to be weights and descriptions on the article. If, however, there are defects in the Bill, then, as the Home Secretary has indicated, it is our hope and wish that hon. members will be able to point out those defects so that it will be as complete a measure as possible.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. M. HUNTER (*Maranoa*): I have no intention of delaying the passage of this Bill. I think that since we must have the Bill, the place to deal with it is in Committee. I am of opinion, however, that it is not a Bill that should come into this Chamber at all. That, I think, was fully discussed during the referendum campaign, and if there was one strong point made during that campaign, it was in reference to the necessity of powers being given to the Federal Government to deal with pure food and drugs and other matters that were distributed amongst the public. Not only is it highly essential that that is the form this Bill should take in the interests of the general public, but for the cheaper administration of the Act and a uniform method of dealing with the different subjects that are contained in the Bill. There is one phase of this question that has not been touched on. When the various health commissioners met in Sydney they discussed the measure that they were prepared to bring before the different Parliaments and try to arrive at some uniform standard which will be a guide for them in the various States, but those standards will probably be altered, and immediately an alteration takes place—the commissioners may agree among themselves, but when the measure is going through Parliament it may be altered, and the result will be if one State does not keep to the standard then the question of under-selling must take place, because there is nothing to stop the Southern States bringing in a lower standard of stuff into our State. Consequently there must be a loss of trade.

HON. R. PHILP: They must pass our standard.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: If our standard is lower, there is nothing to stop them. I believe one of the objects of the Bill is to deal with the boot trade. An inferior class of boot is being manufactured in the South, and is doing considerable injury to the boot trade in Queensland, and the same thing is

Mr. J. M. Hunter.]

being done with regard to the clothing trade. A cheap shoddy class of manufacture is being carried out in this State and sent to Sydney and to towns between here and there, and is being sold under the price of the better class of stuff manufactured by the Sydney houses.

HON. R. PHILP: What, woollen goods?

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: No, piece goods, but not made up to the same standard. There is not the same class of cut and finish put into them that is being done in the other places.

HON. R. PHILP: A lot more stuff comes from there than we send to Sydney.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The hon. member must know that is not a fact. The hon. member must know that New South Wales is taking a large quantity of our clothing, and we are taking a large quantity of boots made in the South.

HON. R. PHILP: We take more clothing from the South than we send there.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The hon. member must know we are sending a lot of clothing to New South Wales. The clothing we take from there is a better class of clothing.

HON. R. PHILP: It is cheaper.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The cheaper clothing is manufactured in Queensland.

HON. R. PHILP: No.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: When we have this dual control of articles of trade, and when there is a difference in the standard of the articles produced, then the local trade must be dislocated, and as a matter of fact it is being dislocated.

Mr. MURPHY: There is nothing to prevent the Federal Government introducing a Bill.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I understand there is something to prevent them introducing a Bill. As they have not done it, I shall be very glad indeed to see this Bill passed, because there is no question there is a great need for it. Anybody who knows anything about the class of foodstuffs that is being palmed off on the public must recognise the necessity for this Bill is very great indeed, but it will not be sufficient simply to pass the Bill. We have already an Act on our statute-books, were it administered as it should be administered, that would have prevented a great deal of the harm that is being done to the public, and the corruption that is taking place would have been prevented, but for some reason or other the Act has been allowed to remain a dead letter.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is incorrect. I pointed out just now that there is no provision made in our present Act providing for the prevention of adulteration. It has evanuated since the year that Act became law.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Adulteration is taking place, not only in foods but in drink stuffs, but there is no doubt of the power of the Government if they chose to use it.

The HOME SECRETARY: All the power has been exercised, and it has been found insufficient.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I should like very much to think that is the fact, but even though the Home Secretary repeats it, I must respectfully differ from him.

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course, if you know more than the experts of the department, I have nothing more to say.

