Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 1881

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 20 *September*, 1881.

Settled Districts Pastoral Leases Act of 1876 Amendment Bill.—Sale of Food and Drugs Bill—third reading.—Unexpended Balances of Loan Votes.—Gulland's Branch Lines of Railway Bill.—Police Jurisdiction Extension Bill.—Local Government Act Amendment Bill.—Liquor Retailers Licensing Bill—committee.—Adjournment.

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

SETTLED DISTRICTS PASTORAL LEASES ACT OF 1876 AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. NORTON presented a Bill to amend the Settled Districts Pastoral Leases Act of 1876 Amendment Bill, and moved that it be read a first time.

Question put and passed; the Bill was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Friday next.

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS BILL—THIRD READING.

On the motion of the PREMIER (Mr. McIlwraith), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council with the usual message.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF LOAN VOTES.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Mr. Macrossan) said that the list appended to the motion was unexpended balances of votes that had been appropriated by the House at different times for special purposes. As the Divisional Boards Act had taken the control of such matters out of his hands, and these balances still remained unexpended, he thought it proper that the sanction of the House should be obtained to authorise him to hand over those votes to the different divisions, as he had no authority to hand them over without having the sanction of the House. He had no authority to spend the money himself——

The HON. S. W. GRIFFITH: What is the meaning of "reappropriated"?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Appropriated by a vote of the House.

Mr. DICKSON: For what object—for main roads?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said for main roads, exactly. In several cases, he believed that more than one division was interested in some of those balances. In such a case as that he should take care to divide the balances equally and fairly between the different divisions. There were one or two cases where there was a road, for which part of this balance was appropriated, running through two divisions, and in one case through three. In such cases as these he would have the money fairly divided, and should take care that the money was spent upon the particular road or bridge on which Parliament originally intended that the money should be spent, so that if any mistake was made it would be made by the board, and not by Parliament. He should not take up the time of the House, as he thought that the thing was quite enough explained, and hon. members understood what was the intention of the Government with reference to it. He would therefore move—

That the annexed Schedule of unexpended balances of Loan Votes be reappropriated, and handed over to the Divisional Boards of the respective districts to which such votes belong, to be expended by them on the works for which they were originally intended by Parliament.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF LOAN VOTES TO BE REAPPROPRIATED.

When voted.	Particulars.	Amount.
		£ s. d.
1876	Cabulture Farms Roads ...	31 17 6
"	Norman's Creek Bridge—repairs	97 18 0
1877–8	Quart-pot Creek Bridge ...	15 0 0
1876	Roads round Dalby ...	172 19 6
"	Roma to Charleville ...	200 0 0
"	St. George to Cunnamulla	195 17 7
"	Roads round Mount Perry	50 12 11
"	Broadsound to Clermont	180 18 5
"	Roads round Clermont ...	211 11 6
"	Ditto Copperfield...	403 5 2
1876–7	Roads, Gladstone District	119 0 1
1876	Springsure to Tambo ...	45 3 3
1877–8	Moore's Creek Bridge ...	5 11 0
"	Comet River Bridge ...	38 14 5
"	Barnes' Road, Mackay ...	700 3 0
1876	Townsville to Etheridge ...	17 8 10
"	Ditto to Dalrymple...	20 5 1
	TOTAL	2,506 6 2

Mr. DICKSON said he thought it would have been more convenient if the Minister who had

charge of this motion had introduced it in committee. It was usual to have matters of money discussed in committee, as it enabled the distribution of the votes to be more fully criticised than when, as in the present case, hon. members could only address the House once. His chief object in rising was to point out that, according to the Auditor-General's Report of the 30th June of this year, there appeared the following credit balances:—Southern division, £1,581 14s.; Wide Bay and Burnett, £553 10s. 10d.; Central division, £1,369 18s. 9d.; and Northern division, £4,663 12s. 2d. That was under "Roads and Bridges." Now he should like to learn from the hon. Minister for Works whether it was intended to hand over to the different divisional boards throughout the colony the whole of these road loan votes, or whether the present motion dealt only with those services for which special application might have been made by the respective divisional boards. The Minister for Works, in dealing with the balances of loan votes, should deal with the whole of the unexpended balances for these services in his hands; but he could not see in the list of votes in this motion votes which dealt with some of the roads in the Southern division and also some in the Northern division. He could not see, therefore, that this motion carried out what he contended ought to be the case — that was to say, that the resolution, if it were wise of the House to adopt it, should apply to the whole of the road loan votes which remained unexpended at the present time. The hon. gentleman had stated that these votes were all reappropriated; but from what he stated he (Mr. Dickson) inferred that they were to be handed over to the divisional boards, and they would have the actual reappropriation of the money; that the divisional boards would receive these votes *in globo*, and would not be called upon to disburse the money upon those roads and works for which the money was originally voted by that House. He hoped this matter would be considered in all its bearings. It would be satisfactory to learn from the hon. gentleman that a uniform action was being taken by the Government with regard to these votes, and that one divisional board was not going to be favoured by being allowed to expend this money when other boards had not the same opportunity. Therefore, in the hon. gentleman's reply to this motion, it would be satisfactory if hon. members could learn whether this schedule of loan votes embraced the whole of the original road loan votes which were unexpended at the present day; and whether it was the intention of the Government to trust the whole of the divisional boards of the colony with such balances of loan votes for roads as might at present be unexpended and in the hands of the Treasurer.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. member for Enoggera asked if this schedule included all the road loan votes unexpended at the present day. It did not include all the loan votes unexpended at present, as the hon. gentleman had just read one for the Northern district which it did not include. But that loan was under a very different appropriation, being under the Loan Act of 1879, for making roads, and had not yet been expended.

Mr. DICKSON: That is exclusive of what I read out.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that was the vote mentioned by the hon. member in the Northern division.

Mr. DICKSON said there was another vote. That was a separate vote.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said there was not. The votes down for the Southern division, the Wide Bay and Burnett division, were both for water supply and for the survey of roads; but the Lands Department now did all the surveying of roads, which used to be in the hands of the Works Department. The divisional boards did not do any surveying, as the Lands Department did it for them. Therefore, he had handed over the survey votes to the Lands Department, and the water supply vote, of nearly £30,000, should be used to supplement the water supply vote already unexpended. This was simply a list of votes he had no authority to expend; but he had authority to expend all the others mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and they would be expended, and were being expended as he had mentioned. The road survey vote would be expended by the Lands Department, at the instance of the divisional boards, when they wished to have new roads surveyed; and the water supply vote would be used to supplement the vote of £30,000 voted in 1879. The road votes which he had authority to spend would be spent as occasion arose; but the list before hon. members included those which he had no authority to spend, and which he intended to hand over to the boards. Of course he could not help it if some of the boards had not expended the balances in their division —that was not his fault. These were votes which were unexpended at the time the Divisional Boards Act came into operation, and he (Mr. Macrossan) refused to spend them.

Mr. McLEAN called attention to what had been said by his hon. friend the member for Enoggera, and pointed out that the hon. the Minister for Works had authority to expend the amount of the loan for main roads to goldfields. There was also £4,663 12s. 2d. for roads and bridges in the Northern district, which was virtually a part of the vote for main roads to goldfields. There was something like £8,000 in this list of credit balances for the Southern division, Wide Bay and Burnett, Central division and Northern division, which was distinct altogether from the vote which the hon. gentleman said he had the power to spend, and there was a sum of £4,911 17s. 8d. for main roads to goldfields. The amount that the Minister for Works asked the House to enable him to reappropriate was simply £2,500, or a little more than one-fourth of the actual amount which, according to the Attorney-General's Report, was available. It was a distinct vote altogether. There was not much difference between the two amounts—the one being £4,600 and the other £4,900—but yet they were quite distinct.

Question put and passed.

GULLAND'S BRANCH LINES OF RAILWAY BILL.

On the motion of the MINISTER FOR WORKS, the House went into Committee to consider the message of His Excellency the Governor, of date the 14th instant, having reference to the construction of certain branch lines of railway by James Gulland.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved that it was desirable that a Bill be introduced to enable James Gulland to construct branch lines of railway connected with the Southern and Western Railway.

Mr. McLEAN said it would be well to have some explanation on the subject. A private member of the House had a Gulland's Tramway Bill on the business paper, and now the Government were introducing a Bill to enable James Gulland to make branch lines of railway. What he would ask was, the nature of the lines that were to be constructed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that last year, at the end of the session, the Government had not time to introduce this measure, and

it was promised at the time that it would be done this session. These were lines from the Southern and Western Railway to the river, for the purpose of loading punts. He had nothing whatever to do with the line in charge of the hon. member for Bundanba (Mr. Foote). That was a line of a very different character to those referred to in the motion, which would carry the same kind of traffic as the Southern and Western Railway.

