

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Council

THURSDAY, 27 OCTOBER 1921

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THURSDAY, 27 OCTOBER, 1921.

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN (Hon. T. Nevitt) took the chair at 3.30 p.m.

CHEESE POOL BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones), this Bill, received by message from the Assembly, was read a first time.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: This Bill is the outcome of deputations representing co-operative cheese factories, before and after a conference of cheese producers held in Toowoomba in March last, at which the following resolution was carried:—

“That, in the interests of the cheese

Hon. A. J. Jones.]

producers of Queensland, it is necessary for the purpose of controlling the marketing of cheese that a pool be formed."

I want to emphasise the fact that this is one of the very many measures that have been introduced by the Government since they came into power in the interests of the primary producers. I have quite a lot of departmental information on this Bill, but I think it will be wise to allow the Bill to get into Committee, because it is a measure that can be much better debated in Committee than on its second reading stage. Hon. gentlemen understand the provisions of the Bill, and there is no need for me to speak at any length, except to emphasise the fact that it is a Bill which has been introduced at the request of the people who are engaged in the cheese industry.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Will you accept any amendments in Committee?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We always are prepared to accept amendments on this side if they are likely to improve the Bill. Hon. gentlemen know very well that the Government have accepted very many amendments on most Bills. I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Like the Government, we on this side are always prepared to be reasonable. The Minister says that this Bill is brought in at the request of the people concerned—the people who want to sell their cheese and want to get the best possible price for it, and as the hon. gentleman has promised to give us further information in Committee, I do not think I need say any more just now. Hon. gentlemen on this side are prepared to do everything they can to help along the primary industries of Queensland. The cheese industry is one that can be made a very big factor in Queensland, and one that will help to settle some of our unsettled lands that are not being worked at the present time. I welcome anything that is likely to give the man on the land a chance to make a better living than he is doing at the present time.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

(Hon. L. McDonald, Acting Chairman, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 to 3, both inclusive, put and passed.

Clause 4—"State Cheese Board"—

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES asked what salary was to be paid to the members of the board.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have no information at present.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 put and passed.

Clause 7—"Delivery to be made in name of producer"—

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: Had any arrangement been made by which the State inspectors were working in harmony with the Federal inspectors on the question of grading and the giving of certificates? When the Council appointed a Select Committee to go into that matter some time ago, it was found that, although the inspectors themselves were

[Hon. A. J. Jones.

working in complete harmony, nevertheless, the departments were at variance, and butter passed as A grade by the State inspectors was refused as B grade by the Federal authorities. In a matter such as that relating to a primary industry which was really outside politics altogether, surely some arrangement could be made whereby the State grading would be accepted by the Federal authorities and the shipping of such articles oversea not held up? There should be no necessity for a second grading or a second certificate.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said the question raised by Mr. Fowles was a very debatable point. It strengthened his argument when speaking on another Bill, when he said that Australia was suffering from over-government and conflicting legislation and administration. In the Legislative Assembly the Secretary for Agriculture failed to get an answer from the representatives of the primary producers there as to which control they most desired as regards grading. Probably members on the Government side of the House differed on that particular point, and there were some questions on which they should be allowed to differ. Probably Ministers differed; but he was inclined to agree with the Hon. Mr. Fowles that it should not be necessary to have dual grading on one commodity, and the argument which appealed most to him was that one grading for one product in Australia should be quite sufficient. However, the hon. gentleman himself had not said whether he preferred Commonwealth or State grading.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: The Commonwealth have the last word.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said he thought it would be admitted that the Secretary for Agriculture had paid a great deal of attention, not only to that Bill, but also to all other matters affecting his department, and he was very strongly in favour of State grading, which he did not desire to relinquish. The Secretary for Agriculture held that there should be one form of grading, and it should be that of the State.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: Butter in London is sold as Australian, and not Queensland butter.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Just so. Probably that difficulty could be overcome by the Commonwealth grading for export only. However, they could not alter that here. He noticed that the matter had been the subject of negotiations between the Commonwealth Department concerned and the Department of Agriculture.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 to 12, both inclusive, put and passed.

Clause 13—"Board may require holders of cheese, etc., to furnish returns"—

Hon. P. J. LEAHY asked if the word "Gazette" meant the "Government Gazette"? There were various newspapers called "The Gazette." There was a "Gazette" at Toowoomba, and there was the "Farmers' Gazette."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Acts Shortening Act shows that it means the "Government Gazette."

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Would the matter be advertised in papers circulating in cheese manufacturing districts? If that were not

done he contended the advertisement would be useless.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That section was taken from the Wheat Pool Act, which was working very satisfactorily.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 14 and 15 put and passed.

Clause 16—“*Non-liability of board for payment in good faith*”—

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Under the clause as it was framed an innocent man might suffer. The clause was all right so far as the board was concerned, for it was thoroughly protected, but suppose a man took cheese which did not belong to him and sold it to the board; what about the rightful owner?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The board is fully protected.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Surely there were others who required protection besides the board. He therefore thought the claim should be amended, and that it was the Minister's duty to frame an amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am not going to do it.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 17 and 18 put and passed.

Clause 19—“*Accounts of receipts and disbursements to be kept*”—

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES said it was possible, under the wheat pool, that losses would be debited against consolidated revenue. He understood there was litigation already pending, amounting to some thousands of pounds. But where were the expenses of litigation to come from under that Bill? There was no clause providing for losses or expenses or litigation. Under the wheat board arrangement he understood all possible losses were chargeable to the State.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 20 put and passed.

Clause 21—“*Recovery of penalties*”—

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN thought sub-clause (4) contained a harsh provision, for it made a managing director equally culpable with the actual offender, both of whom might be subjected to light punishment. Suppose an employee committed an offence rendering him liable to £10 fine and a month's imprisonment; was the managing director to share the privilege of going to gaol, too?

[4 p.m.]

