

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Council**

**WEDNESDAY, 29 MAY 1918**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

WEDNESDAY, 29 MAY, 1918.

Pursuant to adjournment, the PRESIDENT (Hon. W. Hamilton) took the chair shortly before noon.

## THE GOVERNOR'S OPENING SPEECH.

At noon His Excellency the Governor was announced by the Usher of the Black Rod, and was received by the President at the bar.

The Council being seated, a message was sent to the Assembly, informing the members of that House that His Excellency desired the presence of Mr. Speaker and hon. members in the Council Chamber. The Assembly attended accordingly, and, being seated in the place reserved for them below the bar,

His EXCELLENCY read the Opening Speech, as follows:—

“GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

“It gives me very great pleasure to meet you at the opening of this the first session of the twenty-first Parliament of Queensland.

“I am confident you will all share my regret that the terrible war which has now lasted nearly four years has not yet ended in an honourable and enduring peace. Our chief consolation is the certainty that Germany's dream of universal dominion cannot be realised, and that the heroic and costly resistance which the Empire and its allies are offering to her lawless ambition will not have been in vain.

“We would be more or less than human if we did not exult in the achievements of our brave Queenslanders at the battle front, or remained unmoved by the accounts which have reached us of more than one impending reverse being turned into victory by their skill and daring. Such deeds, unfortunately, cannot be performed without heavy loss to the doers, and the ever-increasing number of dead and wounded among our valiant champions is a proof not only of their courage, but also of the dangers and difficulties they so cheerfully face. My advisers have already publicly expressed our appreciation of their splendid devotion and effective services to the great cause for which the free peoples of the world are risking their all. I am sure that my advisers, in thus expressing themselves, were only anticipating your wishes, and that the pride you feel in the exploits of our soldiers is mingled with deep sorrow for those who have fallen and full sympathy for their bereaved relatives.

“To the problem of making adequate provision for the soldiers who return to Queensland, my advisers are giving the very closest attention, and they have already made satisfactory arrangements for a considerable number of them. The work of settling on suitable Crown land such of them as have a turn for agriculture or its allied industries is proceeding satisfactorily.

“Plans have been prepared for a State fruit cannery to be established at Bulimba, and the necessary plant has been ordered.

“Early in the year storms and floods, of unprecedented destructiveness, wrought great havoc in several of our Northern and Central

coastal towns. Innisfail, Babinda, Mackay, and Rockhampton were the chief sufferers by the calamity. My advisers promptly did all that was possible to relieve the widespread distress thus occasioned, and have since drawn up a suitable scheme of restoration and repair by which Government help and credit will be available for the work of rebuilding.

"The State meat shops have thoroughly justified their existence, and applications are being received from nearly every part of the State for the establishment of further branches. My advisers are now considering a comprehensive scheme for the supply and distribution of meat to the whole State from the State cattle stations.

"The State fish supply scheme has been launched. It so far comprises a receiving depot, central market, cold stores, smoke-house, and retail shop. It is intended to organise the distribution of fish to the public, and to take the necessary steps to ensure more regular supplies at reasonable prices. The Government hopes to have a trawler operating shortly, and will subsequently give attention to the practicability of establishing canning works and exporting preserved fish to markets beyond the State.

"My advisers are continuing their policy of increasing facilities for land settlement, and with the result that there is a distinct increase in selections as compared with last year's record. Many selectors who held land as agricultural farms have brought their holdings under perpetual lease tenure. Cecil Plains Repurchased Estate, comprising an area of 120,947 acres, has been surveyed into 208 portions; about one-third of the estate (40,475 acres) has been set apart for soldier settlement, and the remainder will be opened for perpetual lease selection at an early date.

"Crown tenants have been hampered in prickly-pear destruction by the high cost of poison, but it is believed that the steps taken by the Government to open an arsenic mine and establish a works for the production of arsenic will remove this difficulty.

"The Government has initiated a classification of the forest lands of the State with the view of determining what portions should be devoted to silviculture. The investigation discloses a shortage of forest reservation due to hurried pioneering, and the stage has been reached where less than 1 per cent. of Queensland is held for timber production, as against 20 to 25 per cent. in Europe. So impressed has the Government been with the gravity of the position, and the necessity for providing for the timber needs of a much increased population, that it is devoting very serious consideration to the forestry question.

"The legislation for regulating the distribution of our farm products which was enacted in 1917 has been put into operation, and though it is too early yet to look for the full results expected from it, there is already evidence that as the system becomes more widely known and understood its benefits to producer and consumer without the interference of an intermediary will fully justify its enactment.

"Though last season's sugar crop was the largest on record, much of it was lost to the State through the disastrous storms and floods already mentioned. Notwithstanding this untoward circumstance, the Queensland

sugar yield has been in excess of the Australian demand. The Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Acts have produced such readjustment of relations between grower and manufacturer as makes their dealings of a more equitable character than has hitherto been the case.

"In consequence of action taken outside the State, the position of our wheat-producers is anything but satisfactory, and, with the view of coping if possible with the adverse circumstances which have arisen, it is in contemplation to call at an early date a conference of wheat-growers to discuss a situation in which they are so vitally interested.

"Commonwealth interference, under the War Precautions Act, with the State grading of dairy produce is utterly without justification, and imperils that State system of dairying instruction to which the industry largely owes its present flourishing condition.

"The heavy demand upon our mineral resources for war purposes gives the mining industry an Imperial as well as a local importance, and it is satisfactory to know that Queensland is active in the development of this source of wealth. While, in this as in all the other States of the Commonwealth, the gold output is still diminishing, in the yield of other metals, stimulated by sympathetic administration and high prices, there has been a marked increase. In response to representations from this State, an enhanced price has been secured from the Imperial authorities for certain of the metals required in the manufacture of munitions.

"The Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the feasibility of manufacturing iron and steel in Queensland having, in an interim report, recommended that steps be taken to establish a State iron-smelting plant capable of producing pig-iron commercially, and to test in bulk the iron-ore deposits of the State, the Department of Mines has continued its investigations into this matter with a view to giving effect to that recommendation.

"The prevailing war conditions have caused unavoidable delays in the drilling of the bore that is being sunk at Roma in search of mineral oil, but a depth has now been reached of nearly 3,200 feet—within 500 feet of the depth at which a previous bore struck gas, below which it is expected the oil-bearing strata will be found.

"During the year the railway service and certain other Government employees have secured awards from the Arbitration Court. In addition, industrial agreements under the Arbitration Act have been made between the Government and certain branches of the public service, including the teachers, police, prisons and asylum employees, general officers, professional officers, and others.

"These awards and agreements have had the effect of placing the remuneration of public servants on a more equitable basis and of greatly improving their general conditions. As a consequence, the service is much more contented now than it ever was before.

"The Royal Commission appointed to investigate the working of the Railway Department has almost completed its labours, and its report, when presented, will be submitted for your consideration.

"A proposed agreement between the Governments of the Commonwealth and this State is under consideration, whereby the educational agencies of the State will be utilised for the vocational training of returned soldiers, and the work will be widely extended.

"It is proposed to extend the facilities for secondary and technical education.

"Recognising the great and preventible waste in child-life under present conditions, my advisers have established, in different parts of the metropolis, baby clinics, from which the best results are confidently expected. The experiment has been so successful, indeed, that it is proposed to extend the principle to other portions of the State.

"As the authority for raising loan funds conferred by the Loan Act of 1914 is almost exhausted, a further Loan Bill will be submitted during the session.

"The expectations of my advisers as outlined in the Budget of last year with regard to the finances of the State have proved correct, and early action will be necessary to meet the anticipated shortage in consolidated revenue. An interim statement of the financial position will be made, if possible, before the end of the financial year; subsequently certain of the Finance Bills rejected last session by the Legislative Council will be resubmitted.

"Necessary railway construction will be proceeded with as rapidly as the means at the disposal of the Government will permit, especial attention being devoted to the Northern Coast Railway and all agricultural lines that are of an urgent character.

"It is the intention of my advisers to submit for your consideration measures providing for social and temperance reform.

"Much of the useful legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly in the last Parliament was rejected, or seriously mutilated, by the Legislative Council. My advisers consider it their duty to take such steps as will in the future prevent such flouting of the expressed will of the people.

"GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

"The Estimates for the Financial Year 1918-19 are being considered, and will probably be presented to Parliament this year earlier than usual.