{Mr. J. M. Hunter.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I do not profess to know more than the experts, but I do know that the inspection has not been as close, nor have prosecutions been as great, nor as often, as they might be. Even though the Act may not give all the power that is required, it gives greater power to the Administration than they have taken advantage of, and I hope, now that the Government are waking up to the necessity of getting the necessary power, when they get that power they will make use of it. There is one thing

in connection with this inspection, [9.30 p.m.] to my mind, which does not meet the case. I believe the right way to get at this adulteration is to get at the factories where the adulteration takes place, and insist upon those wholesale druggists and packers furnishing to the Health Department a list of the different things they pack and bottle, and the contents of same. An inspection should be regularly made at the factories, and if any goods are found not up to the standard, the whole box and dice should be confiscated, and the people lose their license.

The HOME SECRETARY: Full power is given for that under section 32.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: There is power to get at the retailer—some poor widow or someone in a back street who knows nothing about the contents of a package or a bottle when purchasing from a traveller, and sells it believing it to be a good article. I do not think those are the people the Government should trouble themselves about. I do not say that a casual inspection should not be made in their case; but I believe the right place to get at the trouble is the fountain head—the place where the goods are manufactured and packed. Packers of foods and bottlers of liquors and drugs or patent medicines should submit them to the Health Department, and have them passed as being up to a fixed standard before submitting them for sale.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is all provided for under section 32.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: It is rather an attempt to deal with the retailer and not the manufacturer.

The HOME SECRETARY: It says, "For the making, manufacture, sale, storage, delivery, or preparation for sale." What more can you want?

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: It seems to me that the responsibility is placed on the seller rather than on the manufacturer.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Hitherto that is the manner in which it has been dealt with. If the goods are not made they cannot be sold. Both seller and manufacturer should suffer a penalty; but a special attempt should be made to compel manufacturers to offer to the public nothing but goods up to a certain standard. We were told, by way of interjection, by the Minister for Agriculture that there was a perfect inspection of the beef going into consumption.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I said there was a good inspection of the meat going into consumption in the large centres of population.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: If the hon. gentleman means Brisbane, Townsville, and Rockhampton, that may be so; but there are centres of population where a great deal of

very inferior stock is being killed—where lumpsies are slaughtered and sold to the public. Butchers buy these lumpsies and diseased stock at low rates, and sell them to the public.

Mr. BOOKER: Where are the police?

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The duties of the police are so many that they are not able to give attention to all these numerous matters. They are overworked.

Mr. BOOKER: I agree with you in that.

The HOME SECRETARY: Does the hon. gentleman assert that the police are not doing their duty?

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I assert that the hon. gentleman is asking the police to do more than their duty, and more than they are able to do.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I could give an instance where an inspector of slaughter-houses was appointed, and for the first six or twelve months every butcher in the place lost five or six head of cattle during the month. The end of it was that he was shifted, and no inspector has been put there since.

Mr. BOOKER: State the case. That is a very serious charge.

The HOME SECRETARY: Give the case.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: It can be very quickly ascertained. It shows the difference between the inspection where there is an inspector of slaughter-houses and the inspection where it is supposed to be done by the police.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It shows that you make a statement you cannot stand up to.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You can't stand fire.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The hon. gentleman said the inspection was so good that I stated that case, and I will prove it to him in his office.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No. Prove it on the floor of the House.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: They can't stand fire.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I have no wish to delay the House. The only thing I regret is that the Bill, instead of being introduced in this Chamber, is not a Commonwealth measure, dealing not only with what we manufacture, but also with what is imported, which is of considerably greater amount. It is a great mistake not to have a measure dealing with imported goods, as well as those of local manufacture; it is not giving the local manufacturer a fair chance—not putting him on the same footing as the importer. For that reason it is regrettable to think that the Government have rushed in at the last moment with this Bill to meet a demand made at the last Federal referendum.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was on the programme.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I know it was on the programme last session, and the Government let it go by.

The HOME SECRETARY: Not at all. I explained the reason; we have an improved measure.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The hon. gentleman's explanation does not meet the matter. It would be much better for the Govern-

ment to admit that a measure such as this could be better administered by a central government having the standards equal in the different States, having a central control, and a uniform inspection.