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES agreed that one or the other should be made liable, but not both. In the Commissioner for Railways' last report there were two cases of employees who had defaulted. Would it be fair that the Commissioner himself should be made equally liable with them for punishment? Under the Liquor Act he had always thought it was an injustice that a hotelkeeper should be punished because of an employee, against the licensee's instructions and without his knowledge, selling liquor during prohibited hours. He did not agree with that at all. The clause read—

“the individual person guilty of the offence, and also the managing director or other manager in Queensland of the company, shall each of them be liable to like punishment.”

That should read—

“each but not both of them shall be liable to punishment.”

HON. P. J. LEAHY: He suggested the insertion, after the word “company,” of the words “who has knowledge of the offence.” If all those people had knowledge of the offence, they should be treated alike, but it was a wrong thing that a man without a knowledge of the offence should be punished for something another person did. If the Minister accepted either the Hon. Mr. Fowles's or his (Mr. Leahy's) suggestion, no injustice would be done. Supposing there was some association which was affected by a similar Act, and the Hon. Mr. Collings was appointed the organiser, and the Minister the head of that organisation, would the Hon. Mr. Jones like to be responsible for what the Hon. Mr. Collings did without his knowledge?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Was the Minister not going to accept the Hon. Mr. Fowles's amendment? The Minister had told them distinctly that he was going to accept reasonable amendments. What was more reasonable than the Hon. Mr. Fowles's amendment? The clause distinctly said that a person guilty of an offence should be punished, and that a director of the company, because he happened to be a director, although he had no knowledge of the offence, had to share in the punishment.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He thought the hon. gentlemen were arguing from a wrong standpoint. The Hon. Mr. Hawthorn had stated that if a boy took cheese it would be an offence under the clause. The clause read: “If any person committing an offence against this Act is a company.” The case was mentioned that if a mining company committed a breach of the Act, and the manager of the mine was not in the mine at the time, he was responsible, and he was the person proceeded against. There was absolutely nothing wrong with the clause.

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: Probably, it was want of knowledge of the law that was his difficulty. It seemed to him an utterly comprehensible clause, and one that should be understood. It was nothing else than what it said, that there was to be only one person who was to be punished, if guilty.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Two are to be punished.

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: The clause did not say, as hon. gentlemen opposite suggested, that the manager should also be found guilty. It simply said that he also was liable for punishment, but it must, first of all, be proved that he had guilty knowledge of the offence.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Will you add the words “if he is guilty”?

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: The clause was so obvious that the hon. gentleman should not suggest such words. All this clause suggested was that, not only should the guilty person be dealt with, but the manager was also liable, but it did not say it was to be presupposed that he was guilty.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: You are punishing him for something of which he has no knowledge.

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: It did not presume he had guilty knowledge.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 22 put and passed.

Hon. W. F. Finlayson.]

Clause 23—"Regulations"—

HON. P. J. LEAHY: He was pleased to see the paragraph in this clause that "all regulations shall be published in the 'Gazette,' and shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It will not be necessary to have this now.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: If the Government did not think it was necessary, why was it included in the Bill? Probably, it anticipated something that was not legal.

Clause put and passed.

The Council resumed.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—That the report be adopted.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: How is the three-fourths majority provided for in the Bill to be arrived at? The Bill will probably never come into operation, because they have to get a three-fourths majority of all parties to vote for it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I understand a vote has been taken.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Have three-fourths agreed to it?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Seventy-five per cent.

HON. W. STEPHENS: They have not agreed to it yet.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: According to a deputation which waited on the Minister for Agriculture, there is no doubt about it that three-fourths of those engaged in the industry want the Bill.

Question put and passed.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

I would point out that clause 1 provides that "As soon as may be after the passing of this Act, the Minister shall cause a ballot to be taken, in the manner directed by him, of the cheese producers and dairy farmers supplying milk to cheese factories on the question 'Shall the Cheese Pool Act of 1921 be brought into force?'" The deputation which waited on the Minister assured him that a larger number than three-fourths of those engaged in the industry would vote for the Bill; and the Bill is the outcome of that deputation and requests which were made by those engaged in the industry to have the measure passed.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: In the Constitution Act Amendment Bill which was passed last night, there is a clause which states that all references to the Council, or both Houses of Parliament, in Bills passed up to yesterday, were to be repealed to that extent, and the necessary alterations made. This Bill is being passed through the Legislative Council subsequent to the passage of the Bill abolishing the Council.

HON. J. S. COLLINGS: The abolition is not accomplished yet.

Question put and passed.

The Bill was ordered to be returned to the Legislative Assembly by message in the usual form.

[Hon. P. J. Leahy.

PAPERS.

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

Regulations under the Elections Act of 1915.

Thirty-sixth report of the Registrar of Friendly Societies, Building Societies, and Industrial and Provident Societies.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACTS
AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, this Bill, received by message from the Assembly, was read a first time.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It will be admitted by hon. members that the Workers' Compensation Act on our statute-book is one of the best Acts of its character on any statute-book in the world. While admitting that fact, we still say that the Act is not absolutely perfect. When legislation of this kind is first introduced, it must of necessity be of an experimental nature, and we find as we go on that amendments are necessary, because altered conditions arise which have to be met by an amendment of the Act. When we pass this measure to-day we can safely say that it is the best measure of its kind in the world. One of the things that has characterised this Government since it came into power—