"GENTLEMEN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,—

"The following, among other Bills, will be submitted for your consideration:—

- A Health Act Amendment Bill;
- A Meatworks Bill;
- A Brisbane Tramways Fares Bill;
- A Brisbane Tramways Purchase Bill;
- A City of Brisbane Bill;
- A Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill;
- A Bill to amend the Technical Instruction Act of 1908;
- A Bill to amend the Land Acts, 1910 to 1917;
- A Bill to amend the Closer Settlement Acts, 1906 to 1917;
- A Bill to amend the Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Act of 1917;
- A Police Superannuation Bill;

- A Chillagoe and Etheridge Railways Purchase Bill;
- A State Iron and Steel Works Establishment Bill;
- A Public Works Standing Committee Bill;
- A Marsupial Boards Acts Amendment Bill;
- A Dairy Produce Acts Amendment Bill;
- A Valuation of Land Bill;
- A Land Tax Act Amendment Bill;
- An Income Tax Act Amendment Bill;
- A Harbour Boards Act Amendment Bill;
- A Loan Bill;
- A Wages Bill;
- A Diseases in Stock Act Amendment Bill;
- A Supreme Court Acts Amendment Bill;
- A Stamp Act Amendment Bill;
- A Succession and Probate Duties Act Amendment Bill;
- A Jury Bill;
- A Constitution Act Amendment Bill;
- A State Enterprises Bill;
- An Elections Act Amendment Bill;
- A Local Authorities Act Amendment Bill.

"To these and all other measures I invite your attention, and I earnestly pray that the blessing of Almighty God may attend your labours."

His Excellency then left the Chamber, and the members of the Assembly withdrew.

The Council adjourned at twenty-two minutes past 12 o'clock until half-past 3 o'clock, resuming at that hour.

#### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

##### QUEENSLAND NATIONAL BANK BALANCE-SHEET.

The PRESIDENT announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of a letter, dated 15th February last, covering his twenty-seventh half-yearly report under the provisions of the Queensland National Bank, Limited (Agreement), Act of 1904, which had been already printed and circulated during the recess.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

##### CABINET CHANGES DURING RECESS.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones): I have to make a Ministerial statement. On 26th April last Mr. Wm. Neal Gillies was appointed a member of the Executive Council of Queensland; on 30th April, the Hon. Thomas Joseph Ryan resigned his position as Vice-President of the Executive Council, the Hon. John McEwan Hunter resigned his position as Secretary for Public Lands, and the Hon. John Harry Coyne resigned his position as Secretary for Railways. On the same day the Hon. John McEwan Hunter was appointed Vice-President of the Executive Council, the Hon. John Arthur Fihelly was appointed Secretary for Railways, and the Hon. John Harry Coyne was appointed Secretary for Public Lands. I beg to lay on the table the "Gazettes" notifying the above appointments.

[Hon. A. J. Jones.]

## SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—

“That the Council, at its rising, do adjourn until 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday next.”

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Will the Minister tell us what he proposes to do on Tuesday next? Does he propose to go on with the debate on the Address in Reply, or what business are we to engage in?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: My reason for moving the adjournment of the Council until Tuesday next is that, after the Address in Reply has been dealt with this afternoon by the mover and seconder, hon. members may have an opportunity of perusing the Speech which was delivered this morning by His Excellency.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: It has such a lot of stuff in it that we want a whole week to study it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I thought I was meeting the wishes of hon. members by giving them sufficient time to enable them to prepare their brief speeches.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: We will not make any five-hour speeches.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: On Tuesday next we will resume the debate on the Address in Reply.

Question put and passed.

## PAPERS.

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

Amendment to clause 18 of the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916.

Order in Council, under the Fish Supply Act of 1916.

Regulations, dated 14th February, 1918, under the Income Tax Acts, 1902 to 1915.

Despatches, conveying His Majesty's assent to Acts passed during session of 1917.

Award of Industrial Arbitration Court as of 10th December, 1917, relating to surveyors' chainmen, surveyors' labourers, and cooks employed by the Departments of the Treasury, Public Lands, and Railways

Award of Industrial Arbitration Court as of 3rd May, 1918, relating to certain employees of the Commissioner for Railways engaged in railway refreshment-rooms.

Rules of the Supreme Court of Queensland as of Wednesday, 5th day of December, 1917.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Statement of the operations for 1917 of companies under the Life Assurance Companies Act of 1901.

## THE GOVERNOR'S OPENING SPEECH.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that, for greater accuracy, I have obtained a copy of the Speech which His Excellency the Governor was pleased to make this day to both Houses of Parliament.

[Hon. A. J. Jones.

Under the Standing Orders I should read such parts of the Speech as were addressed to the Council, but in recent years it has been the practice to take the document as read. Is it the wish of the Council that that practice should be followed on the present occasion?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: I beg to move—

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to the Speech with which His Excellency this day opened the present session of Parliament:—

“To His Excellency Sir Hamilton John Goold-Adams, Major on the Retired List of His Majesty's Army, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Governor of the State of Queensland and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.

“MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

“We, His Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Members of the Legislative Council of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection to the Throne and Person of Our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session.

“We shall give our most careful consideration and attention to the several measures mentioned by Your Excellency, and to all other matters brought before us; and we sincerely trust that our deliberations will tend to the promotion of the good government and the welfare of the State.”

I should like, before this motion is put to members of the Council, to congratulate the Government on the victory they obtained on the 16th March last. (Hear, hear!) Despite all the wonderful things that had been said—despite what had been said in regard to the calamity which would take place if a Labour Government were returned for a second term to the Parliament of Queensland, and despite the vilification and misrepresentation of the aims and objects and aspirations of the Labour movement—the Government, with all those obstacles to surmount, and with all those difficulties to overcome, have been returned with an increased majority to carry out the will of the people. I wish to congratulate the Government on the stand they took before the people, and the fact that they have been returned in sufficient numbers to enable them to again take charge of the Treasury benches. As usual, I am compelled to say that the recent election campaign was another campaign in which our opponents endeavoured to vilify the Labour movement.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Who are your opponents?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: I am referring to the opponents of the Labour movement, and if you gentlemen over there represent that class in the community, then I say the cap fits you. I am referring to the opponents of the Labour movement outside.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: That is better.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: They endeavoured to vilify the Labour movement, and to misrepresent the Labour movement, and the city Press and the provincial Press lowered themselves in my estimation to the very lowest depths of mendacity in order to bring about Labour's defeat.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Does that apply to all of the city Press?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: That applies to the city Press.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Without exception?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: However, despite all those obstacles, and despite all the difficulties we had to face, our party has been triumphant. If we want to know the true value of the vote which was cast in the interest of the Labour party at the last election, we need only go from here to the other Chamber and see what is the state of affairs there.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: We know the state of the rolls, too, don't we?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: The rolls are all right. One thing that I appreciate very much is the vote that was given to the present Government by the farming community. At last they realise that they, as farmers, have a friend in the Labour Government; they realise the importance of the efforts that have been put forward by the present Government on their behalf. During the last session, one measure was introduced which I am sorry to say was to some extent mangled in this Chamber; but, nevertheless, it has shown the farmers where the Labour party stand. They can realise by the very introduction of that measure that the Labour party were irrevocably determined to see that they, as producers, received a fair deal. You will remember the State Produce Agency Bill which was introduced here, and which was finally confined to an agency measure, the Government being prevented from doing many things they would have liked to have done in the interest of the farmers. I remember that the farmers were not suffering from the want of agencies, but that, on the other hand, they were suffering from a multiplicity of agencies, and what they wanted was scientific distribution of what they produced. The farmer has now realised that the Labour party are endeavouring to do that, and I believe that the big vote—the big farming vote, anyhow—recorded in favour of the present Government on the 16th March last was because of the attitude adopted in this Council towards that measure brought forward in favour of the farmers.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: They quite approve of our action; I have scores of letters to that effect.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: There is no use disguising the fact that we, on this side of the Chamber, represent a class in the community. We represent the working class in the community. I do not want hon. members opposite to misunderstand me, and I do not want to say anything that will hurt the feelings of those hon. members. I am saying this because I realise that, more or less, members on the other side of the Chamber opposed to us represent a class whose interests are diametrically opposed to the interests of the class we represent. And I want to say that we are not satisfied with the progress that has been made. Although we can congratulate the Government heartily

on what they have done and what they propose to do, still, as a Labour movement, we realise that the majority of the people representing the working class are in chains. We realise that the Labour movement must progress. We recognise that there is no milestone in the pathway of our civilisation where the movement should stand still. We must go ahead or retrograde. We must face all these big questions as they arise or fall into utter ruin. Now, we are going to face these questions. Bigger questions will be introduced this session than were introduced in any previous session, and, if they receive the same treatment as was meted out to important measures that were introduced into this Chamber last session, I am satisfied that the people will take another stand, and will do something that will prove to this Chamber that their will must be obeyed. I for one have no desire to remain here longer than it is necessary. I do not want to be a political Rip Van Winkle here, asleep half my time and enjoying the privileges of a big club or anything like that. I want to do what is necessary in the interests of the people I represent or get out of the Chamber altogether. We are determined on that score anyhow, and I feel satisfied that the big majority that was given to the present Government on the 16th March will show that the people are determined to do likewise.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Why did they not put some of their rejected Bills before the country?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: You are going to get an opportunity, during this session, to put some of those Bills before the people. During the elections we heard a lot said about the class war. There were many men representing the Liberal side of this question in politics who said we were responsible for widening that gulf between employerdom and the employee. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but if it is, it is only because we were endeavouring to show to the people whom we represent that that gulf existed, and that we wanted to do away with certain things in order that that gulf should disappear altogether. That class war has been deprecated in this Chamber, but it is there all the same, and I want to give some of the reasons why it is there. First of all you have a censorship. I do not say it is due to any authority in Queensland, but it is an Australian invention. It is something that has been imposed upon us by the Commonwealth Government.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: It is not an Australian invention.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: It is an Australian invention.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It exists in England.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: You can go to the English papers in your library and you can see things appearing in those papers—things that have been said by statesmen—things that have been said by Labour leaders and ordinary citizens—that are censored in the Australian papers—not allowed to appear in the Australian papers at all. Therefore I say that the censorship we are suffering from in Australia to-day is an Australian invention. I want to show that the great gulf that to-day exists between employerdom and employees is widening, and, in order to do that, might I quote history