Mr. FOOTE said the lines introduced by the hon. Minister for Works had nothing whatever to do with the tramway which he was going to ask the House to approve of, and to which the hon. member for the Logan had referred. It was not necessary for him to add anything to what had been said by the Minister for Works, as the lines were quite distinct.

Question put and passed.

The report of the Committee was adopted; the Bill was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

POLICE JURISDICTION EXTENSION BILL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Sir Arthur Palmer) said this was simply a Bill to extend the powers of the police to racecourses, exhibition grounds, and places of that description. A great deal of harm had accrued lately from gambling being allowed on the National Association's Grounds and on racecourses, and the police were helpless to prevent it. This Bill was brought in for the purpose of extending their powers, and might be made to apply to any places proclaimed by the Governor in Council. He moved that the Bill be read a first time.

Question put and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into Committee to consider the message of the Governor, of date the 14th instant, with reference to this Bill.

The PREMIER moved that the desirability of introducing the Bill be affirmed.

Mr. DICKSON said he should like to hear some explanation of the reasons which had led to the introduction of the Bill.

The PREMIER said the hon. member's colleague, a short time back, took objection to such a course as wasting the time of the House. The reason for the introduction of the Bill was that lately several cases had occurred of municipalities applying for endowment to which they were not, in the opinion of the Government, entitled. For instance, the Council at Maryborough applied for an endowment for lighting and watering the streets. The Government considered that the claim was unjustifiable; but the Attorney-General was of opinion that by law the Government were bound to give it. Another town had actually claimed endowment on the whole of the rates raised from the inhabitants for the sale of water, and the Attorney-General had given his opinion that the Government were bound to pay it. The Government, however, did not intend to meet such claims, and they had, therefore, brought in this Bill to relieve the Treasurer from the necessity of paying endowments to which they considered the municipalities were not entitled.

Question put and passed.

The resolution of the Committee was reported to the House; the Bill was introduced, read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

LIQUOR RETAILERS LICENSING BILL—COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the House went into Committee to consider the Bill.

Preamble postponed.

Clause 1 passed as printed.

Clause 2—"Division into parts"—postponed.

Clause 3 passed as printed.

On clause 4—"Interpretation clause"—

Mr. GRIFFITH pointed out that the definition of a municipality would include a division, although there was a separate definition for a division which would not include a municipality.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could not see any force in the objection. A division constituted under the Divisional Boards Act would come under the operation of the Act, and any division could, if it chose, erect itself into a municipality in the same way as Toowong and other divisions became municipalities.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he presumed that for the purposes of this Act it was intended to distinguish between municipalities and divisions, and he had pointed out that the definition of a municipality would include both. He should like to know also for what purpose a definition of "town" was given.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the object in defining "town" was to furnish a means of ascertaining the boundaries within which a town license would operate. This was very necessary, as a license for a town was £30, while for a place more than five miles from a town it was only £10.

Question put and passed.

On schedule—"List of Acts repealed by the Bill"—

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that Statute 36 Victoria, No. 16, Act to amend the Publicans Act of 1863, be added to the list.

Question put and passed; and schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5 passed as printed.

On clause 6—"Appointment and constitution of licensing boards"—

Mr. MACFARLANE moved that the words "or is a member of," in subsection D—disqualification from appointment—be omitted. The effect of the words to which he objected would be, he explained, to exclude from the licensing boards all members of any society interested in preventing the sale of liquors. He did not object to the exclusion of paid officers of such societies, but thought it was going a little bit too far to exclude members. Besides which the clause would have very little effect in that respect; because, if any member of such a society were anxious to sit on the board, he had only to cease being a member of the society in order to become eligible. The provision, therefore, would do no good; and, as it would give great offence to a large and respectable class in the community, he hoped the Colonial Secretary would see his way to omit it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the hon. member who had proposed this amendment had stated that members of temperance societies were very respectable people. Well, no one ever disputed that; but he took it they were no more respectable than a brewer or distiller. Members of temperance societies, as he understood the question, pledged themselves to prevent the sale of spirituous liquors in every possible way; therefore, they ought not to be allowed to sit on a board appointed to grant licenses.

People who were interested in the sale of liquors were not allowed to sit on these boards, and why should people who were pledged to prevent their sale be allowed a seat there? "What was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander" in this case.

Mr. McLEAN said that the Government assumed certain things and then came to the conclusion that they were right. He did not know of any temperance society which prevented the sale of intoxicating liquors. Temperance societies discountenanced the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, but the members did not pledge themselves to prevent the sale of those liquors. Every member was at liberty to do as he chose in that respect; he simply pledged himself by practice to discountenance drinking. There was no such thing as a pledge to prevent the sale of liquors.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member ought to know more about temperance societies than he did; but, for all that, he (the Colonial Secretary) had seen a temperance pledge taken by some members in some societies to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors. He did not know the pledge of the society of which the hon. member belonged; they might drink hot whisky punch for all he knew.

Mr. McLEAN said the Colonial Secretary was entirely wrong in his statement. There never was such a pledge as that. The hon. member never could have seen a pledge to prevent the sale of liquors.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Mr. Perkins) said the hon. member stated that no pledge was given. Well, he (Mr. Perkins) had never actually seen a pledge; but it did seem very strange, if no pledge was given, that the members of the Good Templars' Society and others made a practice of going about boasting that they would prevent this and that license from being granted, and that all licensed victuallers must be exterminated.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said that this seemed to be the introduction of a new principle into the legislation on this subject. Temperance societies had not come into existence within the last few weeks, or even years; they had been in existence as far back as he could remember. In none of the Licensing Acts here was there any provision excluding from the bench or boards, as the case might be, persons who did not approve of taking intoxicating liquors as a beverage. There was never a temperance man worthy of the name who was so insane as to believe that intoxicating liquors could in no circumstances be taken with advantage. He certainly did not hold to that view of the obligation of a temperance man himself. He thought that intoxicating liquors might be taken medicinally with very great advantage. No harm had resulted, as far as he had been able to see, from the omission to make such a provision as this in previous Licensing Acts, and he could not see why such a provision was introduced here without it was intended as a sop to parties interested in the sale of liquors. He thought it was an invidious distinction to make, because many other persons besides members of temperance societies objected to the spread of public-houses. He himself did not belong to any organisation for the promotion of temperance principles or for the suppression of principles that were adverse to temperance; but he never drank intoxicating liquors as a beverage, and there were many others in the same way who did not take them as a beverage. He could not see why, because a man belonged to a temperance organisation, he should be disqualified from having a seat on a board for the purpose of granting licenses to public-houses.

Mr. KINGSFORD quite agreed with the Colonial Secretary that "what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander." He thought if those interested in the sale of liquors were disqualified, then those interested in preventing the sale should also be disqualified. It was only fair that both extremes should be disqualified.

Mr. NORTON thought this proposal was going a little too far. If they prevented the paid officers of these societies from sitting on boards, then they had done quite enough. He did not see why they should quibble about words. He believed he was quite as temperate a man as any member of a temperance society, and yet he took his glass of grog when he wanted it. The word "temperance society" was a misnomer. He had intended making a similar motion as that proposed by the hon. member for Ipswich, and he should, therefore, vote for the amendment.

Mr. GRIMES said he could fully bear out the statement of the hon. member for Logan. He had seen a good number of pledges, worded in a different way, and he had never seen one in which a man pledged himself to endeavour to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors. If a pledge was taken, it was to abstain from intoxicating drinks. He thought the proposal in the Bill was going a little too far: it would be quite sufficient if they prevented paid agents of temperance societies from holding positions on these benches.

Mr. KELLETT did not think it was going too far; it was only a fair proposal. The hon. member for Logan, who knew something about temperance societies, said that there was no pledge to prevent the sale of liquors; but, when a man became a total abstainer, and joined a temperance society, if he really believed in the thing, and did his duty, then he would try to stop the sale of liquors in every possible way. Such a man should not, in his (Mr. Kellett's) opinion, be allowed to sit on these boards any more than a brewer or a distiller. To strike out these words would make the Bill absurd.

Mr. FOOTE thought this clause was a very fair one. It bore equally on all parties interested. They should take it for granted that a person who was a teetotaller—which any man had a perfect right to be if he liked—would desire to discountenance the sale of liquor in every possible way, and such a person ought not to be allowed to sit on a licensing bench. No doubt he might do good if he were allowed to sit there, but his prejudices might carry him too far.

Mr. RUTLEDGE objected to the proposition that had been laid down—that because one set of interested parties would be excluded by the operation of such a clause as this from taking part in the licensing of public-houses, therefore that another set of interested parties should be also excluded. It seemed to him to be a misapplication of terms to talk like that. Brewers and distillers, while admittedly respectable people, were prevented from taking part because of their interest in the question; and that interest was a pecuniary interest. But the interest alleged to be taken by members of temperance societies was not a pecuniary interest in any sense of the term: it was interest of a different description altogether.