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Is its extravagance.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No—is its humane legislation.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It was introduced by a Liberal Government in Queensland, and surpassed in South Australia and New Zealand.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Workers' Compensation Act referred to by hon. gentlemen was passed in Queensland in 1905. I was then a member of the Legislative Assembly, where we had a Labour party numbering thirty-five members out of a total of seventy-two members of Parliament. It was part of the contract made with Mr. Hinchcliffe when we formed the coalition that we should get this measure. Mr. Blair was then Attorney-General, and he was a fairly democratic gentleman, and this measure was passed. It was passed at the point of the pistol, as it were. When the Mount Mulligan disaster took place, I read in the "Daily Mail" a reference to the Workers' Compensation Act, and it said that thanks were due to the Liberal Government for passing it in Queensland.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: It was the Liberal Government that passed it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: But it was always a Labour reform. If the hon. gentleman likes to look up the records he will see that the first Bill in reference to workers' compensation ever introduced into the Queensland Parliament was brought in by the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher when he was member for Gympie in the Legislative Assembly. At that time the Labour party were in a sad minority, and we could not pass the measure. I claim that to the Labour

party alone, and to no other party, is due the credit for placing the Workers' Compensation Act on our statute-book.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: What is the good of electioneering now. There is no election near.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: In 1915, when we had a true Labour Government in power, and when we had forty-five members out of a total of seventy-two in the Assembly, we introduced legislation to remove litigation from the Workers' Compensation Act.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: What a reflection on your Government if you had forty-five in 1915 and now have a majority of one only.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. gentleman cannot ruffle me with arguments of that sort. In 1905 I was returned for the Burnett by a majority of 500, and a few years later I was defeated for another constituency by the same majority. But that did not alter my principles in the slightest.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: You admit that minorities have rights.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Yes, minorities have rights. The object of this Bill, briefly summarised, is to make workers' compensation insurance an absolute State monopoly in Queensland. I think that is a wise provision.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It has always been a State monopoly.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It will be a State monopoly after the passage of this measure, but it is not absolutely a State monopoly at present. This Bill makes it perfectly clear. I heard hon. gentlemen say last night that we could not point to one good action done by this Council. I know of one good action which can be credited to the Legislative Council, and that is the mistake they made in connection with the very measure we are now discussing. When it was before this Chamber in 1916 we made it a State monopoly. The Bill is further broadened by allowing farmers, prospectors, gougiers, and other classes of persons, whether employees or not, to be brought by regulations within the provisions of this measure.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Can a man insure himself under this Bill?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If the hon. gentleman wants to insure himself he can walk down to the State Insurance Office and they will insure him. There is another wise provision in this Bill, and that is the one which increases the benefits to be paid to injured married workers. It fixes the minimum compensation at £2 per week, and he receives 5s. per week for each child under fourteen years of age, or a maximum compensation for himself and children of £3 10s. per week. The Bill is one of a few clauses. I have information about every clause if hon. gentlemen desire it, but I think we can discuss them in Committee. I do not know whether hon. members can spell repudiation into this Bill or not.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: We ought to examine it and see if it is there.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think that even hon. members opposite will welcome this Bill. We are living in an age when the employers of labour themselves are desirous of compensating their workmen. I am satisfied that a vast majority of employers

are glad to see compensation paid to the widows and children of injured workers, and to see that they are not left in want.

Hon. T. J. O'SHEA: You had better be careful. You will be fired out.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I know a great many employers who have found a good deal of benefit from this particular Act. I could quote figures from Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia, and other States to prove that this form of insurance is 100 per cent. cheaper in Queensland than in the other States.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: What do you mean by 100 per cent. cheaper? You must be taking some of the risks for nothing at all.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I mean 50 per cent. (Laughter.) I know where it costs £2 10s. in one of the States, it costs £1 5s. in Queensland. I hope the Bill will have a speedy passage through [4.30 p.m.] this Chamber. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite will give this Bill their very hearty support, because it is a step in the right direction, and will help a body of citizens who desire protection. I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: I would ask the Minister whether members of Parliament come under this Bill?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: The present law is that any person receiving over £400 a year is not to be deemed a worker under the Act, and this Bill proposes to lift it up to £500 a year, so that in future anyone getting more than £500 a year will not be regarded as a worker. If the Minister would accept it, I would move an amendment to provide that anyone who works is to be regarded as a worker under this Bill. Why should there be a limit of £500 at all?

Hon. J. S. COLLINGS: Because at present we are more concerned with attending to the under dog.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Every hon. gentleman on this side of the Council will welcome anything that will make the Workers' Compensation Act a perfect Act; but I think it is going a little too far to alter the definition of "worker" to apply to a man who is getting £10 a week—£400 a year is a very fair salary, and any man in receipt of more than that salary should be prepared to pay his own premium for workers' compensation.

Hon. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It is a tax on industry to a certain extent.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The employer should be relieved of all responsibility in the matter of paying his employees workers' compensation in regard to employees receiving over £400 a year? A man with £500 a year ought to be well able to pay the small amount necessary to insure himself against accidents. It was supposed to be in the interests of the working man that this was brought in, as the man upon whom it would be a tax might not be able to pay his own compensation premium. However, it is all right, but it is a hit at the employer.

Hon. J. S. COLLINGS: It is putting the saddle on the right horse every time.

Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.]

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Yes, hit him up every time, and down with capital.

Hon. J. S. COLLINGS: You never heard anybody say, "Down with capital." I have said, "Down with the capitalist."

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: There is another view of it that I am against. Clause 12 (19b) provides that—

"Notwithstanding any other Act, the Commissioner of Taxes appointed under the laws relating to State income tax may disclose to the Insurance Commissioner any information in his possession or any facts of which he has knowledge relating to any matter arising under this Act."

When the Income Tax Act was passed, a special feature was made of the fact that it was going to be worked with absolute secrecy—that all the officials in the Income Tax Office would be bound over not to divulge any information of any kind relating to the income tax returns. That has always been a very strong feature in making the income tax acceptable. The doing away with that secrecy clause is a mistake. In any matter, whether the Commissioner of Workers' Compensation wants information or not, he should not be allowed to go to the income tax officers to get it. He can ask for a declaration in connection with anything he likes, and he can get all the information quite easily without going to the Income Tax Office. I think it is a mistake, and a breach of the intention when the Income Tax Act was passed.