*Hon. W. R. Crampton.]*

from a Labour viewpoint? Take your minds back to 1890. There you will find that an endeavour had been made by the workers in the western portion of the State to form themselves into a union. They were opposed most bitterly and most relentlessly by the pastoralists and the landholders of Queensland, and on that occasion they were told to seek political redress. They did that, and, although they were defeated, that defeat meant the laying of the foundation stone of the Labour movement that we are identified with at the present time. And from that we go on and go on, and we find that the movement is nothing more or less than a series of political shipwrecks and industrial shipwrecks, all because of the determined opposition shown by those who control industries and who control the wealth of the community. I want to point this out to show that we on our side of the House know something of the history of the class that we represent. I want to show that in order to show that I am not a hypocrite; that I am here because I represent that class. I do not resent it being said of me that I represent that class, and every man beside me represents that class too; a class that has suffered and a class that has been betrayed by leaders and sold by its representatives, but, nevertheless, a class that is suffering an injustice and is struggling for a fair deal that has been denied it by the people represented on the other side of the Chamber to-day. I want to refer hon. gentlemen to the strike that took place in the sugar industry. There are some sugar representatives here to-day who will remember that in 1911 there was a sugar strike in Queensland. It embraced the whole of Queensland right from the Mossman to the Brisbane River. Those who were engaged in the sugar industry were out on strike. Why? Let me remind hon. members of the facts. Those men were working for something like £1 2s. 6d. per week for a sixty-hour week, and had approached the employers of Queensland and begged of them some amelioration and asked for an alteration in those conditions. They were fighting to improve unbearable conditions, but were refused redress. They were told "No." We, as an organisation, were compelled to fight the barons in the sugar industry, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company in the lead, and we were obliged to send those men into camp. We had very little capital at our disposal, but we did it. We put those men from the Mossman to the Brisbane River into camp, and we kept those men out on strike. I am very proud of the fact that we did, because it not only made history in Queensland, but it made the sugar industry an industry worth working in. It made the industry fit for a white man to work in, and it was a great and distinct benefit to the whole of Queensland. We were fighting against £1 2s. 6d. per week and a sixty-hour week. We were asking for the moderate amount of £1 10s. per week and for an eight-hour day, and they told us we could not get it. Still you say to us when we go on the hustings, in this Chamber, in the other Chamber, and elsewhere, that we are responsible for the gulf between the employers and employees. I say unhesitatingly that the blame is on the shoulders of those who are supported by the other side of the Chamber, and who refused to us the right to ask for decent conditions.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Who refused it? We did not refuse it.

[Hon. W. R. Crampton.]

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: I say that in the past session, and in the previous session, and in other sessions, you people have stood by the men who denied us the right to ask for that living wage.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: That is not so.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: It is true; and I will go so far as to say that you supported the Government that opened labour bureaux all over Queensland as cheap labour recruiting agencies against the interests of those men who were fighting for decent conditions. There was a "black list" in 1890 and 1891 when this great organisation of ours was being founded. When we laid the foundation-stone of that organisation this great black list was handed round from squatter to squatter.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Have you not black-listed Billy Hughes and Holman?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: Politically, yes, but we did it in a straightforward manner. We did not adopt any subterfuge. We did not go behind his back to adopt a black list. We came straight out in the Press and in conference and told the whole world we were against Billy Hughes. We did not adopt the tactics of the squatters of Queensland, who were taking the bread and butter from the mouths of the men who had the courage to stand up for a decent wage.

Hon. G. S. CURTIS: Where do you get your information from?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: The history of the State. I may inform the hon. member that I have the black list; I have the signatories to the black list, and I can show him the whole thing. I do not say that this was confined to Queensland. It applies to Australia generally; and what was adopted in the other States was copied in Queensland.

So much for the statement that has been made regarding those who were responsible for the class struggle. I wanted to point that out to show that in my opinion there was no reason for saying that we were responsible. We have struggled against

[4 p.m.] oppression; we have struggled against these things right down the ages. There are men in the community to-day who may say extreme things, and whom we may not agree with, but they are the children of their environment. They have been brought to that by the amount of oppression that has been brought to bear upon them. I am quite satisfied that there are men in Queensland to-day who would go so far as to treat many of the Labour leaders of Australia—take Frank Anstey—take quite a number of our own Queensland leaders—take leaders in New South Wales and elsewhere—I venture to say that there are employers of labour in Queensland and in other States of the Commonwealth who would go so far as to do what was done in England nearly a century ago with the Dorsetshire labourers. If it were possible, I am satisfied they would transport those men for life for nothing more than standing up for the rights of the class and the movement that they are identified with.

I do not want to say any more in that connection. So far as I am concerned, I think it would be a good thing if the Address in Reply were abolished; I think it would be a rattling good thing to abolish it. I suggest that this afternoon, although

in my opinion the suggestion is such a good one that it really deserves a better birth-place. (Government laughter.)

I now wish to refer briefly to what the Labour party and the present Government have done; and in doing so I cannot overlook the Workers' Compensation Act. I cannot overlook the great benefits that have accrued to the workers generally through the introduction of that particular piece of legislation. I feel satisfied that if a vote were taken of the workers of Queensland on that question, there would be no mistake as to how they would vote. They would be quite satisfied to keep the Government in power, even if it only marked time, in order to retain upon the statute-book that particular piece of legislation. Many and many a man in the State, and his family, have benefited very considerably indeed by the introduction of that reform. I am very pleased to know that they have received that benefit through the business being taken away from the clutches of competition and placed in the calmer and more tranquil atmosphere of State monopoly. I am satisfied that that is the safest place to put it, if we want to confer a benefit upon the working community of Queensland.

I need hardly mention the successful handling of the State butcheries; that goes without saying. The only thing I would like to see is the development of those butcheries to such an extent that the present Government would have power to go further in their investments relating to the purchase of stations in order that meat might be supplied direct to the consumers from their own station properties.

The fish business is also mentioned in the Governor's Speech. It is to-day in its infancy. It is being retarded because they are unable to procure the necessary trawlers in the South to enable them to regulate the supply as it should be regulated; but it must be remembered that they are inflexibly determined to give the people the benefit of that legislation. They have established at Wynnum a depôt which is a credit to them, and on the other side of the river, not many hundreds of yards from here, is a monument to the credit of the department that initiated it. I am satisfied that, with the sympathetic and democratic administration of that department, the people are going to get a great benefit from the wide distribution of cheap fish.

There are also workers' accommodation, factories and shops legislation, labour exchanges, and many other beneficial pieces of legislation to the credit of the Government. I want to refer to the workers' compensation, because I was connected with the administration of the department. In the majority of districts in Queensland, the men have received great benefit by the passage of the Workers' Accommodation Act, and by the sympathetic and democratic administration of the Act. To it they owe the fact that they are better housed and better looked after to-day than they were before.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Your Government did not introduce that legislation.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: Our Government made it possible for the workers to have good accommodation.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They did not introduce the Act.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: They did not introduce the original Act, but they amended it. The old Act was unsympathetically and undemocratically administered. The present Government administered the Act sympathetically, and they also altered it so that they could give satisfaction all round.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We held a pistol at their heads.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You have a lot of pistols. Apparently you are going to try and use them on us.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: The Act was better before you touched it.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: It was nothing of the kind. To-day we are at a deadlock because it is impossible to get the necessary material with which to build this accommodation, and the Government have relaxed the regulations in that regard. Quite right, too! It would be very silly indeed for any Government to say that this accommodation must be provided for the men when it has become an impossibility to secure the material. Accordingly, they have relaxed the regulation. The number of cases that were usually recorded where disease had broken out on station properties has been considerably reduced. In the Labour Department, under the factories and shops legislation, they have been able to do more in one year of their administration than the other people did during their whole political life. Right from the very day that self-government was granted to Queensland until 1915 not so much was done in the way of getting justice for the workers through that department as was done during the year 1916.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: What did you do?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: During the years 1916 and 1917 these people were able to gather £22,500 back pay for employees, one-half of that being more than had been gathered for the workers during the whole existence of the Conservative Government. Surely that was a record! It is a record that I am proud of, anyhow. The present Government did that under the administration of the Department of Public Works.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: It was only a book-keeping entry.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: A great book-keeping entry, so far as the men are concerned who are working under those particular awards. They are very pleased with that bookkeeping entry.