The HOME SECRETARY: Your colleague, the hon. member for Rockhampton, commended the State Government of South Australia for their Act and the way it is carried out.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I hope that if this Bill is passed we may be able to commend its administration in Queensland. This Bill and the South Australian Act only supply the needs of two States; but we are concerned about the Commonwealth in matters of trade, and you cannot touch food, drugs, and clothing in one State without affecting another State in some shape or form. If our manufacturers are encouraged by our Health Act to put up a lower standard of goods than the New South Wales Act requires, they are put into the position that they cannot compete with the manufacturers in New South Wales. On the other hand, if New South Wales has a higher standard than we have, the people of that State cannot come in and trade with us, because we have a low standard, and consequently lower prices. Intercolonial freetrade cannot take place while we have different standards for textile fabrics and other goods in different States—we cannot have that interchange of goods which it was intended should take place at the time we agreed to federate. That is one of the strongest reasons which could be advanced in favour of placing the matters dealt with in this Bill under the control of the Federal Government instead of under the State Government. However, I am glad to see the Bill introduced because it is badly needed in Queensland, though I regret that we have not seen fit to put the matter in the hands of the Federal Government.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

The HOME SECRETARY: I move that the committal of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for to-morrow. I hope to have the report of the Health Commissioner in the hands of hon. members before the Bill is considered in Committee. (Hear, hear!)

Question put and passed.

STATE CHILDREN BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I feel rather pleased at having charge of this Bill, because I think it is a measure which will commend itself to the good sense of hon. members present. At this late hour I do not intend to make a long speech; neither is a long speech necessary, for it would be doing hon. members an injustice to say that there is any man in this House who is either hostile or indifferent to the little children who have no parents, or the children whose parents' influence is injurious to their future prospects. Therefore, there is no necessity for me to discuss the objects of the Bill, since those objects are not opposed by any section in the House. The Bill is a non-party Bill and a Committee Bill. I shall merely give a brief outline of the objects that we have in view in submitting the Bill. In passing, I may say that it is a fairly long cry from the time

Hon. K. M. Grant.]

when John Pound started, in 1839, to gather in the destitute children from the streets of Portsmouth and establish a Ragged Union School. He had to appeal to a rather indifferent crowd for support for his project. And when, many years later, Elizabeth Barret Browning wrote that heart-moving poem, "The Cry of the Children," it was to an indifferent crowd that she appealed. But now we may say that we have advanced in these matters—"the old order changeth, giving place to new"—(hear, hear!)—and we are not indifferent to any proposal or measure for the amelioration of the lot of any section of the community, more especially the helpless section of the community. Any measure of that kind appeals to any party, no matter what their shade of politics may be. This Bill is founded principally on the South Australian Act of 1895, as amended in 1909, and partly on the Western Australian Act of 1907. A conference was held in Adelaide in 1909, which was attended by representatives from all the States, and the representatives at that conference, after going into the matter very carefully, reported that it was desirable that all the States should pass a Bill founded on the South Australian Act. This Bill is really framed in accordance with the recommendations of that conference, and is, as I have said, based principally on the South Australian Act of 1895 as amended in 1909. It is a consolidation of the Industrial and Reformatory Schools Acts, 1865 to 1906, the Orphanages Act of 1879, an amendment of section 3 of the Children's Protection Act of 1896, an amendment of the Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opiums Acts, 1897 to 1901, of the Infant Life Protection Act of 1905, and the Children's Courts Act of 1907. The definitions, which are contained in clause 4, really embody most of the important alterations proposed in the existing law. If hon. members will turn to the definition of a "neglected child," they will see how far-reaching it is. At present the State Department can only take control of orphans or children who are semi-orphans. If members will peruse some of the descriptions in the definitions of a neglected child, they will see that under this Bill the Government are asking for power to take over the care and control, not only of those children who have no parents, but also of those who are in almost a worse position than orphans, inasmuch as they have parents who are injurious to their future prospects. The Government will be able to claim those children. They can bring the children before the court, and then after the case is decided they can adopt one of two or three different courses. They can put them into an industrial home, or put them out with foster-parents, or put them out with their own parents under probation, the Inspector of Orphanages paying periodical visits to the homes where they are boarded to see that they are well cared for.