Mr. STEVENSON did not think that members of temperance societies should be allowed to sit on these boards. As the Colonial Secretary had said, "what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander." If a teetotaller, as a member of a temperance society, was true to his principles he would do all in his power to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors; and he could not possibly be an unbiassed member of a licensing bench.

Mr. H. PALMER (Maryborough) thought the clause ought to be retained as it was. His experience was that members of temperance societies were very narrow-minded and very prejudiced, and not at all well qualified to sit on a bench and decide as to the granting of public-house licenses. Members of those benches should as far as possible be free from prejudices either one way or the other.

The HON. G. THORN thought there was an additional reason that could be urged against the amendment. Members of temperance societies in some places might be able to cram a board, and might refuse every public-house license; the result would be that a number of shanties would spring up in those places. He begged to inform members of temperance societies in this House that he had been in places where every second house was a public-house, and yet he had seen no drunkenness in those places.

Mr. GRIFFITH wished to know whether the chairman of a divisional board, if a member of a temperance society, would be disqualified from sitting on a licensing bench?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he thought it was a mistake. A similar proposal was put into the Bill last year; but it was left out by the Legislative Council, and the amendment was accepted by this House. The Legislative Council then insisted on limiting the disqualification to paid agents, and it was a very proper limitation too.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that supposing he, as a landlord, happened to be chairman of a divisional board he would be disqualified from sitting on a licensing bench. In his opinion, nothing could be fairer than to put independent men on those benches. Surely, nobody could say that he, as a landlord, was not interested!

Mr. KINGSFORD pointed out that the chairman of the divisional board would not be disqualified if he was a member of a temperance society; but if he was a member of a society for the prevention of the sale of liquors, he would be disqualified. There was a distinction, as the hon. member for Logan had said that temperance societies did not prevent the sale of liquors.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that that was quite a new light in which to look at the matter. According to that view of it, anybody could sit on these benches.

Mr. MACFARLANE thought that hon. members who had spoken had scarcely understood the object he had in view. The Colonial Secretary said that "what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander," but that was not a proper way of putting this matter. As had already been pointed out, a brewer and a publican were pecuniarily interested in the consumption of intoxicating drinks, but a member of a temperance society was not so interested; he was interested for the sake of morality and the sobriety of the people, and that was all. If persons who abstained from intoxicating liquors were not allowed to sit on licensing benches, then persons who drank them should not be allowed to sit on those benches either.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Abstainers are not in the Bill.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he had been rather surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Maryborough (Mr. Palmer), from whom he had expected very different observations. That hon. member said that his experience was that members of temperance societies were narrow-minded men. Well, all philosophers and patriots, all men who tried to do any good for their country, were narrow-minded men. They were before their time; and in daring to stand up for their opinions they were narrow-minded. They were men of one idea, or perhaps only half an idea. The hon. member (Mr. Thorn) had stated that he had been in large towns in Europe where every second house was a public-house. He wished that hon. member would be a little more exact in his statements, for there was not a large town in any country where even every tenth house was a public-house.

Mr. KELLETT said he quite agreed with the remark of the hon. member (Mr. H. Palmer) that the majority of the members of those societies were very narrow-minded. The majority of them had been hard drinkers in their time, and, after having ruined their stomachs until they could stand drink no longer, then they objected to any man who could take his glass of whisky; and they were so weak-minded that they were afraid the sight of drink would lead them astray. He should be sorry to see such men on a licensing board.

Mr. FOOTE said he could not agree with the remarks of the last speaker. Though not a teetotaller himself, he respected teetotallers very much. They had done a great deal of good, and the majority of them were not men who had been at one time hard drinkers and who could stand drink no longer. Even if that were the case it would be a good thing, for there were many hard drinkers who could not say, "I have nearly destroyed myself with drink; henceforth I will be a teetotaller." There were many very worthy men amongst the teetotallers who abstained, not so much on their own account as for the sake of doing good to others by example in putting down drunkenness, which they considered an enormous evil. That was surely a very laudable object, and ought not to be treated indecorously. They ought to give that respect to teetotallers which was due to them and their work.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put.

The Committee divided:—

AYES, 25.

Sir Arthur Palmer, Messrs. Pope Cooper, Perkins, Low, McIlwraith, Black, Kingsford, Macrossan, Stevenson, F. A. Cooper, De Poix-Tyrel, Lalor, Hamilton, Baynes, Foote, Sheaffe, Persse, Wyndham Palmer, H. Palmer, Archer, De Satgé, O'Sullivan, Kellett, Lumley Hill, and Thorn.

NOES, 11.

Messrs. Griffith, Macfarlane, Grimes, Dickson, McLean, Aland, Francis, Beattie, Rutledge, Norton, and Bailey.

Question, therefore, resolved in the negative.

Mr. GRIFFITH called attention to the fact that in the same subsection trustees of public-houses were not disqualified from sitting on licensing boards. If a man was trustee for a public-house he had a distinct interest in its retaining its license, at all events, and his duty in that respect might influence him as much as a pecuniary interest. He was aware that that provision was in the present law, but it was a wrong one. Of course, a trustee's disqualification should only apply locally. He would suggest that the clause be amended in that direction.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he should not object to any amendment of that sort.

The clause was amended, on the motion of Mr. GRIFFITH, by the addition of the word "any" before the words "such member," and the words "within the jurisdiction of the board," after the word "aforesaid."

Clause, as amended, passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed as printed,

On clause 9—"Jurisdiction of board"—

Mr. RUTLEDGE said that if the offences against the Act were to come before the licensing

boards, or the licensing justices in the licensing district, much delay would ensue owing to the long intervals that would elapse between the meetings of those bodies. Supposing a breach of the Act were committed to-day, and the board did not meet for three or four weeks, an unnecessary amount of delay and a vast accumulation of business would take place. What he would suggest was that meetings of the licensing boards should not be limited to the particular occasions contemplated by the Bill.

Clause passed as printed.

Clauses 10, 11, and 12, were passed as printed.

Clause 13—"Procedure of licensing boards."

Mr. RUTLEDGE said that now was the place for the amendment he had suggested to come in. This clause provided for quarterly meetings of the licensing boards. No provision was made for them meeting oftener, and he thought in emergency cases the police magistrate should have the power to convene the board to deal with a case under the Act. Supposing an instance were to occur three or four weeks before the licensing meeting. Then the board, which alone had power to take cognisance of and deal with the case, could not do so until three or four weeks had elapsed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the provision made was ample, and, as far as experience went, more than ample. There was provision for meetings every month in the year, and in the next clause power was given to them to adjourn as often as they liked.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he knew they could adjourn when they had any business before them, but there was no provision for calling an emergency meeting, however important might be the business to be brought forward at it. He was not going to move any amendment because, if the Colonial Secretary would not accept it, he would not waste his own time and the time of the House in doing so.

Mr. MACFARLANE moved that the meetings be held half-yearly, instead of quarterly, as proposed. His object in doing so was that it was well known to many members of the House that the licensing authorities in Scotland, at all events, only met once a year to grant licenses, and half-yearly to make transfers to those who wanted them. He thought that meeting monthly, as they did at the present time, put the members of the board to a considerable amount of trouble and inconvenience; and the provisions of this Bill would simply keep things in the same state. It would not only save the board trouble, but it would also be convenient for the ratepayers, who wanted to petition against the granting of any licenses or transfers, if the meetings were held not oftener than half-yearly for licenses, and quarterly for transfers, when they were required. It might be said that they would not be required to meet so often in the old country as in a new one like this, but provision was made for special occasions; and in the case of any new town rising suddenly, the Governor in Council could issue a proclamation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if you gave some people an inch they wanted an ell. The present meetings of the licensing board were held monthly, and he had altered them to quarterly, and now the hon. member wanted them held every six months. He (the Colonial Secretary) believed if the hon. member had it his way, he would have them held every six years.

Mr. MACFARLANE: I would have them held twice a year.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was not inclined to give way, and he did not think the Committee would give way, to the hon. member. One hon. member got up and wanted the meetings held more often, while another said that half-yearly was enough. He (the Colonial Secretary) held that quarterly was not one bit too often, and that this, with the other special provisions, would answer every purpose.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said that one hon. member had not got up and complained that the meetings were not held often enough. He supposed that the Colonial Secretary referred to him; but he had complained that no provision was made for any emergency that might arise. He wanted them to meet more than once a month if there were any licenses to issue. On any occasion of importance they might have to wait three or four weeks before the matter could be brought before the board.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY would like to know what the emergency meeting was that the hon. member referred to? What emergency meeting would be likely to take place? The hon. member was confusing two things—matters which would come before the licensing meetings only, and offences against the Act—every one of which could go before the police magistrate and justices at any time, on any day.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he remembered a case in point not long ago where the holder of a license became insane, and it was necessary to deal with the case at once. But under this Act no provision was made for such a case being dealt with at once.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he believed he knew the case referred to by the hon. member. It was not the fault of the law at all; it was simply because the licensing board would not meet. It was not convenient for them to do so.