Apart from that, many other things have been done, such as the establishment of labour exchanges. I do not think that there is a member of this Council who really understands why those exchanges were founded as they have been. First of all, let me say that the Minister was absolutely sincere in his desire to build up those exchanges for the benefit of the people. And when I say "the people" I mean employers and employees. He wanted to be able to show the employers some way of registering employees and themselves registering so that they would get a plentiful supply of labour, and so that labour would be more mobile than it is at the present time, and there would be less unemployment. He has met with a considerable amount of success in that direction. Those exchanges to-day stand as a monument to the credit of the present Administration.

I also want to mention something in connection with certain legislation which was

*Hon. W. R. Crampton.]*



introduced during the last session and which was cast out by this Chamber, but which will be reintroduced during the present session. One of those measures is the Iron and Steel Works Bill. During the recess I have had many opportunities of conferring with the Minister who has taken a very keen interest in this matter, and I am inclined to say that he stands almost alone—outside one or two of our enthusiastic geologists—in the interest he shows in the development of our natural resources in connection with this particular matter. I do not think there is a man in Queensland who is more sincere than the Minister in his desire to develop our natural resources, especially the iron and coal resources of Queensland, and to make this State what it should be. I have read reports issued by geologists and speeches that have been made by the Minister, both inside and outside of this Chamber, showing that we have almost unlimited possibilities in this connection, that we have almost unlimited iron ore deposits, especially at Biggenden, which was practically the centre of attraction in this connection last session. The Minister has shown during the recess that that ore can be successfully and profitably treated.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Nobody doubted that.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: I know the hon. gentleman did not doubt it, but other hon. members did doubt it.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Look at the good Bill we gave you.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: You did not pass a good Bill. However, I am glad that the hon. gentleman admits that it was a good Bill. It is to be reintroduced, and I hope the House will pass it in a form which will enable the Government to make this enterprise self-supporting.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You would not accept £150,000.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: We were not offered £150,000.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Yes, you were.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: Why was a limitation placed on the amount at all? We have reason to believe that the limitation was made in order to endeavour to get us to try experiments which would enable private enterprise to come in and develop this industry in the interest of private persons and against the interest of the State.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Your own Royal Commission said £5,000 would be sufficient.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: The Royal Commission said that £5,000 would be sufficient for the initial expenditure. The Minister has shown us that with an old furnace—certainly by no means a modern furnace—the Biggenden ore could be successfully treated, and that 70 per cent. of magnetite ore could be treated more profitably than 50 per cent. of hematite ore in other parts of the world.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Do you want £500,000?

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: We do not want to fix any limit. When the Minister has shown what can be done, surely to goodness you can place the business of the safe development of this important industry in his hands.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: He can get money every year.

[Hon. W. R. Crampton.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: The Minister has also devoted his attention to the conservation of by-products, which now go to waste. I have heard it stated in this Chamber repeatedly that a great waste is going on from our chimney stacks. The Minister wants to prevent that loss, and to show that by conserving the by-products a big saving can be effected, and that big things can be done in that direction. He proved at Ipswich that the Government are determined to have the iron and steel industry developed, and we should vote unanimously for that measure when it comes before this Chamber again this session in order to enable the Government to make progress in the direction of conserving by-products of commercial value which are now going to waste. To show that there must be a great amount of waste going on, not only here, but in other parts of the world, I may mention that the Durham coalowners were supplying coal to the Germans in pre-war days, that the Germans took that coal to Germany, manufactured coke from it, and then sent that coke back to Durham, and were able to undersell the Durham coke manufacturers. Why? Because they were saving the by-products. I read quite recently a series of articles written by one of our Government geologists, and I suppose other members have read those articles, in which the writer shows how cement can be made at Many Peaks or Biggenden. He shows that with the materials which are there at our command, the limestone, and other material, cement can be made, and that with the introduction of patent flues the by-products can be saved, so that with every 100 tons of cement we shall get 2½ tons of potash. We can obtain sufficient potash there to supply the whole agricultural community of Australia with that particular commodity. What a fine thing that would be for Queensland! The farming community to-day is languishing for want of potash, and I am sure that if the Government took up this particular industry they would be backed up by the people of Queensland. The Government are endeavouring to secure the best scientists the world can produce in order that they may develop our resources economically and in the interest of the State. The Minister has shown me proof of his statement, that in the manufacture of 1 ton of coke we to-day in Queensland, by clinging to the beehive system, are losing something like 14s. 3d. per ton, and the hon. gentleman merely asked you to give the Government the necessary power to establish this industry on a sound and payable basis—to introduce a new system in the making of coke which will mean the saving of by-products which are lost under the beehive system, a loss which, as I have said, amounts to 14s. 3d. per ton. That loss is made up by ammonia sulphates, which amount to 4s. 5½d. per ton; by tar, which amounts to 4s. 8d. per ton; and the rest by a saving of gas. The Minister is satisfied. He has the authority of the Government Geologist. He is backed up by the scientists in this statement, and he believes that can be arrested, and if it can be saved. I see no reason why this Chamber should limit the amount of money that should be voted to the Government for the development of this very great industry. I want to say, in connection with that matter also, that there are reasons why I am so very anxious to see this industry controlled by the State. I do not want to see any private enterprise gathering the profits from the industry. I want to see the State

benefit in the interests of the people, and I want to see the State get the whole of the benefits for the people. I have before my mind's eye just now the history of America; the history of the coal trusts; the history of the iron trusts; and the history of the steel trusts; and I have in my mind's eye the great fortunes that have been built up by men like Carnegie, Pierpont Morgan, and others, who have made all their money out of iron, steel, and coal. I also can picture the many struggles that have taken place when men and women were compelled to combat the forces arrayed against them, the forces that were endeavouring to prevent them from getting a living wage out of those industries—that is, the wealthy magnates who would deny these people the right to a living wage—and if we allow private enterprise to develop these industries, we are going to have the same thing in Australia. Some of you can no doubt remember Ludlow. If you do not remember Ludlow, you do not know anything about the history of the class we represent. If you read the struggle on the fields of Colorado—if you know anything of the struggles of the men in America on the coal-fields and the ironfields, you will remember Colorado and the big strike that took place there some time ago, when these "Pinkertons"—these spies—had been engaged and paid highly for their services to do nothing further than shoot down those men who had the temerity to stand up for a living wage. I do not want to see that here. I am perfectly sure that hon. members opposite do not want to see that. I am quite satisfied that their desire is to see a fair deal, and to make this a white man's industry, but, consciously or unconsciously, hon. members opposite are supporting the party to which I have referred, and, in order that that condition of affairs might be prevented, and in order that we might give the State an opportunity to do this against private enterprise, I am asking this Chamber to consider the position as I place it before hon. members. The Governor also referred to another very important question: During the recess the Minister was able to persuade the Government to acquire a certain valuable property at Gibbinbah, in the Stanthorpe district, for Government purposes, and there they are endeavouring to develop a new industry. They have found a very valuable ore there, containing something like 30 per cent. of arsenic. To-day we must remember that we are paying £60 per ton for arsenic. That is the price that was fixed by the Federal Government, but before that it had soared to something like £150 or £150 per ton, while in pre-war days it was from £15 to £20 per ton, and the Minister assures us that it can be brought back to that level again. He assures us that it can be produced for something like £15 or £20 per ton. £135 per ton is the price to-day for arsenic in the old country. The Minister gives us that assurance, backed up by the department's authority and the department's geologists. They assure him that this arsenic can be produced in the Stanthorpe district for £15 or £20 per ton. We have had a legacy in the shape of the prickly-pear menace, and that prickly-pear must be eradicated if you are going to do anything with our pastoral country.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: What are you doing to eradicate it?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: We are developing an arsenic mine in the Stanthorpe

district, as we find the use of arsenical poison is the most economical way of eradicating prickly-pear. We are not asking for any support in that connection, fortunately. We are merely reminding hon. members of something the Minister, through his department, and backed up by the Government, is doing at the present time. As the Minister has stated, he does not want to establish the industry on war-inflated prices; he merely wants to take away from a monopoly at the present time the right to charge these people what they like.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Can you make arsenic at pre-war prices?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: The Minister assures us that it can be done. The Income Tax Bill is a measure that will be again introduced. It was here last session, but hon. members did not even consider it. It was thrown out because it meant taxation, and that taxation was to be imposed upon the wealthy people. Hon. members threw it out. They did the same with the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill, but these measures are coming before us again, and we sincerely hope that they will receive more favourable consideration than they received during last session. I am not going to say that all taxation is fair. I am not one of those who think that taxation should be placed on the shoulders of people indiscriminately, but I am one of those who believe that the working class do not pay all the taxes. It was said last year that the more taxation that is introduced, the worse becomes the position of the working class. I do not hold with that at all, because I find that the working class go to arbitration repeatedly for the regulation of working conditions and for the regulation of wages, and they always appeal to the court on the score that, unless they get a certain wage or a certain increase, they cannot live. It is a living wage they want. How, in the name of fortune, can you tax people who are only getting a living wage? You can tax them, but you lower their standard of living. The taxation proposals that will be submitted to this Chamber from the Legislative Assembly will be such as will fall upon the shoulders of those who are best able to bear it.