HON. H. G. MCPHAIL: There are different forms of legislation passed by this Legislature; there is revenue-producing legislation, legislation dealing with the moral aspect of things, and humanitarian legislation, and this is one of those measures which we all agree with in so far as it is going to help those who need it most at a certain time. The principal Act has been growing in favour with all sections of the community, notwithstanding the attitude that the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn has adopted to-day, which is one of fault-finding. The hon. gentleman says that the burden is placed upon the shoulders of the employer. If the hon. gentleman reads the Bill he will see that there is extended to employers in this measure the right to insure. Clause 3 reads—

"including the insurance of farmers, prospectors, gougers, or any other class of persons, whether employees or not, who may desire insurance."

Is that not an advantage to the man who desires to insure himself against accidents? I would like to point out in connection with the principal Act that I had occasion to deal with a case which came to me, and which proved to be a hardship. Two or three men were engaged in a small company of their own, and, of course, they did not come under the Act. The company was afterwards converted into a limited liability company, and one of those gentlemen really became an employee. Just before the official declaration of the company had been made, one of the men unfortunately lost the use of an eye as the result of an explosion, but owing to the fact that the company was not declared to be registered, he was not entitled to any compensation. However, on the matter being brought before the Minister who had charge of that depart-

[*Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.*]

ment, he very generously agreed to make him an allowance.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Had any policy been taken out at all?

HON. H. G. MCPHAIL: The policy was void until this man was declared to be an employee, and he was not an employee because he was one of the proprietors of the company; but he did become an employee after the company was re-formed. Through the generosity of the Minister, he was allowed a very reasonable sum as compensation for the loss of his eye. Under this Bill any employer who desires to insure himself will be entitled to do so. That is a very liberal provision, and one that will be appreciated. It is legislation of this kind which really proves to the outside public that the Government have that feeling of sympathy, that humanitarianism, which should be displayed by all legislators.

HON. T. J. O'SHEA: By letting a man insure himself.

HON. H. G. MCPHAIL: Even by letting a man insure himself against accidents under this Bill. Referring to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Hawthorn with regard to those people drawing larger salaries than £400 a year, I ask, why should not a man who is drawing £520 or £600 a year be entitled to some of the benefits under this Bill?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Even at the expense of his employer?

HON. H. G. MCPHAIL: Even at the expense of the employer. We have to bear in mind that to-day £500 a year is not much better than £300 a year was a few years ago.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The trend is the other way now.

HON. H. G. MCPHAIL: The trend may be that way, but not to any great extent. After all, who pays the premium? The employer passes it on to someone else. Do we not find in connection with every award that is made to-day granting an increase of wages to employees that it is passed on to the general public? And if the employees get a rise of 5 per cent. in wages you generally find 10 per cent. passed on, which shows clearly that it is not the employer who has to bear the burden. The Act will be considerably improved by the amendments proposed in this Bill, and the public outside, when they realise the added benefits that are now being obtained, will feel gratified that the Government have taken this action to broaden the scope of the measure.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

(*Hon. L. McDonald, Acting Chairman, in the chair.*)

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, put and passed.

Clause 5—"Repeal of section 7"—

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: This clause read—

"Section 7 of the principal Act is repealed."

Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Collings could tell them what section 7 of the principal Act was.

HON. J. G. COLLINGS: I can tell you that the Lower House knows all about it, and it does not matter what we know.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: That clause repealed section 7 of the principal Act, which gave companies power to issue accident insurance policies. What would be the effect of the passing of the Bill? Would it mean that no more policies should be issued?

HON. J. S. COLLINGS: It does not repeal the policies.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Were policies to cease, or did policies at present in force continue?

HON. J. S. COLLINGS: It says policies shall be issued only by the Commissioner. Read the preceding clause; it is all there.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It had nothing to do with the preceding clause. He was dealing with clause 5 of the Bill. There were hundreds of policies still in existence under clause 7 of the principal Act. What provision was being made regarding them? Were they to be allowed to elapse by effluxion of time, or were they to be transferred to a State Insurance Department, or what?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Clause 5 of the Bill, of course, repealed section 7 of the principal Act. He did not know whether it was necessary to make any such provision as that suggested by the Hon. Mr. Fowles. His interpretation of the Act would be that no interference would take place with policies already issued, but that after the passing of that Bill no policies could be issued by a company for accident insurance.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES said insurance companies had had to pay large sums as security to the Government. Those amounts varied, he thought, from £800 to £5,000. For the payment of those amounts the companies were allowed to issue an unlimited number of accident policies. If the Government now deprived the companies of that right, would they return the deposits, or would they keep them, or would they return only part of them? He did not suppose the Government would return a penny of them. The injustice of the matter was that, although the Government prevented companies from issuing accident policies, they did not return the guarantees paid in respect of such policies.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 12, both inclusive, put and passed.

Clause 13—"Amendment of section 20"—

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN asked the Minister for some information as to the subclause which gave the Commissioner power to impose penalties not exceeding £300. Was that not rather a severe penalty for a Commissioner to be allowed to impose?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: An amendment has been accepted by the Assembly reducing it to £100.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: But the Bill says £300.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I omitted to state on the second reading that the amendment was accepted in the Assembly.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Well, why do you not have correctly printed Bills circulated here?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is not sufficient time.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: That was what members on that side continually complained of. Bills were rushed through before members had time to know what they really were.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The altered Bill is here now.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN said that in a couple of days the Council was asked to rush through business which would take from three to six months' careful consideration. In the previous sitting, between half-past 2 and half-past 3 o'clock in the morning no less than six Bills were passed.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They were not very important measures.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: What about the Magistrates Courts Bill?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That was fully discussed in the other House.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It was not fair to ask any body of men to rush through Bills in that way.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You rushed home.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: He went home at 11 o'clock. He did not want to remain to rush through Bills in that way.

Clause put and passed.

The Council resumed.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

The report was adopted.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a third time."

Question put and passed.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I move—

"That the Bill do now pass."

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: This is a very excellent Bill and really affects every employee and employer in Queensland. I suggest, therefore, that the Minister give instructions to the Government Printing Office to issue the consolidated form of the Act as soon as possible.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I will convey your suggestion to the Premier.

Question put and passed.

The Bill was ordered to be returned to the Assembly by message in the usual form.