Mr. MULLAN: It is to be hoped that you will blot out that part about convicting the child.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The hon. member will see that the procedure adopted at the present time of convicting the children, and getting the conviction removed by a minute of the Governor in Council, is done away with entirely. If hon. members will turn to clause 36, they will see that that is altered. I am

[Hon. K. M. Grant.]

sure that members must have noticed in the streets of Brisbane what is really a crying shame—that is, little children out at a late hour of the night going round and most persistently trying to sell flowers and button-holes. (Hear, hear!) And it is not only in the streets that they sell their flowers, but they also go into the bars of hotels, and the police cannot interfere with them.

Mr. HAMILTON: They sell newspapers, too.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Under this Bill the Orphanages Department can take action and have the child placed under proper care. (Hear, hear!) Under clause 5 there is provision for taking away from the orphanages the industrial section of the aboriginal stations and putting them under the care of the Protector of Aborigines. At the present time they are under the orphanages. Paragraph 4 of clause 5 provides for the alteration of children's courts. At the present time a child might be brought before the children's court and the parents notified when a trial is coming on. The alteration we now suggest is that the Orphanages Department also be notified, so that they come to the court, and if the child is convicted, the Orphanages Department can take entire charge of it. We cannot do that at present, as there is no provision to enable us to do so. Part II, deals with the State children department. This is a new department called "The State Children Department," instead of "The Orphanages Department." In South Australia the whole of the orphanage department is managed by twelve "Visitors." We do not propose to do that here, however. (Hear, hear!) I do not think it is at all desirable that outside people who are not responsible to the department or to Parliament should have the control of children. (Hear, hear!) Here we propose that the Director of Orphanages—that is the new title which the Inspector of Orphanages will assume—will have entire charge of them. (Hear, hear!) We do not follow South Australia in that respect, nor does Western Australia. We go into line with Western Australia rather than South Australia. Then in regard to institutions that a child might be sent to, a child might be sent to Government institutions or to a semi-Government institution—that is, an institution that is conducted privately, but which receives Government subsidy.

Mr. MURPHY: You do not propose to nationalise orphanages?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No. We will have State orphanages, and subsidise other orphanages as we do at the present time. The figure paid per day to orphanages at the present time is 10d., and in some cases they get even more. It is a matter that the Government decide by regulation, and when you take everything into account it is a fairly good sum to pay.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Not enough with the increased cost of living.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: In our own orphanages it does not cost quite so much as that. These other institutions are really doing good work, and I think that the children know that they are well looked after. But I do not know that more than 10d. per day can be claimed for their maintenance. The Bill proposes to give the Minister the right to take a child up to

the age of thirteen. At the present time the age is twelve, and we are increasing the age by one year. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. FOLEY: Make it fourteen while you are about it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is now the same as South Australia.

Mr. COLLINS: Why not go one better than South Australia?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: In Western Australia it is fourteen, and we propose to make it thirteen.