HON. G. S. CURTIS: The man getting his weekly wage is called upon to contribute.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: He does contribute, but his standard of living is lowered. These taxation measures are only going to affect the man getting £3,000 a year or more, with a super tax of 20 per cent. on all over £400. Surely that is not a very big thing. Those men cannot be considered to be very poor or very hard up who are receiving £3,000 a year.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Will there be a deficit at the end of the year?

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: I hope so. Whenever I see a deficit I am satisfied that the Government is doing its duty. When I see a surplus I am quite satisfied they have not been spending the money that was given to them to spend in the interests of the State. Quite a number of things have to be remembered when we are dealing with such a proposal as this. We should not indiscriminately introduce this legislation. Take a glimpse of the Federal war time profits tax. It is going to kill the mining industry. You can imagine men who have spent £20,000 or

*Hon. W. R. Crampton.]*

£30,000 in developing a mine. The year before the war commenced is [4.30 p.m.] taken as the basis of assessment.

In that year possibly no profits were made. While the war is on they may make a profit of £1,000 during the year, and they are to be taxed to the extent of 50 per cent. upon that profit. No allowance is to be made to pay back to them any portion of the £20,000 or £30,000 they have spent in developing the mine. I am opposed to that principle. We say that the proper individual to tax is the man, and especially the absentee, who is making a big profit out of Australian industries. Those are the men who are best able to afford to pay taxation; not those who have material that they bought in pre-war days and who make a slight profit for one year after the war.

Take a newspaper. Take, for instance, the newspaper that I represent. It is in exactly the same position. There is no such thing as war time profits in connection with a newspaper. To-day we are paying £60 per ton for all paper that is imported into Australia as against £11 or £12 per ton in pre-war days. During the first year of the war we might have been working on paper purchased at pre-war prices, and we might have made a little profit in the year preceding the war. During the year 1916—the second year after the war commenced—we might have made twice that amount of profit. Our business might have developed to such an extent as to let us make a decent profit. Well, we have to pay 50 per cent. of that in taxation, although from that time, so long as the war lasts, and probably for one year after it terminates, we may be losing money. I hold that that is most unjust, whether it applies to us, or whether it applies to the mining industry, or any other industry.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Are you blaming this side for that?

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: No, I am blaming the people you represent, whether in Queensland, or Australia, or Great Britain, or any other part of the world. I am blaming the class you represent.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: We do not represent any class.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: Those are the people who are going to be hit—the shipping companies, for instance. Those are the people we want to get at. To-day, if you have a consignment of goods landed on a wharf, whether it comes from another State or from overseas, for the first seven days that consignment may lie on the wharf without any charge being made by the shipping companies. After seven days they make a charge of 2s. 6d. per ton or part of a ton. In pre-war days the charge was 1s. per ton, so you see they have raised the charge by 150 per cent.

Hon. T. C. BEIRNE: They want you to take away your goods quickly.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: I am speaking from personal experience of this. When a consignment of goods comes to Brisbane by boat it frequently happens that the documents are brought forward in another boat, arriving, perhaps, ten days or twelve days or a fortnight later. Your consignment of goods is landed on the wharf and put in some out-of-the-way corner, and you do not know a

thing about it until the documents are presented to you, perhaps a fortnight later. The practice is in all this business to pay on sight of documents. I have conferred with quite a number of people in business, and I learn from them that that is the general practice. The result is that, as your goods may have been lying on the wharf for a fortnight, you are charged demurrage.

Hon. T. C. BEIRNE: You are jolly lucky. As a rule, they are sent to the King's warehouse, and then you are charged storage.

Hon. W. R. CRAMPTON: Whenever the waterside workers, or organised labour generally, stands up for an increase of wages, whether it is the Chamber of Commerce or whatever other body it may be representing the employers of labour, they at once squeal and agitate against granting an increase in wages. But not one word is said against the imposition of these unfair conditions, because they can pass on the cost to the community. But they are very much troubled about a "smoke-oh," or about a reduction in the hours of work that are asked for by organised labour.

In addition to that, I also find that the Government are entitled to something like 1d. per parcel as harbour dues; but you cannot get a parcel of less than 1 cubic foot measurement from the wharf for less than 3d. The other 2½d. goes into the coffers of the shipping companies. That is the position we are in to-day. The shipping companies also charge you 10d. per ton for stacking, although there is no stacking done on any of the wharves to any extent. A hogshead is supposed to represent half a ton, and you are charged 5d. for stacking it, but it is simply thrown off the vessel on to the wharf without any attempt at stacking, and the same thing happens with a consignment of iron or steel, or steel goods. Yet in every case you are charged 10d. per ton for stacking. I am satisfied that this legislation should again be introduced, if for no other reason than to give us an opportunity of taxing those people who are best able to bear this particular kind of taxation.

I had something to say in connection with the Chillagoe Railway Bill and with many other subjects, but the time is getting on. I will, therefore, confine myself to touching upon the position of this Council. We know that we are not an elected body. We were never elected by the people. Some of us—I include myself in this—were rejected by the people. My hon. friend on the other side, who was Treasurer in the Kidston Ministry, was also rejected by the people. We are brothers together in this Chamber, and yet we have just as much say with regard to legislation as the men who have been elected by the people. I can remember going to the constituents of the Windsor electorate and asking them to elect me to make laws in the other Chamber for three years. They said to me, "No, we are not going to have you for three years, we prefer someone else." But, despite the fact that they turned me down, someone else was able to say, "Brother, go yonder to the Council and make laws—not for three years, but for the term of your natural life." I do not know whether we can congratulate ourselves, but we do not represent the people.

Hon. A. A. DAVEY: What about the referendum last year?

[Hon. W. R. Crampton.]

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: The referendum was only a mere myth and a shibboleth. The people were not given the opportunity to consider the question seriously. Consequently, they did the very opposite of what they intended to do. I am sure of that.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They would do the same again.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: Another opportunity is going to be given to the people to say whether we shall continue our political existence or not. I sincerely hope that the time does come when the people will be given an opportunity of saying whether we shall continue to exist as a Council, because the attitude adopted by this Council last session on many important measures that were passed by the Legislative Assembly shows clearly and conclusively that we have no right to exist at all.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We were against the extravagance of the Government.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: Of course you were against the extravagance of the Government, and you are going to be against the extravagance of the Government on this occasion! I am not going to humble myself to the Council, and I am not going to ask hon. members to pass Government measures. I am going to allow this Council to do just as it pleases. I am quite satisfied we shall be perfectly safe in the hands of the people when the question is referred to them.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We are prepared to go to the people.

HON. W. R. CRAMPTON: I am totally opposed to the bi-cameral system. When the members who represent the people go before the people they give an account of their stewardship, and if the people are not satisfied with that account, they can say whether these members shall be returned again or not, but this Chamber goes on for ever; the members of this House enjoy a power that we should not enjoy. We have power over the financial legislation and all the other legislation that may be introduced in another Chamber, and I do not think such a power should be vested in a Chamber which is not representative. I have much pleasure in moving the motion.

HON. T. NEVITT: I have very great pleasure in seconding the motion so ably proposed by my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Crampton.

I wish to tender my sympathy to the Hon. A. J. Thynne in the very serious bereavement which he suffered during the recess. Whilst as politicians we are divided on the political field of battle, yet when bereavement comes to any of the members of this Chamber I feel sure that the sympathy of every other member goes out to him in his bereavement.

I intend to be somewhat brief in my remarks, for several reasons. In the first place, the Council and the Assembly are called together very much earlier this year than they have been called together for many years past. That of itself proves that the Government are very sincere in their desire to do business, and I sincerely hope that the members of this Chamber will approach the different matters mentioned in

the Governor's Speech in a calm and dispassionate manner—in a manner somewhat different from the manner in which they approached some legislation of last session.

I wish to congratulate the Government on their very successful efforts in the country in March last. We had a good many members on the other side of the Chamber prophesying what the Government were going to meet with when they went to the country, but the Government met with a very different reception from that which members opposite anticipated.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They had a lot of luck.

HON. T. NEVITT: Do you think that the people of Queensland have not sufficient intelligence to decide which is the best party to represent them in the Legislative Assembly?

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They had a lot of luck, and you know how.

HON. T. NEVITT: They had this much luck, that they had had three successful years of administration, and the people recognised that they intended, as far as their powers would permit them, to improve the condition of the workers and producers as compared with what they had been in the past. That is what the people realised in March last when they sent back the Ryan Government with a bigger majority than they had before. The Government are now in possession of very great power, and I sincerely hope they will use that power with discretion, and I have sufficient confidence in the Government to believe that they will do so. We all know that we are passing through very troublesome times, and while we may not agree politically, I think we should try at a time like this to give each other credit for trying to the best of our ability to promote the welfare of the country (Hear, hear!)