MAINTENANCE ORDERS (FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT) BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, this Bill, received by message from the Assembly, was read a first time.

[5 p.m.]

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am sure that this measure is acceptable to all hon. gentlemen of this Council, and, as a matter of fact, the measure has been introduced here at the request of the Imperial authorities; therefore, I am sure, it will have the support especially of hon. gentlemen opposite. Hon. gentlemen understand quite well the objects of the Bill.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You have not told us what they are, so how can we understand them?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. gentleman knows very well that it would be wasting the time of the Council to explain the Bill in detail. It is self-explanatory.

Hon. A. J. Jones.]

The hon. gentleman knows the objects of the Bill is to allow persons to be proceeded against in Queensland who may have committed the offence of desertion in Great Britain, and there will be reciprocity between the different States. I beg to move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

(*Hon. L. McDonald, Acting Chairman, in the chair.*)

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—“*Enforcement in Queensland of maintenance orders made elsewhere*”—

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: He was not quite sure as to whether he should propose an amendment to the clause and other clauses, or simply to protest against the language employed.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You will be breaking the pledge if you do.

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: Probably there was an inspired compliment in the Bill, and he was going to ask the Minister to take particular note of the point he was raising. In that clause there were used the words “England or Ireland.” That occurred right through the Bill and also occurred in the title. He did not know whether it meant that no maintenance orders under the Act should apply in Scotland, but he strongly protested against the implication that England represented what was called the United Kingdom.

HON. A. HINCHCLIFFE: What about Wales?

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: Wales was simply part of England. It was not an independent principality. He suggested to the Minister that the use of the words “England or Ireland” left the Bill open to misinterpretation, because it would be obviously impossible for the Act to apply to any case that might arise in Scotland.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: “or any other part.”

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: If the hon. gentleman referred to the ancient realm of Scotland as “any other part” he was adding insult to injury.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: It is your own Government doing it.

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: He moved that the word “England” on line 24 be omitted with a view to the insertion of the words “Great Britain.”

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: He sympathised with Mr. Finlayson. If he were a Scotchman, before that Bill was passed, it would be passed over his corpse.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was necessary for the Council to adjourn for dinner, and as the amendment moved by Mr. Finlayson required some consideration, an adjournment would give him the opportunity of gaining an opinion on the point raised.

HON. T. J. O’ SHEA: You are becoming considerate.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: The point raised by Mr. Finlayson was an excellent one and might well be disposed of. He did not know whether there were maintenance orders in England at the present time running in

Hon. A. J. Jones.]

the courts of Scotland, or whether there were maintenance orders in Scotland running in England. Maintenance orders in England run through England only, and he very much doubted whether Scotland was a reciprocating State. The legitimist laws in Scotland were so broad that it might be found that there were no maintenance orders there, and that Scotland was left out not for any insult to Scotland, but rather because it was not necessary that it should be left in.

At 5.13 p.m.,

The Committee adjourned till 7.15 p.m., resuming at the hour named.

At 7.15 p.m.,

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Acting Chairman in the chair.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Before the tea adjournment the Hon. Mr. Finlayson moved an amendment to omit certain words, and explained that if the Minister could give satisfactory information as to why Scotland was omitted from the Bill he would not proceed further with his amendment. The title of the English Act read as follows:—

“An Act to facilitate the enforcement in England and Ireland of maintenance orders made in other parts of His Majesty’s dominions and protectorates and vice versa.”

Section 12 of the English Act read as follows:—

“Where His Majesty is satisfied that reciprocal provision has been made by the Legislature of any part of His Majesty’s dominions outside the United Kingdom for the enforcement within that part of maintenance orders made by courts within England and Ireland, His Majesty may by Order in Council extend this Act to that part, and thereupon that part shall become a part of His Majesty’s dominions to which this Act extends.”

The following letter was also despatched by Lord Milner, Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the Governor of Queensland on the 20th October, 1920:—

“I have the honour to transmit to you, to be laid before your Ministers, copies of the Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) Act, 1920, . . . and to express the hope that it may be possible for your Ministers to take early steps to introduce the promised reciprocal legislation.”

Letters had also been received by the Premier from the New South Wales Premier stating that New South Wales had passed a similar measure. The Act must be reciprocal with the Act passed by the Imperial Parliament, otherwise it would have no effect. He pointed out that, when the matter was being discussed in the House of Commons, the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, in introducing the measure, used the following words:—

“I may say that this Bill does not apply to Scotland, purely because there are certain very technical considerations concerning the administration of the law in this connection in Scotland which make it very difficult actually to apply it and work it.”

He (Mr. Jones) did not know why Scotland was omitted in the Imperial Act, but the fact

remained that the Bill had to be identical with the Bill passed by the Imperial authorities. He hoped that the Hon. Mr. Finlayson would withdraw his amendment.

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: He was pleased to get the Minister's very kind and satisfactory explanation. During the dinner recess he had made some inquiries himself, and the information he received corroborated that supplied by the Minister. He had received the additional information that the Bill passed by the Imperial Parliament specifically excluded Scotland, and in that case it did not apply to Scotland. As this was a reciprocal measure where the Australian States and other Dominion Governments were asked to pass a measure which would identify itself completely with Acts passed by the Imperial Government, Scotland not being included in the Imperial Act, it would not appear in the other Acts. If there was any fault in it, it was not the fault of the Queensland Parliament. The second reason given to him for the omission of Scotland was a more satisfactory one. It was that experience showed that it was not necessary to issue anything in the nature of a maintenance order in Scotland, as Scotchmen were always famous for recognising and honouring their obligations in this connection. (Laughter.) Subject to the kindness of the Committee, he expressed his satisfaction with the explanation, and asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment (*Mr. Finlayson's*), by leave, withdrawn.

Clauses 3 to 12, both inclusive, put and passed.

The Council resumed.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

The report was adopted.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly by message in the usual form.

[7.30 p.m.]