The amendment was negatived, and the clause agreed to as printed.

Clause 14—"Adjournment when no quorum."

Some verbal amendments were made at the suggestion of Mr. GRIFFITH.

Mr. BEATTIE said there was one thing to which he would like to call the attention of the Colonial Secretary. That was that, in the case of Brisbane, he could see there would be a difficulty in forming a quorum. The central board consisted of five members. Suppose that only two of its members were present, but there happened to be two or three members of divisional boards present, who were also justices of the peace; would that, he would ask, be a legal quorum? He took it that it would not be a legal quorum for a license within the city of Brisbane, because the members of licensing boards who represented outlying districts would have no *locus standi* in connection with the central board, except in connection with their own district. That was why he (Mr. Beattie) had neglected his duty as a member of a licensing board. He could not see the use of his sitting unless he had a voice in the business other than the cases where a license was to be granted in the district he represented. A case might arise where an individual might be very anxious to get a public-house license; but the district in which the house was situated might get up a petition against it, and delegate their member to present it to the central board. Yet the central board might grant the license in spite of such representations. What was the use, then, of the attendance of the member representing the division? He did not say the present board would do such a thing, but it was quite possible that the thing might arise. In a case in which he himself had presented a petition to the board they acted as reasonable men would, and refused the license.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not know what remedy the hon. member proposed. Did he propose that the members of the divisional boards should grant the license?

Mr. BEATTIE: No.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the license would be granted or not by the majority, which must rule in this as in every other instance. The attendance of anyone in the way suggested by the hon. member would always carry its due weight. His influence and knowledge of the locality would be properly considered; but, as to leaving it to him to decide, that was beyond the question.

Mr. BEATTIE was satisfied that the board would pay attention to the representations made to them, but why could not the chairmen of the different divisional boards be made permanent members of the licensing board? This came very near to local option, he must acknowledge, because no doubt the central board would pay a great deal of attention to the individual representing a particular district.

The clause, as amended, was agreed to.

Clauses 15 and 16 were passed as printed.

Clause 17—"Offences and duties of officers."

Mr. RUTLEDGE desired to call attention to the following subsections in this clause:—

"*(e)* Three clear days before the time appointed for hearing any application for a license or certificate, or for the renewal, transfer, removal, or transmission of any license or certificate under this Act, which application may have been objected to, give, in writing, notice of such objection to the applicant, and shortly the nature thereof.

"*(f)* Immediately on receipt of any objection, as in the preceding subsection *(e)* mentioned—other than from an inspector—forward a copy thereof to the inspector for inquiry and report."

According to subsection C of clause 19, an inspector was required to furnish a report on his refusal to grant a certificate in any case seven clear days before the day of hearing the application. These provisions would clash somewhat.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could not reply to the hon. member, for he could not understand him.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the 35th clause provided for objections—he would not go into details—but it required at the end of it that notice of the objection was to be given seven clear days before the day of hearing the application. Under subsection E of clause 17 a copy of an objection was to be forwarded to the applicant by the clerk of petty sessions three clear days before the day of hearing, while under subsection C of clause 19 an inspector was to inspect the premises, and, if he found the provisions of the Act not complied with, he was to refuse to give a certificate and was to report to that effect to the clerk of petty sessions seven days before the day of hearing. This would, of course, be impracticable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thought there was some mistake in the copying of the Bill. In subsection E there should be a "7" instead of a "3," and in the other clause there should be a "3" instead of a "7."

Clause put and passed.

On clause 18—"Governor may appoint inspectors and sub-inspectors"—

Mr. GRIFFITH asked what officers would be appointed as inspectors?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said as far as possible they would be officers of police, but in some instances paid inspectors might be appointed for large districts.

Clause put and passed.

On clause 19—"Duties of inspectors"—

Mr. GRIFFITH asked if the Colonial Secretary would not reduce the time before which the inspectors were to send in their reports. As it at present stood, it appeared to him to be too long. Three days would be sufficient. Subsections C and D ran into each other, and they both appeared to run into F, while subsection C covered all that was essential in subsection D.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the word "seven," in line 47, be struck out, with a view to the insertion of the word "three."

Mr. RUTLEDGE called the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the fact that there was no provision made for an inspector basing an objection on any grounds other than those named in the clause. The inspector might have the best reasons for knowing that the applicant was not a fit and proper person to hold a license. That would be a very proper objection, but no provision was made for it in the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said subsection B provided that part of the duty of the inspector should be to—

"Acquaint himself with the manner in which all premises licensed under this Act within his district are conducted and kept, and whether the provisions of this Act in relation to such premises, and the management thereof by the licensee, have been and continue to be observed."

What more could he possibly do than that?

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he was speaking of the case of a man making an application for a new license. It was probable that the board would know all about a man who had held a license, but in the case of a new license being applied for, what would be done?

Mr. BEATTIE said in no case would a board grant a license without previously asking as to the character of the applicant.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said that ought to be provided for in the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said subsection E, in defining the inspector's duties, stated that he should—

"Attend at the quarterly or monthly meetings, as the case may be, of the licensing board or licensing authority, and on any other occasions when required by such board or licensing authority; and make all inspections, examinations, and reports required, or that may be directed by any authority competent to call for the same under this Act."

He did not think the duties of the inspectors could be more clearly defined than they were.

Mr. GRIFFITH said, as he understood the Bill, great difficulties would be met with in applications for packet licenses, as there would be just the same formalities to be observed as in applications for hotel licenses. If a ship came here wanting a packet license the master would have to make a formal application for it, and would have to give long notice if he desired a transfer; so he (Mr. Griffith) mentioned this now because part of the duty of an inspector would be to examine packets when applications were made.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there were several so-called steamers trading to this port to which he would be very sorry to grant licenses, as a good many of them were utterly unfit for them.

Amendment put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, subsection D was amended in the 49th line by substituting "three" for "seven."

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 20—"Penalty on inspector or sub-inspector receiving bribe"—

Mr. GRIFFITH moved the addition of the following words after the words "pounds" in line

22:—"Nor more than £50, and in default of payment to imprisonment for any time not exceeding six calendar months."

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

On Schedule B—"General regulations for conducting the business of licensing boards and licensing authorities"—

Mr. GRIFFITH called attention to the 8th regulation, which said:—

"The licensing board or licensing authority shall then consider the application; and, if unanimous, shall give their decision through their chairman; but, if not unanimous, shall decide by vote as prescribed by the 10th or 13th section of this Act, whichever be applicable (retiring, if necessary, to a private room), whether the application shall be granted or refused."

He pointed out that the sections mentioned had no bearing on the point.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the words "a majority" were substituted for "vote as prescribed by the 10th or 13th section of this Act, whichever be applicable (retiring, if necessary, to a private room)."

Mr. RUTLEDGE said the 10th clause of the schedule required attention. That clause said:—

"When any objection appears to the board or licensing authority to be frivolous or vexatious, the costs occasioned thereby may be ordered by the board or licensing authority to be paid by the objecting party."