I wish, further, to congratulate the Government upon the very statesmanlike programme they have submitted to Parliament in His Excellency's Speech. Every section of the community is catered for in that Speech. During the present session, we shall be called upon to place upon the statute-book legislation affecting every section of the community, and I am confident that if that legislation receives the fair and impartial treatment that it should receive, it will not be very long before we shall find that it will be of great benefit to the community. I would remind hon. gentlemen that the mandate which the Government have now received practically compels them to pass legislation that this House refused to pass on a former occasion.

I wish to call attention to paragraphs 2 and 3 in His Excellency's Speech. Paragraph 2 reads as follows:—

"I am confident you will all share my regret that the terrible war which has now lasted nearly four years has not yet ended in an honourable and enduring peace. Our chief consolation is the certainty that Germany's dream of universal dominion cannot be realised, and that the heroic and costly resistance which the Empire and its allies are offering to her lawless ambition will not have been in vain."

I think we can all fully subscribe to that

*Hon. T. Nevitt.]*

statement, no matter on which side of the House we sit. We all sincerely hope that the war will not last much longer, and that an honourable and enduring peace is not far away. I do not propose to read the whole of paragraph 3, but I cannot refrain from quoting the following sentence:—

“Such deeds, unfortunately, cannot be performed without heavy loss to the doers, and the ever-increasing number of dead and wounded among our valiant champions is a proof not only of their courage, but also of the dangers and difficulties they so cheerfully face.”

Unfortunately, I am afraid that we have still to have a great number more men injured and maimed before peace is brought about. I sincerely hope that the boys at the front will be reinforced in sufficient numbers from the various allies, so that the dawning of peace may not be unduly prolonged. I wish to refer to one or two phases of this question which call for some remark. Some people have said that the members of the Labour party do not go on recruiting platforms as much as they should do. My own personal view is that it is not those who go on public platforms either for or against conscription who do all the best work for the country. There are many other ways in which inducements can be held out to those who are physically fit to enlist in the defence of their country. If there was not so much commercial immorality amongst us, I feel confident that there would not be the same necessity to go upon the platform and solicit people to come forward and take their place amongst our comrades at the front. Then, again, some people have said that Australia has not done sufficient. Up to date, I maintain that she has done very well; but we shall never have done sufficient until we accomplish the end we are aiming for—that is, a successful putting down of German militarism. But when anyone says that Australia has not done enough, surely they do not realise that already we have sent over 320,000 men across the sea, and, with the number of rejects, very nearly half a million people have offered their services. Half a million out of a population of 5,000,000 means that one-tenth of the population have already offered their services to the country, and I feel sure that, if commercial morality was a little better than it is to-day, a great many more would have come forward. I shall give one or two instances where I consider improvements could be made. Here is a case in point showing what the “flag-waggers” of New South Wales were doing. This appeared in the “Brisbane Courier” of 24th April last—

“PATRIOTIC FUNCTIONS.

“INVESTIGATION IN NEW SOUTH WALES.

“Sydney, May 23.

“An immediate investigation of all the organisations and schemes to raise money for patriotic purposes has been decided upon by the Department of Repatriation. It is stated that in some cases action may have to be taken by the department under the powers conferred upon it by the War Precautions Act. Colonel Far, an officer of the department, intimated to-day that some striking cases had already come under notice. In one suburb a carnival for raising money for the insurance of

recruits was to yield 63 per cent. to the promoter, the remaining 37 per cent. going to the fund.”

I ask hon. gentlemen whether they think that is a fair thing. Under the cloak of assistance to wounded soldiers they get up an entertainment out of which they take 63 per cent. of the profits and hand back to the wounded soldiers only 37 per cent. These, and similar things, are what have caused a number of the physically fit not to come forward to defend their country. The same article continues—

“While in yet another case 80 per cent. of the takings were to go to the showman, the patriotic fund benefiting to the extent of 20 per cent.”

They use the soldiers as an advertisement to get the people to buy their tickets, and then extract 80 per cent. of the profits and put them in their own pockets, and hand back 20 per cent. to the soldiers. Those are the things that have caused a good deal of the so-called slacking in recruiting. I will give another instance of commercial immorality which has exactly the same effect as the instances I have already given. Messrs. Huddart, Parker, and Co. were fined £5 for supplying the Defence Department with coal 20 per cent. short of the quantity ordered. I will quote another instance with quite the opposite result, although I do not condone any policy of short weight in any shape or form. This particular case appeared in the Brisbane law courts, and it was also in connection with the supply of goods to the Defence Department, the deficiency being valued at 1s. 3d. The presiding magistrate fined the defendant an amount of £10 for robbing the Commonwealth of 1s. 3d. worth of crockery, but Huddart, Parker, and Co., one of the wealthiest companies in Australia, for robbing the Commonwealth of 20 per cent. of the goods for which they tendered, were only fined a “five-.” Even the Melbourne “Argus,” which it is well known has no sympathy for the men who hold Labour views, could not stand the bare-faced robbery of the Defence Department by the coal proprietors, and expressed itself in very strong terms on the subject in a leading article, pointing out that, as justice is administered in Australia to-day, there is one law for the rich and another for the poor. So long as these conditions exist, you cannot expect the physically fit to come forward to defend their country, because they are not going to defend such scoundrels as I have referred to. It is up to the people of Australia to do their duty and to leave no stone unturned until they put down such things as I have mentioned. I say, without fear of contradiction, that commercial morality is at a lower ebb to-day than ever in the annals of history. Our law courts in every direction have pointed this out. Look at the records of the law courts of Great Britain and the law courts of every civilised community, and you find that commercial morality is lower to-day than ever, and until the people of Australia realise what their duty is, not only to the soldiers, but to those who remain behind and have to produce the requirements of life, and give them a square deal, we are not going to get what we are looking for. The war, at the present time, is in such a critical stage that it is up to all parties in the community to settle their differences and do the best that is in them

[Hon. T. Nevitt.

to get the country out of its difficulties. In the past we have not been told the truth in a great many instances. When the allies had a reverse in France only the other day, what was the result? As soon as it became known in Australia a greater number of recruits came forward. Had the censor simply used his common sense, if he possessed any, and allowed information that is allowed to be sent broadcast in Great Britain—had he allowed the same information to be circulated broadcast in Australia, we would not be in the position we are in to-day, having to go upon the platform and beg and pray young fellows to come forward to defend their country. Give a Britisher all the facts; put them straight in his face, and he will be prepared to do his duty, provided that the people with the money are prepared also to do their duty and give him justice.

I wish to refer briefly now to a letter that I saw in a newspaper some little time ago over the signature of an hon. member of this Chamber. I do not intend to go into very great detail in connection with the

[5 p.m.] matter, but, as a member of this Chamber, I strongly resent some of the expressions contained in that letter. Speaking of Labour members, and members of unions generally, the hon. member said—

“They have a court and two judges to see that they are in no way molested nor in any degree injured. They have a trades hall to themselves. At the present time they are solicitously cared for by the Government. Is it much wonder that they claim all the dignity and privileges of the nation?”

I wish to point out the necessity for those two judges. According to the report for last year of the Director of Labour and the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops, the Labour Department found it necessary to institute prosecutions against forty-two persons in the city of Brisbane or its limits for breaches of the Industrial Peace Act and the Industrial Arbitration Acts and awards; and, under the Factories and Shops Acts, the department had to institute twenty-four prosecutions. In the country, under the Industrial Peace Act and Industrial Arbitration Act and awards, they had to initiate eighty-five prosecutions, and seventy-two prosecutions under the Factories and Shops Acts. The department was instrumental in recovering arrears of wages during the twelve months ended 30th June, 1917, on behalf of employees, of no less a sum than £11,196. I wonder how many judges the hon. member would have required if he and his friends had been robbed to the extent of £11,000. It is absolutely essential that judges should be provided to adjudicate in cases of this kind, when we find the employing class robbing their workers to the extent of £11,000 in one year. In this same letter the hon. member used what I term an insulting, jeering remark with reference to members of this Chamber. He said—

“The leading lights of the brilliant men at the front of our State politics to-day have begun the electoral campaign with an outburst of rancorous spite against the House of Parliament, which they induced the Governor to deteriorate, for manifest objects, last session.”

Implying that the members who were called to this Chamber by His Excellency last session had caused a deterioration in this

Chamber I throw the remark back in the hon. gentleman's teeth, and I say that the members of this party who were called to the Council last year are just as honourable as the hon. gentleman who used that expression.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Whoever he was, he only represented himself. He does not represent this Chamber.

HON. T. NEVITT: I know he is only one, but that is his opinion, and I give my opinion in the opposite direction, which I am perfectly entitled to do. Here is another extract from this letter—

“Note this, ye men who, by close application to business, devotion of your intellect to the higher aims of life, honesty in all your dealings, have earned money, and saved some of it.”