INCOME TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, this Bill, received by message from the Assembly, was read a first time.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: As the Legislative Assembly have completed the business of the session and are waiting for the Council to complete the business here, I will be very brief in moving the second reading of this and the other two Bills we have to pass this evening.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: As this Bill is a very important one, and we have just received it, will the hon. Minister explain it clause by clause?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. gentleman will have a copy of the Bill, and probably it will be wise if he reads the Bill clause by clause. As a matter of fact, the hon. gentleman knows all about the Bill, as he has read it previously, and has no doubt read the comments on it in the daily Press. The hon. gentleman knows, too, that I would be entirely out of order, if I

attempted to explain the Bill clause by clause in a second reading speech. That is a matter for the Committee stage. The Income Tax Commissioner is here, and if the hon. gentleman wants any information when the Bill is in Committee he will be able to obtain same. I have no desire to refuse to give information to the Council, and I hope the hon. gentleman does not entertain that idea for one moment, but I can only deal with the principles of a Bill on the second reading speech. The Bill makes more perfect our present Income Tax Act. It corrects anomalies and grants concessions, and the hon. gentleman already knows that one of the concessions granted will be welcomed by the primary producers, as it allows the farmers to carry over their losses in subsequent yearly returns up to a period of five years. If the hon. gentleman will look at clause 6, he will find that that is provided for. That is a very valuable concession. In providing for this concession the Government have been prompted by one desire only, and that desire, as has been characterised in the legislation introduced by this Government on behalf of primary producers, is to assist those people engaged in primary production, and if they have a loss in one year to help them till a more prosperous time comes. The hon. gentleman will admit that this is a valuable concession. The Bill also makes more stringent the rules regarding the duties of agents of absentees and trustees in the matter of paying income tax. The Bill is not a very lengthy one, but it is a very important measure, however. In Committee we can deal with it clause by clause if desired, but I want to remind hon. gentlemen opposite—I am glad I can speak of them in the plural—that this Bill has been before the Assembly, and has been passed by the Assembly, and it has been before the public for some considerable time. I hope hon. gentlemen will allow the Bill to pass through its second reading and committee stages with reasonable despatch, so that we may proceed with other business. I will content myself by moving—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

HON. A. H. PARNELL: I think when I asked the hon. gentleman to fully explain the Bill I was only making a very reasonable request. I have been a member of this Chamber for thirteen or fourteen years, and I have never yet known a Minister who would not fully explain the provisions of any Bill introduced.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have taken hours in explaining a Bill.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: I will tell you how you explained Bills last night.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: A little while ago you complained about me talking too much.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: We came here at half-past 3 yesterday afternoon, and sat till half-past 2 in the morning discussing the Constitutional Act Amendment Bill, and then the Minister submitted six Bills and rushed them through in fifty-five minutes. Two of those Bills were very important, and the country and hon. gentlemen were entitled to get the fullest information in regard to them. We were not afforded that information, and we were not even allowed to move a single amendment. I did not speak on the Constitutional Act Amendment Bill because I recognise fully that the sooner this Chamber is abolished the better it will be for the

Hon. A. H. Parnell.]

country, and the better it will be for the people; but I hope in the future that a better constituted House will arise. This is a Bill that should receive a great deal of consideration, and should be discussed by hon. gentlemen who are more familiar with the subject than I am. However, I am here, and I will do my best. This Bill is going to harass the farmers and public bodies of Queensland to a very great extent. The Bill is to be retrospective. It will go back as far as 1915, and harass the community in connection with another matter.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I thought you had not read the Bill?

HON. A. H. PARNELL: I have not read the Bill. With regard to the question of writing down stocks, we know that many of the large business firms have lost very large sums during the last year or two, and have had to write down their stocks, and it is only fair that they should be allowed to write them down. They paid high prices for those stocks, and in many cases they have actually reduced the value of their stocks by one-half. I have seen many articles that cost 10s. or 12s., and to-day they are being sold at half that amount.

HON. R. BEDFORD: But still it came out of the previous income which was not then taxed.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: The hon. gentleman knows that some firms in New South Wales have lost as much as £50,000 or £60,000 since the war ended, and they deserve every consideration. There is only one good clause in the Bill, and that is the one which is going to give a little relief to the farmers and dairymen. But I would ask, Why should not the pastoralists and the selectors have some relief too?

HON. T. L. JONES: There is an amendment extending it to graziers.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: I have been a pastoralist, and I know the selectors, and I know the great risks they have to take with stock, and they are entitled to every consideration. I do not see why the Commissioner should put a tax on war bonds. When the people took up war bonds they were under the impression that they were going to be free from tax, but we find the interest on war bonds is to be added to the general income, and a man is to be taxed on that.

HON. T. L. JONES: That is not being done.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: He is taxed at the higher rate.

HON. A. DUNN: His capital is reduced by the amount of the war bond.

HON. T. L. JONES: That is not correct. It simply provides that the capital value of those bonds shall be deducted from the paid-up capital. It does not work out that a tax is payable on war bonds.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: But his war bond interest is added to his general income, and he is taxed at the higher rate.

HON. A. DUNN: That is not the way it is done, but the effect is the same.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: I have nothing further to say on the Bill, but when it reaches the Committee stage I want the Minister to give a full explanation of clause 5. I know the Bill cannot be altered.

Question put and passed.

[*Hon. A. H. Parnell.*]

COMMITTEE.

(*Hon. G. Page-Hanify, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, in the chair.*)

Clauses 1 and 2 put and passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of Section 7"—

HON. A. H. PARNELL asked whether the allowance of £100 in connection with the land tax applied to town lands?

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is only an allowance given on country lands.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 15, both inclusive, put and passed.

The Council resumed.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

The report was adopted.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Legislative Assembly by message in the usual form.

MINERS' HOMESTEAD PERPETUAL LEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

RETURNED FROM ASSEMBLY.

THE PRESIDING CHAIRMAN announced the receipt of a message from the Assembly returning this Bill without amendment.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

RETURNED FROM ASSEMBLY.