Suppose forty or fifty people signed an objection to the granting of a license, how would it be possible for the board to say who should pay the costs? It might be a nice question, what proportion of the costs should be paid by each. This was an altogether unnecessary provision, for they never heard of frivolous or vexatious objections being made in the past. It seemed as though the introduction of a provision of this kind was intended to discourage objections altogether, for people could never be sure that the licensing justices would not decide that the objection was frivolous or vexatious; and this uncertainty would prevent any objection being made. It was very desirable to prevent frivolous objections being made; but the amount of harm that would be done by discouraging objections would far outweigh the good that might be done by lodging objections.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, as far as he understood the objection of the hon. member (Mr. Rutledge), if four or five people brought forward a frivolous objection, he did not object to them having to pay costs; but if forty or fifty people joined in bringing forward such objection, they ought to go scot-free. It was easier for forty or fifty people to pay the costs than for two or three; and it was all the better for the lawyers. If fifty people signed an objection which was found to be frivolous or vexatious, it was quite right that lawyers' costs should be recovered from them. He thought the hon. member's objection took it for granted that the licensing bench would say an objection was frivolous or vexatious when it was not. But he (the Colonial Secretary) had more confidence in them than the hon. member had; and there was not the least fear of any harm being done to persons who brought forward proper objections.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said he should support the clause as it stood, because it would discourage frivolous objections.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he hoped the provision as to appeal, in rule 9, would be struck out. With respect to the question of costs, he thought the parties should be placed on an equal footing. But he thought it was not right to deter people from making objections by saying that, if the objection appeared to be frivolous, they should pay the costs. It might be that people were performing a great public duty in calling attention to matters connected with the applicant for a license, or the undesirability of the license being granted; but this regulation said: they must pay their own costs, and, if unsuccessful, they would be made to pay the costs of the applicant. He thought this was a great mistake. It was, they should recollect, not really a judicial proceeding. It was a matter for the discretion of the licensing boards; and no person who had fair ground of objection ought to be deterred from making it by the threat that if he were unsuccessful he would be made to pay the costs. He would like to know how many instances there were within their own knowledge, quite recently, where applications for licenses made time after time would have been granted but for the objections of those who were performing a public duty—an unpleasant duty, very often. Objectors often performed public duties; and were they to be told that they could make an objection, but they would do so at the peril of having to pay the costs of the applicant? That, he thought, was a mistaken principle. It ought to be a principle in a matter of this kind that the public were perfectly justified in going into court to make objections, and that they should not be called upon to pay costs. He suggested that the clause be left out altogether.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he knew cases where objections made to the granting of licenses put the applicants to very considerable expense to defend themselves, and yet the objections were the most frivolous and stupid that could possibly be conceived. Surely persons who made objections of that sort ought to be made to pay the costs. The regulation provided that they should be paid only in the case where the objection was frivolous or vexatious, and that would be a matter for the bench to decide. If the objections were reasonable the objector would not have to pay the costs, though he might be unsuccessful. He thought the provision perfectly reasonable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not see any parallel in the case drawn by the hon. member for North Brisbane. He did not see how any application for a new license could be held to be frivolous or vexatious; but he could easily understand objections being made that were very frivolous and vexatious. Had they not heard, time after time, of objection being taken to the granting of a license simply because it was for a house opposite to the house of the person who opposed the license, although the house for which the license was sought had been there long before he built, but because it "came between the wind and his nobility" he objected? He (Sir Arthur Palmer) thought that was a frivolous and vexatious objection, and that in such cases the objector should pay the costs.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he thought he knew the case to which the Colonial Secretary referred. Unfortunately, in a case like that, assuming that it was correct, the difficulty would be to get at the real individual who did object. There might be persons who objected on other grounds than the grounds entertained by the man who desired to prevent another man establishing a house next to his own house; other individuals might object because the place was not wanted, and another might oppose the license because he did not want competition. The bench might be under the mistaken supposition that there was some sort of a combination or understanding between the persons objecting from personal motives and those objecting from public motives, and might inflict costs upon the man who, perhaps, had

nothing to do with the selfish objection raised. In the case referred to the bench decided upon their own knowledge of the circumstances of the case; they knew that the place was not wanted, and their decision was quite irrespective of what any other person did.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member was utterly mistaken. In the case he (the Colonial Secretary) referred to, the license was granted and was being held still.

Mr. FRASER said he thought it would be well to define what was frivolous and vexatious. In the case put by the Colonial Secretary, it appeared that the man objected because the public-house would be opened opposite his own house. He (Mr. Fraser) thought that was a perfectly legitimate objection, and the man had a perfect right to make it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I did not say he had not.

Mr. FRASER said he failed to see that, because an objection might be regarded as frivolous by some people, a man should be punished for raising that objection. To him it would be anything but a frivolous objection, and he (Mr. Fraser) thought that the Colonial Secretary would accomplish every object he had in view if he left this subsection out. He did not see why any member of the community should, by having a threat of this sort hanging over him, be deterred from objecting to a license upon any ground whatever that he might consider justifiable.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he happened to know a good deal about these matters, as he had appeared several times in support of objections, and could say that he did not know one case in which the objection could be conscientiously called either frivolous or vexatious. Persons raising objections to the granting of a license generally presented petitions, and were sometimes put to inconvenience and expense in having to find money for paying counsel to support their objections. If people who acted simply from a sense of public duty had to do all this, and then have the additional difficulty staring them in the face that in the event of their not making good their objections, the result would be to discourage objections of every kind, and that, he thought, was wholly undesirable.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the hon. member was mistaken when he said objections were always made from a sense of public duty. They were more frequently made from personal spite.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the Colonial Secretary stated that this Bill was introduced in the interests of the publicans, and seemed to think that the public had no rights at all. He would like to know if the Bill had been introduced on behalf of the public, or were the public to be thoroughly ignored? Was the Bill for the good of the people or for the good of those who held licenses? If it was in the interests of the public, had the public a right to object?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Certainly they have.

Mr. MACFARLANE: If the public had a right to object, had not individual members, or any number of the public, a right to object? He maintained that the public had their rights as well as publicans. He did not think that a publican should be harassed with too many restrictions. If he had paid for his license, he ought to be protected. By having such a license he secured to himself certain privileges, and those privileges were neither few nor small. The publican was a man selected out of many to hold a license—many would like to hold them, but only a few were permitted to do so. Still he had to pay for the privilege, and, having to pay, he was entitled to certain rights. What he (Mr. Macfarlane) maintained was that as he was entitled to those rights and privileges, so the public were entitled to see that the licenses were justly granted. That was all he contended for, and, that being the case, he he did not see why this clause should be inserted to prevent persons making objections when they saw fit. He had lived a number of years in the colony and he had never known any vexatious or frivolous objections brought into the licensing court. He had often seen petitions brought in for the purpose of having licenses refused on account of there being too many in the district, or perhaps because the house was opposite a public work or a church; but he would not call those frivolous objections. It was just possible that the licensing board might consider them frivolous; but he thought people should be able to assert their right and prevent a public-house being licensed when there were too many in the district. Common justice ought to be meted out to all concerned. The hon. member for Stanley (Mr. O'Sullivan) said some objections were brought from mere spite, but he (Mr. Macfarlane) had never known any cases of that kind. It was just possible that such a thing might happen; but he thought it was very unlikely, as no single person would have influence enough to secure, say, fifty others to enable him to carry out his spite.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he thought there was nothing fairer than that those who wished to carry out those little spiteful matters should pay for them. The hon. member himself (Mr. Macfarlane) must acknowledge that, when a vexatious and frivolous charge had been made, the man who made it should pay for the trouble and expense of those who were inconvenienced. In their other Acts they had it that no charge could be brought against a publican without it being in writing, and dealt with in a judicious way, and that the person making the charge should come to court and be examined, and if the charge could not be proved he should pay the costs.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was one observation made by the hon. member (Mr. Macfarlane) that he could not allow to pass without the strongest contradiction he could give it, and that was that the Bill had been brought in in the interest of the publicans.

Mr. MACFARLANE: The Colonial Secretary said so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he never said so, and he never thought so. He utterly denied that he had done so. He had said before, and he would say again, that he had had deputation after deputation of publicans upon this very subject; and a fairer set of men to deal with he never came across. They stated that they did not care how stringent the provisions of the Bill were—they would never affect the honest dealer; and they were as anxious as anyone could be to get at the dishonest ones. The Bill had been brought in to meet a want which had been long felt. They had now seven Publicans Acts in force—each one contradicting the other in many particulars; and it was exceedingly desirable that they should amend the law, and have one Bill, so that the publicans and the public might know what they were doing. He considered the remarks of the hon. gentleman altogether beside the question. If any man, or any set of men, brought forward any frivolous or vexatious opposition they ought to be made to pay the cost of it; whether it was one man, or fifty, it made no difference. No licensing court was likely to say that opposition to a license, because the place was opposite a church, or opposite a man's own door, or was not wanted

in the district, was frivolous or vexatious. The hon. members who opposed this clause were just splitting hairs.

Mr. GRIFFITH said there was an error in one of the objections he had made to that clause—that it was not reciprocal, and did not provide for the payment of costs by the applicant if the objection were sustained. He found, however, that clause 36 dealt with that matter, and much more fully than this clause, but he was not sure whether the two clauses were consistent. He should like to see this rule left out with a view of clause 36 being altered to suit the object sought.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said clause 36 contained the same provision, only more amplified. It made the publican pay also. There could be no harm in passing both those clauses. Clause 36 provided that every party should pay.

Question put and passed.

Schedule C passed with a verbal amendment.

On clause 21 — "Licenses that may be granted"—

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he understood there were to be some amendments proposed in this clause, both by the hon. member for North Brisbane and by the hon. member for Port Curtis. The hon. member for Port Curtis proposed to give lodging-houses an hotel license, and he had drafted a number of amendments to meet that view. He (the Colonial Secretary) had no objection to provide for an hotel license, but he did not think it required all the amendments the hon. member had made. If the hon. member would look at the 23rd clause with the amendment he (the Colonial Secretary) proposed in that clause, it would meet the object of all the amendments he proposed to introduce into this Bill. If on the 55th and 56th lines they were to leave out the words "as well as a bar for the public convenience," and use the words "with or without a bar for the public convenience," every reasonable wish the hon. member for Port Curtis could have for allowing private hotels would be amply provided for. That would allow the licensee to please himself as to whether he should have a bar or not, as he might not wish to have a bar. He thought that would meet the whole thing, as if they were to make an amendment in this clause they would have to make several. He approved of the hon. member's object, as he did not see why private hotel-keepers should be obliged to keep a bar.