No doubt, there are a number of hon. members of this Chamber who have earned money, and earned it honestly. But the inference there is that other hon. members may have made money that they did not earn honestly. Yet we find any number of instances in the report of the Department of Labour which show that a good many business people in Queensland have tried to keep back from those who earned their money honestly an amount of over £11,000, and that the department was able to prevent those employers from defrauding their employees of that amount of money. Language of that kind does not become anyone, much less an hon. member of this Chamber. The hon. member further said in his letter—

“You may, a la mode democratical, in dealing with opponents, evade veracity, economise truth, substitute fictions for facts, freely use vulgar epithets when referring to your opponents.”

I can throw that remark back in the hon. member's teeth. Personally, I do not believe in using vulgar expressions at any time, but, when hon. members of this Chamber apply remarks of that kind to other hon. members, it is about time we got our backs up and retaliated.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Why don't you retaliate in the same paper as the letter appeared in?

HON. T. NEVITT: Would we get the same publicity as the hon. member got?

HON. P. J. LEAHY: You ought to try; you never know.

HON. T. NEVITT: I certainly did not try, but we have had experience of our prospects of success in the past.

I will now give, in reply to the hon. member's view of the members of the Labour party, the opinion of a man who is equally as good a judge of ability and in every other direction as the hon. member. This is what Lord Morley says, speaking of Labour members of the House of Commons—

“Will anybody who has watched the House of Commons say that in moderation of demeanour, in decency of manners, in self-respect, in freedom from swagger and assumption, these men have shown themselves inferior to men sitting by their side who have had all the opportunities of wealth, education, and culture. If I were leaving the House of Commons to-morrow, and were called upon to adjudicate a prize I would

Hon. T. Nevitt.]

impartially give the prize for good manners, for self-respect, for moderation of statement, for respect for the audience they addressed in the House of Commons, to the dozen Labour men whom we have had the pleasure of having amongst us rather than a dozen gentlemen I could name if I liked."

That comes from a man of world-wide reputation and an impartial observer.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: I suppose we are equally good here, are we not?

Hon. T. NEVITT: The men representing the Labour movement in this Chamber today come from exactly the same class as the men of whom Lord Morley was speaking when he used those words. My hon. friend who moved the adoption of the Address in Reply said he represented a class. We do represent a class.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: We represent everybody.

Hon. T. NEVITT: We represent the worker every time—not necessarily the manual worker alone, because there are many besides manual workers included in our movement. We have tried to the best of our ability to give everyone a fair and square deal. We are entitled to that, and, what is more, we are going to insist upon it. The people have given us a mandate, and we are going to put it into execution.

We come now to paragraph four of the Governor's Speech, which shows that the Government are not negligent in their duties so far as the returned soldier is concerned. We have had ample evidence of judging that the Government, from the very commencement of the war, realised the great responsibility thrown upon them to make the best provision possible for our returned soldiers when they came back to Queensland. They set apart a good portion of land at Beerburum and also at Sunnybank, and spent a good deal of money in both places. They also set aside some of the finest lands in the Central and Northern parts of Queensland. In another part of the Governor's Speech we find that about one-third of the Cecil Plains Estate is also specially reserved for returned soldiers. That shows that the Government have realised their duties and are fulfilling them to the best of their ability. I believe what has been said by impartial observers from other States, that, as far as they can gather, the Ryan Government have done more than any other Government in Australia for the returned soldier.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Victoria is far ahead of you. I will show you directly.

Hon. T. NEVITT: I am not as conversant with what has been done in Victoria as with what has been done in Queensland, but I know that at the present time there are many and valuable forms of land tenure in Queensland which are open for the returned soldier only. Impartial observers from other States have said that we are far ahead of any other State.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: It is not correct.

Hon. T. NEVITT: That may be so from the hon. gentleman's point of view. Of course, we cannot all see from the same point of view.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: I will give you some figures in a day or two.

[Hon. T. Nevitt.]

Hon. T. NEVITT: I shall have very great pleasure in listening to the hon. gentleman.

Now we come to the paragraph of the report mentioning the very serious storms and floods which have afflicted the Central and Northern parts of the State. We can all sympathise with those people who, in many cases, practically spent a lifetime in building up a little home for themselves and their families, and who in a few hours saw those homes totally destroyed. The Government realised their responsibilities in that direction and sent up representatives to each place to try and find out the immediate requirements of the people, and they did what they thought was necessary, under the circumstances, and tried to relieve the distress as much as possible. Men who have sprung from the ranks know exactly what privations of that kind mean to the worker. Those who have not sprung from the ranks, and who have been blessed with a good deal of this world's goods, do not always realise what is absolutely necessary in cases of that kind. We have had similar instances in the past, when troubles were not handled with the same liberality with which the present Government handled the late troubles in the North.

The next paragraph in the Speech relates to the State butchers' shops and the fish supply. My honourable friend dealt very fully with that portion of the Speech, and I shall not, therefore, trespass further on the time of the Council in that regard.

In the next paragraph of the Speech I notice, from my point of view, the very pleasing result of the land administration of the present Government. We were told that very few people have any belief in the perpetual lease system, but we find that some people who had a freehold tenure, or a tenure which could be converted into a freehold in the course of a few years, voluntarily giving up their freehold tenure and going in for a leasehold tenure.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: How many?

Hon. T. NEVITT: It does not give the number.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: I think there were three.

Hon. T. NEVITT: I will just read that paragraph for the information of the hon. gentleman. It says—

"Many selectors who held land as agricultural farms have brought their holdings under perpetual lease tenure. Cecil Plains Repurchased Estate, comprising an area of 120,947 acres, has been surveyed into 208 portions; about one-third of the estate (40,475 acres) has been set apart for soldier settlement, and the remainder will be opened for perpetual lease selection at an early date."

That is a very pleasing feature to those who have been advocating for practically a lifetime the leasehold tenure as against freehold. When you find people voluntarily giving up the freehold tenure for leasehold tenure it shows that we were on the right track when we advocated leasehold as against freehold.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: There is only a mere fraction.

Hon. T. NEVITT: There is an old saying, of which I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is aware, that a straw will indicate the direction of the wind, and a straw will indicate the trend of public opinion; and we know that the people backed the Govern-

ment up by sending them back with a bigger majority in the other House than was ever known before.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Not on that issue. You know the real reason why you came back, don't you?

HON. T. NEVITT: That was one of the issues, and it is very gratifying to myself, and I know that it must be so to my colleagues.

Then, we come to the question of forest reservation. In the past the Government of the State has been so negligent that at the present time there is only 1 per cent. of the lands of Queensland held for timber reserves. In thickly and densely populated countries like Europe they have something like 25 per cent. of forest land reserved. Is it not a reflection on the policy of past Administrations here? They have turned every reasonable asset they could into cash, and then they tell us that they have had surpluses.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: The conditions are different.

HON. T. NEVITT: Of course the conditions are different. The conditions are so much different that, instead of having 25 per cent. of our lands under forest in this country as they have in Europe, we should have considerably more.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: We have them in forests, but they are not reserved.

HON. T. NEVITT: If I read this paragraph correctly in the Governor's Speech, it means that there is only 1 per cent. of the lands of Queensland with marketable timber that are reserved. It behoves any Government to see that a considerable area of our lands that are inferior for agriculture and dairying purposes, but capable of producing marketable timbers, are put under timber for the benefit of future generations.

Then, the next paragraph alludes to the State produce agency. My colleague dealt very exhaustively with that matter, and I, therefore, shall not say anything further upon it than that I understand from those who are well able to judge that the State produce agency has been established on good lines, and there is every probability of it being not only a commercial success but satisfactory to producer and consumer alike. It will be the means of bringing the producer and consumer much more closely together, and thereby saving a good deal of unnecessary cost, and from what I can learn there is every probability of the venture turning out what may be termed a howling success.

Last year the seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply said that there were certain undertakings which private enterprise could not and would not develop, and that it was the duty of the country to develop them. Well now, that is exactly the attitude we take up in connection with the Iron and Steel Works Bill. But how did hon. members on the other side treat that Bill last session? The Government placed before them the absolute necessity that existed at that time—and I am sure that at the present time the necessity is greater—that we should become as nearly as possible self-supporting. That Bill was not passed. But the Government is so determined, so sincere in its

business methods, that it is going to reintroduce the Bill as early as possible, to see whether hon. members of this Chamber will not give it the serious consideration the Government requires, in order to put it on a fair and sound foundation.

HON. R. SUMNER: The scene is changed—we have won the elections.

HON. T. NEVITT: No doubt; and I hope that that is one of the reasons which will induce them to give this matter the consideration it requires. What does our friend the "Brisbane Courier" say on this matter? On the 22nd of the present month, in a leading article or a sub-leader, it made use of the following words:—

"As a matter of principle, the interference of the State in the domain of private enterprise is nothing but trespass, and is justifiable neither morally nor economically."