THE PRESIDING CHAIRMAN announced the receipt of a message from the Assembly returning this Bill without amendment.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, this Bill, received by message from the Assembly, was read a first time.

SECOND READING.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: I beg to move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

HON. R. BEDFORD (speaking from the Opposition side of the Chamber): I must certainly object to this Council, which was appointed to check hasty legislation, being used as a vehicle for rushing through legislation in this way. The hon. leader of the Council has not attempted in any way to explain the Bill, and I must insist, even if I have to divide the Council on the question, as to whether he shall not be forced to supply cogent reasons why this Bill should be passed, and why it should be bludgeoned through by a brutal majority. I do not know if I am in order in saying that, but it is the fact. I ask, in deference to hon. members on this side, that he tells us something about this Bill.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: It is about time, when the hon. member gets up and makes

such a big fool of himself—I say it is about time that this Council should be abolished.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Why, you yourselves said that last night. Why should I not say it to-night?

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

(Hon. G. Page-Hanify, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, in the chair.)

Clause 1 put and passed.

Clause 2—Amendment of section 4—

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Clause 2 of the Bill deals with the franchise of the principal Act, so that the next board will be elected on the broad franchise of one adult one vote. I rise particularly to say to the Hon. Mr. Parnell that I have no intention of treating the Council in any way discourteously. The Bill passed through the Legislative Assembly with very little discussion—little or no discussion. In this Council it is merely a formal Bill, and the other one is also a formal Bill. If they were contentious measures I would endeavour to explain their principles in my second reading speech. I have quite a lot of marginal notes on this Bill, and if hon. gentlemen want information I can give it to them in Committee. It does not follow, because I formally moved the second reading of the Bill, that I do not know anything about it. I resent the charges made by hon. members opposite. I do not endeavour to treat this Council in any way discourteously. I am not capable of doing that.

Clause put and passed.

[8 p.m.]

Clauses 3 to 12, both inclusive, put and passed.

The Council resumed.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

The report was adopted.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly by message in the usual form.

ANIMALS AND BIRDS BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, this Bill, received by message from the Assembly, was read a first time.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Legislative Assembly bells are ringing, and they desire to have our Bills returned by a quarter past 3 o'clock. I am sure there is no opposition to this Bill, and that it would only be a waste of time for me to explain it. This is a measure that will bring Queensland into line with other States. There has been no legislation of this kind for a period of thirty years. I am sure the Bill will appeal to all hon. gentlemen in this Council. It is really a non-contentious measure, and should be readily agreed to. I beg to move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

HON. R. BEDFORD: I wish to say that this Bill recommends itself to every Nature lover in Australia. One of the worst sights I

have ever seen in my life was 5,000 *Carpentaria* finches in a great cage for sale in Japan. There should be some power to control the export of these birds, and to control the ruthless slaughter of birds and animals. This Bill represents to some extent the work of one of our most prominent bird lovers, Mr. Chisholm; and the labour that he has given to this work of love for the last ten or fifteen years deserves something in the way of recognition by this Council. I only wish to say that in deference to the work of a great bird lover and a very excellent Australian.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: We, on this side of the Council, have no objection to the Bill. We regard it as a very useful Bill, and we welcome it.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

(Hon. G. Page-Hanify, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 to 20, both inclusive, put and passed.

The Council resumed.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the Bill without amendment.

The report was adopted.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR MINES, the Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be returned to the Assembly by message in the usual form.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES moved—

“That the Council, at its rising, do adjourn until Friday, 25th November.

Question put and passed.

VALEDICTORY.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: In moving the adjournment of the Council, I cannot do better than conclude by extending to the officers of the Council and the “Hansard” staff the thanks of hon. members for their work and courtesy to all hon. members during the session. (Hear, hear!) It is too early to wish hon. members the compliments of the season; but I hope, when the Christmas season comes round, that they will have an enjoyable time. I hope hon. members will have a good holiday. I suppose this is the last time we will meet here as a Legislature.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Do not speak too soon.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think that we will say good-bye to each other to-night. At any rate, I am perfectly sincere in hoping hon. members will have a well-earned rest and a good holiday during the Christmas season. I thank hon. members for the assistance they have rendered me and for the courtesy they have shown me since I was first appointed as the representative of this Government in the Council five years ago. I beg to move—

“That the Council do now adjourn.”

HON. A. H. PARNELL: Before the Council adjourns, I would like to say that I think, so far as legislation is concerned, we have not served any useful purpose by coming here this session. We have been here for eight or nine weeks, and we have received

Hon. A. H. Parnell.]

Bills from the Assembly by the barrowful. We have not been allowed to make any amendments in any measures brought forward this session. We were not allowed to cross a "t" or dot an "i."

HON. T. L. JONES: No one stopped you from moving amendments.

HON. A. H. PARNELL: The Bills were rushed up here and rushed through quickly, and I do not think they will serve any good purpose. After the way the legislation has been passed this session, I do not regret the abolition of the Council. So far as I am concerned, I attended a good number of sittings in this Council. One year I attended 600 meetings in one capacity or another in this Council. So far as this session is concerned, I never attended a meeting where a deliberative Chamber has been turned into such a burlesque as this Chamber has been turned into lately.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Who was responsible for last night? Hon. members opposite.

HON. R. BEDFORD: What about one of your members trying to put a whole Act in as an amendment to a Bill?

HON. A. H. PARNELL: At one time it was an honour to hold a seat in this Chamber. I looked upon it as an honour when I came here first, but I do not look on it as an honour now. I hope that this will be the last time that I will be asked to meet in this Chamber. Before I leave, I want to thank the officers of the Council for their courtesy to me on all occasions, and I want to thank the "Hansard" staff and reporters for the work they have done here.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Are you going to thank us?

HON. A. H. PARNELL: I leave that to you yourselves.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I did not hear what the Minister said earlier in his remarks.

HON. W. DEMAINE: Is this your swan song?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: There is not much of the swan about you. You are a real old gander. (Laughter.)