Mr. NORTON said that in a general way the suggestion of the hon. Colonial Secretary met the object he had in view, but there was the difficulty that, if they accepted the amendment he proposed, anyone who had an hotel license, and who did not keep a bar, would still be bound to accept as a lodger anyone who came to ask for rooms if there was accommodation vacant. That was a great objection, and, if they accepted the amendment in that way, he really thought it would have the effect of preventing many from taking out licenses who would otherwise do so. It had been suggested to him that social status had something to do with the question, and so it had; but it was more a sentiment than anything else. The only objection he had to the hon. member's suggestion was that it would compel anyone who took a license to accept any lodger who might ask for rooms; whereas at present the more respectable lodging-houses were not obliged to take in anyone as a lodger unless they cared to do so, and very properly they would not take in any who were not respectable persons. The object was to make lodging-houses as good as they could be made, and in some way to offer all the advantages to persons stopping in them which they would have in stopping at an hotel, without the disadvantages of an hotel. If the Colonial Secretary could meet the further objection he raised he should be glad to accept his amendment; but he did not know that it could be met. In the present condition of affairs the places he (Mr. Norton) spoke of were really private lodging-houses, while, if the Bill was altered in the way proposed by the Colonial Secretary, they would be public lodging-houses; and as public lodging-houses they would be bound to take in anyone who might ask to be admitted.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the objection of the hon. member was merely a theoretical one. They knew that licensed publicans were obliged to take in any travellers; but they knew as well as possible that, as a matter of fact, hotel-keepers selected their customers quite as much as any lodging-house keeper in town. The line was so clearly drawn that a man who would be received in one house would not be admitted into another. The hotel-keepers in every town he had seen chose the people whom they would entertain, and would not take anybody whose manner or dress they did not approve of, but immediately said they had no accommodation. Clause 6 was the only clause he (the Colonial Secretary) knew of that compelled a publican to accept any traveller who presented himself, and then the house must be on the public highway. That did not apply to lodging-house keepers in town, and he thought the amendment he proposed would meet the objection.

Mr. GRIFFITH did not agree with the Colonial Secretary at all. Section 80 provided:—

"Every house in respect of which a liquor retailer's license has been granted shall be held in law to be a common inn."

The result would be to turn a private lodging-house into a public-house. In fact, anybody would be entitled to be received, no matter in what state he was. Such a provision as that would be entirely inapplicable. At the present time private lodging-houses were very necessary. There were in England many institutions of that kind that were termed "private clubs," and he thought it very desirable that lodging-houses should be allowed to be carried on as they were at present. The hon. member for Port Curtis, who introduced this subject, said that this part of the matter was purely a sentimental one, and that he did not think much of it from that point of view. He (Mr. Griffith) thought a great deal of it from that point of view. Private lodging-houses of a superior class were usually kept by widow ladies who could keep themselves in a pretty good position in that way, and bring up their children, and to whom their social status was of very great consequence. The proposal of the hon. gentleman (the Colonial Secretary) would in no respect make a private lodging-house differ from a public-house. He hoped the Colonial Secretary would see his way to accepting the amendment. There could be no serious objection to it, and they did not wish to prevent ladies having that resource open to them. He could not see that any harm would be done by the amendment. There was another serious objection which this amendment would remedy. He understood that in private lodging-houses wines and spirits were now supplied in some way; but it was desirable for the people living in them, and for the lady who kept the house, that they should be allowed by law to provide their own wines and spirits if they paid a license fee to the Government. There were many arguments in favour of this, and few against it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member for North Brisbane was entirely

wrong when he said that any lodging-house keeper would be obliged to receive any drunken man.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I did not say so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he took down the words. A lodging-house keeper was not obliged to do anything of the sort. The hon. member drew a distinction between hotels and lodging-houses, but he (the Colonial Secretary) could not see it. One paid a license for selling spirits, and the other sold spirits without a license. That was about the distinction. The amendment he proposed would meet every objection of the hon. member for Port Curtis. The amendments proposed would involve a great deal of alteration in the Bill, and, as he had said before, nothing would be gained, because lodging-house keepers or hotel-keepers would not take in people whom they did not like.

Mr. DICKSON said he gathered from the debate that the private boarding-house keeper would not be compelled to accommodate undesirable lodgers, whereas those who held a publican's license would be compelled to give drink to anyone who demanded it. If the Colonial Secretary could show that such was not the case, he (Mr. Dickson) would support his amendment. The hon. member for Port Curtis, he understood, wished to relieve the holders of a private hotel license from being obliged to supply drink to people to whom they might not wish to sell. As far as he could see, it appeared to him that a private boarding-house keeper who obtained an ordinary license would have to supply drink to all comers.

Mr. NORTON said he had anticipated there would be some difficulty in connection with this amendment; and in case it should be rejected he had some idea of proposing an amendment somewhat similar to that suggested by the Colonial Secretary. This idea was to insert, after "as well as a bar" in the clause declaring what accommodation must be provided in the house, the words "for the use of those persons only who are lodgers therein or." The clause then went on "for the public convenience," etc. That would to a great extent meet his view, and, though not liking it so well as the separate license provision which he had suggested, he should like to accept the concession which the Colonial Secretary was disposed to make. The 80th clause could be brought into accordance with his proposed amendment by the insertion of the words "and in which there shall be a public bar," which would exempt all the licensed private boarding-houses from the operation of the clause. If the Colonial Secretary particularly objected to his amendment he would accept that of the hon. gentleman, though he confessed that he would rather see his own inserted.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the whole difficulty could be got over by giving the Treasurer power to grant licenses to private persons for the sale of liquor.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that would not do at all, as this Bill altered the provisions of the present law with respect to licensing.

Mr. GRIFFITH said, if the amendment was a desirable one he did not think it ought to be rejected because it would involve a little extra trouble; and the Colonial Secretary might rely upon the assistance of the Committee to point out the further consequential amendments which would become necessary. The matter of two hours' trouble or less should not, considering the short time that the House had been in session, deter the Government from adopting a desirable amendment. He would point out some of the clauses applicable to private lodging-houses, which would have to be altered if no special provision was made for them. Clause 4 provided that the name must be painted up over the door; and, as a matter of fact, the inscription as prescribed would be incorrect, because these hotels would be licensed for lodgers only. Then the keepers of such houses must keep their lamps lighted, and must measure liquor in half-pints, and so on. If on a public highway—as the houses must nearly always be—the keeper, by clause 60, must provide for travellers, and must find forage and stabling accommodation for four horses at least. The Bill would be, in fact, dealing with two distinct and separate classes. The business of supplying drink and accommodation for all comers was a very different thing from the business of supplying liquors as food to lodgers living in the house and selected by the person keeping the house. Again, with reference to music, unless special provision were made, people living in a private boarding-house would not be allowed to have any music without first obtaining a special license. They would not even be allowed to play a game of cards together. The two things were, in fact, entirely distinct. The Committee generally approved of the proposition, and he hoped the Colonial Secretary would not be deterred by fear of a little extra trouble from accepting a most valuable amendment to the proposed law.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he hoped the Colonial Secretary would not help to multiply the conveniences for the consumption of drink. In introducing this Bill, the hon. gentleman evidently recognised the danger of the business when he hedged and fenced it in with 113 clauses. The persons to be licensed were to be men of the highest respectability; the houses were to be first-class, and every precaution was taken to protect the public. Now, it appeared that one member of the Committee was trying to introduce a lodging-house clause; another proposed a grocer's clause, and if that were to continue it would be as well to strike out every clause, and declare for freetrade in the sale of intoxicating liquors. Every dining-room and *restaurant* keeper would next demand a license for supplying people at dinner with intoxicating drinks. He had always held that the public had certain rights in this matter, but he also admitted that licensed victuallers, who had gone to great expense in fitting up houses for the accommodation of the public, had also rights which ought to be respected. He hoped the Colonial Secretary would set his face against the amendment, because it would give licenses to females to engage in a business which was not at all suited to them. It was recognised as being a dangerous business, and it was the duty of the Committee to guard females from being compelled to deal out intoxicating drinks.