Mr. MULLAN: And they cannot enter a factory till they are fourteen.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Clause 20 gives power to take neglected children into custody. The department has no power to take any action now in the serious cases that are brought under its notice. Clause 21 defines the powers of the court with regard to neglected children. The court can admit a neglected child right to the department under the Bill without conviction. Clause 23 deals with uncontrollable children. Parents are often—at least they are not often, because it is a very rare thing in Queensland to find children who are utterly beyond the control of their parents—but if there are such cases the parent can go to the court and direct that the child shall be dealt with as an uncontrollable child. Then the court can do one of four different things. It can put that child in the reformatory, into a State orphanage, into a subsidised orphanage, or have it registered out. Some cases have arisen in Queensland where a child refuses to attend school. A party was prosecuted for not sending his child to school the other day, and he said he could not control the child. We could not do anything as the law was then, but we have got provisions in this Bill which will enable us to get control of that child when the parents are helpless to deal with the child themselves or if it is a criminally neglected child. Clause 25 provides that all children can be detained until they are eighteen years of age. In the past the boys are discharged at seventeen and the girls at eighteen.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: From State supervision?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes. But if they remain at school until they are thirteen, they will still have five years at service. There are special provisions for retaining the child for two years if admitted after attaining the age of sixteen, so in some cases they might exceed by a few months the eighteenth year. Clause 26 provides the institution to which the children should be sent, and clause 27 refers to the warrant for detention, form of order, and statement of age and religion to be *prima facie* evidence. Clause 28 provides that absconding State children can be arrested without a warrant. Clause 29 gives power to discharge State children from the control of the department. The discharge will be on probation, and the child may be visited by an inspector from time to time. In some cases girls can be detained if necessary till they are twenty-one. Clauses 33 and 34 deal with the apprenticing of children by the department and the placing out of children by the director. Clause 35 deals with the placing of children with foster-mothers or with their mothers who are widows or deserted wives.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I hope you will be more liberal with the mothers in future.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is a very doubtful point. If members will carefully read the reports of inspectors, they will find that to board out children at their own homes, no matter how humanely it may sound, is not always a wise thing. The opinion of the Inspector of Orphanages and other inspectors is that the children with foster-mothers get on better than they do with their own mothers. I have read the reports very carefully, and those members who have done the same will find my statement is borne out by those reports. When the matter first cropped up, like a number of other members I thought it was a very humane thing to give poor mothers, who had not enough money to keep their own children, enough money from the State to enable them to do so, but it has not always worked out well in practice.

Mr. FOLEY: Don't you think that the reason is that you did not give them enough to look after the children?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No; the foster-mothers seem to look more carefully after their children at times. Hon. members will notice that in clause 36 the school age is raised to thirteen, but I would ask them to note that the Minister has authority, if he thinks it desirable, to extend that age by one year, making it fourteen. Clause 49 gives the order of maintenance of children, and members will notice that "near relative" has been extended a little to bring in foster-mothers, sisters, brothers, or stepfathers or stepmothers to maintain their children. Clause 52 deals with illegitimate children, and I think members will find that it is fairly explicit, and there is also provision in it that when a man has been accused of being the father of a child, the mother's evidence is taken, even if not corroborated, unless the man goes into court and swears otherwise. Part VI. deals with the foster-parents. At the present time in boarding children out with foster-parents, it is the child who is licensed. We have a suggestion in this Bill that foster-mothers, not children, should be licensed—that a woman should be licensed as a foster-mother, and the department will take into account how many children she can receive at one time. They are not registered at the present time. Clause 63 provides for payment of foster-mothers, not exceeding 10s. per week. At present, infants under two years of age are paid for at the rate of 8s. a week; two years and upwards, 6s. in Southern districts, and 7s. in the other districts. Clause 64 gives a new power to the department to be represented and conduct cases, and clause 65 contains restrictions on the employment of children. In that we are following the good practices which have been adopted with success in other countries. For instance, no child can be permitted to sing at public entertainments between 8 o'clock in the evening and 5 o'clock unless on licensed premises.

Mr. FOLEY: Would this be a child under seventeen years of age?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: A child under ten. Then, again, in clause 66 no child under the age of fourteen can be allowed to engage in any employment that is dangerous to their

Hon. K. M. Grant.]

health, even in licensed premises. If a child is doing some contortion act in a theatre or circus, and the Director of Orphanages thinks it is injurious to the child's health, then he can come in and take action.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Through a medical certificate?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes; there will be no hardship involved. I do not think it is right for a little girl of seven or eight to be on a stage at 11 o'clock at night dancing and singing for the amusement of the people there. The rest of the clauses from 67 onwards are practically the same as we have now; there is very little new. The Bill, as I have said, is really a consolidation of Acts already in force in Queensland; it is purely a Committee Bill, and one which no one in the House will object to the principles of. It is with every confidence that I submit this Bill for the consideration of members.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): I move the adjournment of the debate.

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

The House adjourned at eight minutes past 10 o'clock.