HON. W. J. DUNSTAN: Propaganda.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I do not like his propaganda at all. I understood the Minister to say that he wished us a very long holiday. I am not going to say goodbye, because I think it is only going to be au revoir. I think you will find that, when proper representations are made to the authorities in Downing street, they will come to the conclusion that the time has not arrived to allow the Upper House in Queensland to be wiped out by the crowd in power to-day.

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: Who is going to make those representations?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Probably the hon. gentleman would like a trip home. But representations will be made—there is no doubt about that.

HON. R. BEDFORD: Will you get Black Labour Cowley and Philp?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: When they know how the majority was obtained in this Council, they will regard it as an unwarranted procedure.

HON. R. BEDFORD: The King sent for me on two occasions to come here.

[Hon. A. H. Parnell.]

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The hon. gentleman has mentioned before that on two occasions he was sent for by the King. I object to the way you were sent here.

HON. R. BEDFORD: How were you sent here? You were sent here when you were beaten for Ithaca.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I was sent here when there was a reasonable number of members in the Council. There were less than forty-five then.

HON. T. L. JONES: You are a superior sort of man.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: If I were not superior to the hon. gentleman, I would not be much.

HON. R. BEDFORD interjected.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: There is a clown everywhere.

HON. R. BEDFORD: There is also an educated hog everywhere. Both are necessary in their own spheres.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: The action of this Council in passing the Abolition Bill will be about the last straw for the people of Queensland. I think they will wake up. They will see the Constitution maimed as it is at the present time with a Government like they have got in power—the most extravagant Government we have ever had, and a Government that cannot live within their means. It is a Government that has been guilty of repudiation, confiscation, and everything else. The Hon. Mr. Parnell said he could not agree with the legislation brought in this session. I think it was a most barren session, except for the Bill abolishing the Council. That Bill will do more to show the people of Queensland the wrongs they are suffering from at the present time than anything else that could have been introduced. I am most hopeful of the result that the Abolition Bill will bring about. It will wake the people up, and show them how they are situated in Queensland at the present time. I can assure you that a very strong resolution is going to the King. It will be such a resolution as will make the authorities pause before they consider the carrying out of the wishes of the present Government.

HON. J. S. COLLINGS: Another traitorous delegation!

[8.30 p.m.]

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I must say my own opinion of the delegation was that it was the wrong thing to do. Personally, I knew nothing about it till later. I am not within the inner circles of the Nationalists, and I do not try to be. I act on "my own" always, and have always played an independent part.

HON. R. BEDFORD: We always do that over here.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: How can you say that after the pledge that was read here last night? I certainly think that that delegation was a mistake; and I do not think, beyond getting a Governor appointed by the Home authorities, that they did any good at all.

HON. W. F. FINLAYSON: They did not do that.

HON. R. BEDFORD: They blackened this country's face as much as they could.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I do not think they did that. I think the Government blackened their face. They destroyed their credit by their own repudiatory legislation.

An HONOURABLE GENTLEMAN: Their credit is still good.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It is so good in England that they cannot get a brass farthing.

HON. R. BEDFORD: They have not got it in England.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: New South Wales and several of the other States have got money. Victoria is in good credit.

HON. R. BEDFORD: The Cingalese loan and the Nigerian loan were floated on better terms than the New South Wales loan. Their credit was better than that of New South Wales.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: In any case, their credit is better than ours. We are absolutely down and out on the London market, all brought about by the legislation of this Government. So far as the Income Tax Act Amendment Bill is concerned, I do not think it will do the country any good to wring the money out of them. Last year the Government got in in income tax one and a-quarter millions, which were raked in from the pockets of the people.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: This Bill mostly relieves the taxpayers.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It does not. It increases their taxes very largely.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You should not take advantage of this motion to make a speech of this kind.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I do not know that it will do any good to prolong this debate. I hope Parliament will be called together a little earlier next year and will sit a little longer, and bring in some legislation that will do some good. The legislation passed this session is not going to put one single man into employment. It is not going to put an acre under cultivation, and it is not going to do the country any good. This will all react on the Government, and if they let the people have an opportunity of saying what they want the Government will be knocked out by a tremendous majority.

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN: Before putting the motion, I would like to make a few remarks. First of all, I wish to thank hon. gentlemen for the courtesy I have received—(Hear, hear!)—whilst acting as Presiding Chairman during the past month. At times, as hon. gentlemen are aware, feeling ran pretty high, and it was somewhat strenuous, but I have to thank hon. gentlemen for the consideration and the kindness shown to me, and at the same time I also want to thank each and every individual officer of the Council for the very able manner in which they have performed their duties. Before I became an officer of this Council I realised that the officers at all times were not only efficient, but that they were kindness itself to hon. gentlemen. (Hear, hear!) Nothing was a trouble to them, but since I have attained the position of Chairman of Committees of this Council, I have had the privilege of seeing their work a little more closely, and it has only given me a greater faith in the competency of the respective officers, and I sincerely thank them, and I am sure hon. gentlemen will agree with me

when I offer them the sincere thanks of every member of this Chamber. One other matter I would like to mention: It has been stated that there is a possibility that this may be the last time this Chamber will assemble. If that is so, I sincerely hope with all my heart that the Government will be able to see their way clear to recompense or to put the officers of this Chamber into similar or better positions than they hold at the present time.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: We all agree with that.

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN: I am extremely pleased with the way in which hon. gentlemen have received the few remarks I have made, and I will conclude by remarking that, when I was elected Chairman of Committees of this Chamber, I said I would try to the best of my ability to hold the balance evenly between the individual members of this Chamber. I realise that the men who have occupied that position in the past were some of the most capable and able men Queensland has produced, and I realised I had a very difficult task to maintain the high standard, but I tried my best at all times to do my duty impartially and fairly to all sides of this Chamber. Again I have to thank hon. gentlemen for the courtesy extended to me.

HONOURABLE GENTLEMEN: Hear, hear!

Question put and passed.

The Council adjourned at 8.37 p.m.