Mr. NORTON, with all deference to the hon. member, thought the hon. member had been talking a lot of rubbish. The present question had nothing to do with the increased sale of liquor. What did it matter, one way or the other, whether a lodger got wine, or ale, a bottle at a time, from the lodging-house keeper, or had to send out for it? Scores and scores of times—not only here, but also in Sydney—he had obtained ale and wine in lodging-houses. They professed to send out for it, but whether they did so or not he could not say. If refreshments of that kind were to be supplied at all in these houses it was better that the Treasury should have the benefit of the fee, and that the Government should legalise what was now being done in an underhand way. He could always manage to obtain a supply wherever he went, and so could anyone else; but it was not always convenient for a man who came to town for a day or two to send out for a case of wine or a dozen of ale.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, before going much further he should like to know what the hon. member proposed should be the license fee. If the hon. member wished to make it less than that of an hotel, he should certainly oppose the amendment, because the necessities of the Treasury must be looked after. He now saw a force in the remarks of the hon. member for North Brisbane which, he confessed, did not strike him before; but it was necessary to see where this clause would carry the Committee. It was patent to everybody that hotels of different classes picked their guests just as much as any private houses in town. People—he would not say the "lower orders," but who were not well dressed, and did not move in certain society—would never dream of going to the first-class hotels; they would go to those established for their own class. If it was the wish of the Committee that the amendment should be agreed to, he saw no great harm in it; but he should insist upon the fee for private houses being the same as for ordinary public-houses. There would be no hardship in this, as the private hotel-keepers would be exempted from many of the obligations enforced upon the ordinary publicans. They would not be obliged to find provision for horses, nor to take in parties they did not wish for. He would give way on the question of the amendment, but not on the question of the reduction of the license fee.

Mr. NORTON said that, with regard to the license fee, that would, of course, have to be settled by the Committee; but he thought it should not be so much for a private hotel as for a public-house. Whatever the fee was it would benefit the Treasury. He certainly thought it ought not to be more than £10; but he did not press any amendment in that respect. He would now move the omission of the word "three," in the 1st line, with a view of inserting "four."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the hon. member's argument was a very weak one. The question was one which affected the Treasury very considerably. He would beg to point out that the Bill provided for inspectors to visit lodging-houses. He knew where he could put his hand on a good many lodging-houses which required visiting.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that the hon. member for Port Curtis had styled his remarks rubbish, but, with all due deference to that hon. member, he would say that he (Mr. Norton) was speaking on a subject to which he had given very little thought. The hon. member said that if liquors could be got in private houses it would make no difference. It was well known, however, that the multiplication of the conveniences for obtaining intoxicating liquors increased the amount of drinking and of drunkenness. He should oppose this amendment, as he had said before, because it was introducing a new system. It would ultimately do a great wrong to the whole colony. They had no idea what evil could be committed by private houses.

Mr. KINGSFORD said the hon. member's argument was altogether contrary to experience. It struck him that to drive a man away from his home, which might be a lodging-house, was the way to make him drunk; while to enable him to get all he required at a lodging-house was the way to keep him sober. He knew he should think himself safer in a respectable lodging-house, and he was much more likely to keep sober there than in a public-house. He should support the hon. member's amendment. He did not wish to be kept sober by Act of Parliament.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said the hon. member for Ipswich had stated that the proposal of the hon. member for Port Curtis was the introduction of a new system. But that was not so, because the hon. member for Port Curtis had stated that any man in these private lodging-houses could get intoxicating liquors. The Treasury at present was losing a large amount of revenue from what was really the present system, and they ought to recognise as legal what had been going on illegally for years past. The hon. member for Ipswich had taken the hon. member for Port Curtis to task because he described what he said as rubbish. He (Mr. Macdonald-Paterson) was inclined to agree with the hon. member for Port Curtis that what the hon. member for Ipswich said was rubbish. For instance, the hon. member for Ipswich had said that under this proposal females would be compelled to take out licenses and serve grog. Now, there was no such thing as compulsion in the amendment of the hon. member for Port Curtis. It was entirely elective on the part of private lodging-house keepers whether they took out a license or not. He should support the hon. member for Port Curtis in his amendment, though he did not go with him altogether with regard to cheapening the license.

Mr. MACFARLANE desired to correct the hon. member. He had not used the word "compulsion" at all. What he said was that those females who took out licenses would have to sell grog in private lodging-houses. He did not think that lodging-house keepers would have to take out a license, nor did he think that every lodging-house keeper would do so. Some people would sell grog without taking out a license at all.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON contended that the hon. member had used the word "compulsion," for he had taken a note of it. He was perfectly certain that the hon. member had used the words that "females would be compelled to sell liquors."

Mr. MACFARLANE said that that was what he had stated.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS thought it was desirable that the question of fee should be settled before the amendment of the hon. member for Port Curtis was put. It would be a great injustice to licensed victuallers to grant licenses at a reduced fee.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put. and negatived.

Mr. GRIFFITH proposed the insertion of the word "five," with the view of having grocers' licenses. He might mention that a deputation of retail grocers waited on him and asked him to introduce them to the Colonial Secretary, who was good enough to allow them to interview him on the matter. The proposal was not, as was sometimes stated, to enable any retail grocer, or anybody who called himself a grocer, to sell wine in bottles. That would be an extremely unfair, improper, and dangerous thing. What was proposed was that wine and spirit merchants, who paid a license fee of £30, should on payment of an additional license fee be enabled to sell small quantities. That was a very reasonable proposition, and there were very good reasons for it. The Colonial Secretary thought favourably of the proposal, and was good enough to hold out some encouragement in the matter if it were proposed in a tangible form to the Committee. In view of that he (Mr. Griffith) had prepared some amendments for carrying it out. The details were the same as those in force in Victoria. The hon. member (Mr. O'Sullivan) had already given notice of some amendments of this kind; and he (Mr. Griffith) hoped he did not think he (Mr. Griffith) was anticipating him under the circumstances under which the matter had been brought under his notice. He proposed, therefore, that grocers' licenses should be granted to wine and spirit merchants, to be continued

while they held spirit licenses. There was to be an extra fee, and they would only be allowed to sell small quantities while they were registered as spirit merchants. The moment they ceased to hold a spirit license the right of selling under a grocer's license would be stopped; while, if they violated the conditions of their licenses—if they allowed liquor to be drunk on their premises, or sold after they had ceased to hold a spirit license—they would be liable to a heavy penalty and be incapable of holding a grocer's license for the remainder of the year. He did not think there were any serious objections to this proposal. Grocers very often sold intoxicating liquor without a license. It was stated that it would be unfair to the publican, but he did not see where the hardship was. He did not think it would diminish the trade of licensed publicans in the slightest degree. There were objections, he knew, from various points of view made by some people. This was a matter on which the publicans and the total abstainers agreed; they both thought that grocers' licenses should not be allowed. He thought that with proper safeguards it was a very desirable thing. With respect to the license fee, he intended to propose what the deputation asked—namely, £10—which, considering that they already paid £30 for a spirit license, was quite enough; but that was entirely a matter for the Committee to decide. He moved that the word "five" be inserted instead of the word "three."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. gentleman had partially described an interview which he had with a deputation of grocers introduced by himself. He (Sir Arthur Palmer) must confess that the strongest arguments in proof of the proposal were used by the deputation as a body, who admitted that they themselves did the thing, that they were obliged to do it, and that they could not keep up their trade connection unless they did it; but that they would far rather do it legally than illegally. He liked men who told him the truth. He told the deputation that if something of the sort were proposed he should not object to it, but he noticed that as soon as he gave way on one point they wanted more. For instance, there was nothing said by the deputation about a "pint."

Mr. GRIFFITH: That is mine, and not the deputation's.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the deputation said nothing whatever about a pint. The only reference was to a bottle, and he thought a bottle was quite small enough a quantity. He did not believe, either, in the £10 license. He thought that £15 was quite low enough. He had no objection to introduce the principle into the Bill.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the clauses to be proposed were copied from the Victorian Act, whereby all grocers were allowed to sell pint bottles. He himself had intended to move the same clauses, but was glad that the work had been taken out of his hands, and he should support the hon. member for North Brisbane.

Mr. MACFARLANE said it was very seldom that he disagreed with the leader of the Opposition, but he certainly did so on this point. The hon. member for Port Curtis had maintained that the issue of private-house licenses would not increase drunkenness, while the leader of the Opposition had maintained that the issue of grocers' licenses would not affect the publicans. Surely, either one or the other statement must be wrong. If the inference was that the amount of drink sold by the publicans would not be lessened, it showed that his original argument was perfectly right—namely, that the greater facilities were given for selling drink, the greater the amount of drink that would be sold. He should oppose the amendment. If grocers were allowed to sell a bottle, why not a glass? And if the thing was good, why not allow everybody to sell? There was another argument against the proposal which he thought would commend itself to hon. members. Look at the position those grocers would be placed in who declined to sell drink at all. They would be handicapped. Those who did sell would have an advantage over them, and an injustice would be done to honest men. If such a system were to be allowed, it would be more honest, more manly, and more fair to have freetrade in drink at once, and allow everybody to sell it who chose to pay a license.