Fancy the "Brisbane Courier" speaking of anything being justified "morally"! The "Brisbane Courier," in its old age, is learning something. It is trying to make people believe that it is possessed of morals. Well, I sincerely hope that it will put its commercial morality to a little better use than in the past—that is, by giving a fair deal to everybody who should get a square deal. In the past it has not given to members on this side of the Chamber, to members of this political line of thought, either a fair, or a just, or a reasonable deal—and yet it talks about morals! In a further statement it says—

"Normally speaking, prices are subject to the control of free and honest competition."

I ask any hon. member whether those words are true at the present time? Why, every business man knows, every man who purchases anything in the community knows, that we are not open to free and honest competition. Anything but free! We are not free in a thousand and one ways. Let a man set up a certain line of business and he will find, if he does not care to adhere to the prices laid down by the different associations, that he is not free. They will not even supply him with material at all.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Are not prices regulated now?

HON. T. NEVITT: Some of them only. I say that it was never justifiable for anybody to make use of those words, particularly at the present time. Everybody knows that there is no free competition. Certainly not within these last ten or twelve or twenty years have we had free competition in commercial life in every way in Queensland.

Now, just a few words on the mining industry. My hon. friend dealt exhaustively with the mining industry, but I would just like to give my modicum of praise to the Minister occupying the position of Secretary for Mines, and also to his predecessor. In my estimation, those two Ministers have done more for the mining industry than all other Ministers put together. They have administered their department in a more business-like, a more just, and a more reasonable manner than it has ever experienced before. Take the question of State batteries. When I was a member of the other House, and long before, the party advocated the erection

[Hon. T. Nevitt.]



of State batteries. The hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of President of the Council was the first Secretary for Mines to put the idea into practical operation, with the result that the battery which was established has been a very material benefit to the Wolfram Camp district. I sincerely hope that the present Minister will continue in that same line of action. Then, again, those Ministers opened a free assay office in Cloncurry, and another in Mareeba, which have been of very material advantage to those mineral districts. For many, many years we had been asking past Governments to do that, but they would not budge an inch; they left everything to private enterprise. With what result? Where is the gold mining industry to-day? Had the department been administered by such liberal-minded men as the present Minister and his predecessor, I believe that the gold-mining industry would not have been in such a languishing state as we find it to-day; it would have been in a much better condition. Then, again, take the Roma oil bore. The Ryan Government made a national monopoly of the mineral oil resources of Queensland, with the result that, I believe, from all accounts—geologists' reports and so on—that we are on the eve of a great discovery in the Roma district. If we can only strike oil in payable quantities, there is not the slightest doubt that it will relieve the Government of Queensland in their financial troubles very materially, because at the present time we pay something like 200 or 250 per cent. more for kerosene, benzine, and other mineral oils than in pre-war times. If we could only strike oil in payable quantities in the Roma district, there would be such a revolution in Queensland for the benefit of the people of Queensland that it would be a very much happier country to live in.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: If we do not?

Hon. T. NEVITT: Well, we shall have to go on trying somewhere else, because there are other places in Queensland which have indications of containing oil under the surface.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Better indications, too.

Hon. T. NEVITT: That I do not know. But I do know that there are other districts, and I sincerely hope that, if we fail here, we are not going to close down altogether. I hope the Government will not allow that plant to lie idle, but will utilise it in other places. All we want are the sinews of war.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: We will see that they do it.

Hon. T. NEVITT: Hon. members have been such fine advocates in the past of socialistic enterprises that I am quite sure, now that they know what the voice of the people has been, that they will turn round and exercise their abilities in that direction. The mover of the Address in Reply last year also said that there was not a Bill of any great importance in the Governor's Speech. That hon. member should be highly flattered, because in two directions the Government have followed out the little hints—shall I call them—that he gave. One was that the Government had not dealt with their financial proposals in the Speech. On this occasion they had referred to them in the Speech to some extent. Then, again, we have some very, very important Bills amongst the measures presented. We have, for instance, the Health

Bill. In my estimation that is one of the most important Bills with which it is possible for any Chamber to deal. At the present time there is great room for improvement in our Health Act. More stringent and more liberal methods are necessary to deal with the red plague and the white plague. Fortunately, our medical gentlemen—and we have two in this Chamber who are always prepared to place their knowledge at the disposal of the Chamber, and although I have not been here very long, I have read their speeches when any Health Bill or any other measure dealing with the medical faculty was before the Chamber—fortunately, the medical faculty the world over are now realising and bringing under the notice of the people the great necessity of dealing with the red plague and the white plague, and the prevention of the destruction of infantile life. Our Government have taken the bull by the horns, so to speak, and opened baby clinics. Although the Hon. Mr. Fowles, when speaking on this question last year, was told that the Government intended to deal with baby clinics, he replied, "Yes, in seven, or eight, or ten years' time." In less than as many weeks after the hon. gentleman spoke—in fact, I think even at the time he was speaking—the Home Department had made investigations as to the best methods to adopt to prevent this great destruction of infantile life, with the result that a few weeks after the hon. gentleman spoke baby clinics were established in Brisbane. Medical gentlemen have informed me that they are doing very excellent work, and I understand that the Government are going to extend the clinics to other parts of the State.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Did you not start them a week before the elections?

Hon. T. NEVITT: Could you organise baby clinics in a week, or a month, or a year before the elections? It takes a considerable amount of investigation to acquire the information you need before you can establish matters of the kind on a successful basis. There is one thing I can say, and that is that all the Governments the hon. gentleman has supported during the whole of his political life never thought it worth their while to do anything to save infantile life.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Any Government I supported did.

Hon. T. NEVITT: They never took any action in that direction. It is only during the last six months that anything worth a mention has been done to prevent the destruction of infantile life.

There is another phase of this question on which I should like to say a few words, and that is cremation. I understand that a measure is to be introduced dealing with cremation, and I hope that cremation will be made compulsory, especially in the case of infectious diseases. Steps should be taken to make cremation popular by having lectures delivered on the subject.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Why not make it a plank of the party platform?

Hon. T. NEVITT: The party have the health of the people at heart. At any rate, I sincerely hope that included in the Bill will be provisions making cremation compulsory. There are a number of other things that I should have liked to have brought under your notice, but time is passing, and I shall conclude by calling attention to the financial proposals of the Government. The

[Hon. T. Nevitt.]

last paragraph of His Excellency's Speech gives the reason why increased taxation is necessary. It says—

“During the year the railway service and certain other Government employees have secured awards from the Arbitration Court. In addition, industrial agreements under the Arbitration Act have been made between the Government and certain branches of the public service, including the teachers, police, prisons and asylum employees, general officers, professional officers, and others.”

The railway service alone is responsible for an increase of £759,000, owing to the increased rates of wages paid under the awards and the increased cost of material. The producers of Queensland will have to make up that deficiency.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: You have not told us how the Northern railway strike was settled.

HON. T. NEVITT: It was settled in a satisfactory manner, and without bloodshed.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Has the New Zealand judge sent in his award?

HON. T. NEVITT: I am not in the confidence of the Government in that matter, but I have no doubt that if a question is addressed to the Minister he will supply the information. The railway employees, the school teachers, the police, and the other officers enumerated in the Governor's Speech have been given something like a reasonable award, and the result will be, if you do not pass the taxation proposals of the Government, that there will be a deficit. It is the duty of the Government to make income and expenditure meet as far as lies in their power, and they are going to try to do that by the imposition of four additional taxes—*income tax, land tax, succession and probate duties, and stamp duties.* Those are the methods by which they propose to make up the deficit, and they have a mandate from the country that members of this Council shall give serious consideration to those measures and allow them to pass, so that the Government may close the year with a small surplus instead of a deficit. They are going to put the burden on those who are able to carry it. I have here a quotation which shows commercial morality as it exists to-day, and it is too good not to be printed in “*Hansard.*” It reads thus—

“The New York City Department of Health has unearthed a sensational fraud in the manufacture of fake salvarsan. The imitation, which was put up in New York and sold widely throughout the United States, as well as in Canada, Mexico, and Central America, consists of ordinary table salt coloured with a little aniline dye. The package, circular, ampoules, and every visible detail of the original article are cunningly imitated. It is believed that at least 50,000 doses of the fake article have been sold. Considering what salvarsan is sold for, the faker of salvarsan reaches about the limit of the depths of human callousness for gold.”

Those are the kind of people that we are trying to root out of the country.

HON. A. H. WHITTINGHAM: That is not in Australia.

HON. T. NEVITT: We have the same class of people in Australia.

HON. A. H. WHITTINGHAM: I don't believe that.

HON. T. NEVITT: I will bring you evidence of it before I am very much older. The object of this party is to root out men of that class, and to prevent any more men of a similar class taking root in the country.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: That is our object, too.

HON. T. NEVITT: Then you have not demonstrated it in the past.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: It is not our fault.

HON. T. NEVITT: It is your fault, or the fault of the Government of the day, because, if there were stringent legislation on the statute-book, those people could not exist in Queensland. I have very much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—That the Council do now adjourn.

Question put and passed.

The Council adjourned at twenty minutes to 6 o'clock p.m.