Mr. NORTON said the Colonial Secretary had stated that the grocers who waited upon him admitted that at present they sold bottles in order to keep up their business, but that they preferred to sell legally rather than illegally. Why should men, when they wished to pay a license fee for what they at present did illegally, not be allowed to do so? The grocers would like it better, and the country would reap the benefit. The hon. member's argument was quite beside the mark, for, whether the grocer's license was or was not granted, those men would continue to sell.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he knew something about grocers, and he could affirm that not so many grocers as were supposed sold drink on the sly. One of the largest grocers in the colony conscientiously gave up selling grog wholesale, and his trade was larger now than it had ever been before. He believed that those grocers who held spirit licenses did sell grog on the sly, but that those who had no spirit licenses were not breaking the law by selling it without a license.

Mr. NORTON: They need not take them out unless they choose.

Mr. FOOTE said the argument of the hon. member (Mr. Macfarlane) appeared to cut both ways. The hon. member first said that grocers who did not take out licenses would suffer considerably, and next that certain houses had given up the liquor trade altogether, with the result that their trade had considerably increased. He (Mr. Macfarlane) knew for a fact that grog was already sold by grocers, and had seen a bill where the grog score was put down to other innocent materials. It would be much better to allow grocers who were so disposed to pay a license for what they already did illegally, than allow the present system to continue. It was evidently the intention of the House to make the Bill a thoroughly good one. They were not there to plead the cause of temperance, but to regulate the liquor traffic.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he should like to have the Chairman's ruling on the point of order as to whether a person interested in the liquor traffic ought to take part in the debate.

Mr. FOOTE said a similar point of order might be raised with reference to persons who were opposed to the liquor traffic.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said he was afraid that if the latter point were raised it would completely close the mouth of the hon. member (Mr. Macfarlane). That hon. member was more than a strictly temperate man; at the same time he ought to know that the majority of hon. members were temperance men, who were not afraid to take their wine or beer in the face of the world, and who thought that the drink traffic could be grappled with and confined within its proper channels. The hon. member had said earlier in the evening that the Bill was one to encourage the sale of intoxicating liquors. He (Mr. Macdonald-Paterson) felt inclined to deny that altogether. It was a Bill to prevent the increase of intoxication. The hon. member seemed not to know that scientists had lately

discovered—what men of common sense knew long before—that certain liquors were foods. The hon. member denied that they were foods, in which case his arguments must count for nothing.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald-Paterson) was evidently labouring under a great mistake on that point. He would defy him to mention any scientist in the world who said there was food in alcohol. They were not, however, discussing that question, although he felt tempted to say that in that particular the hon. member was talking on a matter that he knew nothing about. He did not profess to know so much as the hon. gentleman on some subjects, but he did on this one.

Mr. THORN said that he had not expected to see the hon. member for Logan silent on this question, and he therefore hoped that hon. gentleman would give the House his opinion upon it. He (Mr. Thorn) went with the Good Templars in this matter. Moreover, he thought that it was a subject which should not have been introduced in this Bill at all, but should have formed the subject of a separate measure.

Mr. FRASER thought that the hon. member for Ipswich was entitled to a large amount of credit and consideration for his consistency and for his endeavours, as far as possible, to limit the consumption of intoxicating liquors. He (Mr. Fraser) did not believe, however, that any member of the House would be an advocate for an extensive consumption of those liquors. In the present case, as he took it, it was a choice of evils they had presented to them. He would be as glad as the hon. member for Ipswich to see the consumption limited. But they were aware that, as a fact, this custom existed without the license to a large extent, and that they were trying to legalise it. He could bear out what was represented to the Colonial Secretary by the deputation, because one or more grocers had waited upon him, and had positively told him that under the present state of things he was compelled to oblige his customers in this way. He did not think that the granting of that license would add to the consumption of drink in a private way. He sympathised with the hon. member to a great extent, but could not go the whole length with him. He (Mr. Fraser) was, for one, a pretty temperate man, but he found it necessary sometimes to have a little stimulant. He confessed that it would be with very great reluctance he would send to the public-house to get a supply; whereas, if this license were granted, he would be able to order what he wanted from his tradesman in the regular way. Looking at it in this light—that it was a choice of two evils, and that they were choosing the lesser—he was disposed to support the amendment of the hon. member the leader of the Opposition.

Question—That the word proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 21.

Sir A. Palmer, Messrs. McIlwraith, Griffith, Dickson, Stevenson, Lalor, Foote, Black, Norton, O'Sullivan, King, Fraser, Macdonald-Paterson, Persse, Kingsford, Groom, H. Wyndham Palmer, Archer, Garrick, Sheaffe, and Lumley Hill.

NOES, 10.

Messrs. Macrossan, Perkins, Price, Thorn, McLean, Macfarlane, Beattie, Grimes, Francis, and Hamilton.

Question, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. NORTON moved the insertion of the following definition:—

2. A private hotel license, which shall be as near as may be in the form numbered two of the said schedule.

Question put and passed.

Mr. BEATTIE would like to know by which rule was the licensing of boarding-houses to be regulated. If one boarding-house was going to obtain a license he did not see how they could refuse another.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the licensing boards would please themselves as to this.

Mr. BEATTIE said he knew they could. The hon. member for Rockhampton had told them they ought to keep the liquor traffic in its proper channel, but this was the very thing that would take it out of its proper channel.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: What is the question before the House?

Mr. BEATTIE said he did not know. The House had introduced two new systems of granting licenses.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No!

Mr GRIFFITH moved the insertion, after the 8th line of the clause, of the following words:—

A grocer's license, which shall be as near as may be in the form numbered three to the said schedule.

Mr. McLEAN said he felt confident that if the deputation of publicans, who waited on the Colonial Secretary and asked him to amend the Licensing Bill, had foreseen what was taking place to-night, they would never have dreamed of waiting upon him. What they were now about to do was to upset all the old system of granting licenses to public-houses. Hitherto there had been some restriction; but by the amendment of the hon. member for Port Curtis, who seemed to have gone hand-in-hand with the leader of the Opposition on this question to allow the grocers to sell bottles of grog, the publicans, in whose interest this Bill was framed——

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I deny that it was introduced in their interest.

Mr. McLEAN said he begged the hon. gentleman's pardon if he said the Bill was introduced in the publicans' interest; he did not intend to do so. What he said was that it was done at their request; and he said further—and he thought the publicans would bear him out—that had they foreseen what was taking place to-night they would never have waited on the hon. gentleman for that purpose. It might be denied, but it was the experience of the world, and was proved to demonstration at Liverpool, that the greater the facilities that were given for the sale of intoxicating drinks, the greater would be the drunkenness. If there could be anything demoralising to a community it was the offering of greater facilities for procuring drink. If it was not respectable, as one hon. member had said, to go to a public-house to get a bottle of drink, would it be more respectable to go to the grocer for it? Not a bit more. This system of granting grocers' licenses was opposed to the interests of the publicans. What was the great evil at home? It was the establishment of the grocers' licenses. It was also well known that intemperance among women was greatly on the increase in the mother-country.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: In Scotland.

Mr. McLEAN: Whether in England, in Scotland, or in Ireland, did not matter; he said it was on the increase in the mother-country. He reckoned the three as one—the United Kingdom. This increase was clearly traced to the present system which was now being introduced into Queensland; and, he said, before many years had passed over their heads in this colony, they would be repealing what they were doing to-night. An hon. member had asked why he (Mr. McLean) had not spoken on this question. He knew he was regarded as a man of one idea, and he was quite prepared for the whole House and the whole colony to look upon him in

that light. He looked upon himself as right. He was not going to give them a lecture to-night. The reason why he took such an interest in this Bill was because his object was not so much to make licensing laws as to prevent, as far as he possibly could, the sale of intoxicating drinks, and he maintained that in proportion as they increased the facilities given to the liquor trade they would increase drunkenness. They were increasing the facilities to-night, so that they would be much greater than before.

Mr. NORTON: No!

Mr. McLEAN: The hon. member for Port Curtis said "No," but would his system decrease them?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Certainly.

Mr. McLEAN: It would do nothing of the kind, and it would be proved before very long whether they were increasing these facilities for intemperance or not. He had no doubt hon. members would make the Bill as good as they possibly could according to their light, but the time would come in this colony when they would not be legislating for the increase of facilities for drunkenness, but for the suppression of them as far as they could.

Mr. NORTON said he had very great respect for the hon. member, because he stuck to his opinions; but he thought he had been arguing on entirely false premises. The object of the amendment which he (Mr. Norton) proposed was not to increase the facilities for drinking, but to restrict them. In the existing Act every facility was offered for drinking. Every hotel must have an open bar, and why should there not be hotels without open bars—hotels where people could go without having to drink at the bar? His amendment absolutely restricted the facilities for drinking; because instead of going to those hotels where people were expected to be "nipping" all day long—and, in fact, where they were treated with the cold shoulder if they did not do so—they could go to other places. His amendment was actually an inducement to people not to drink so much. As to grocers' licenses, how would they increase the opportunities for drinking? A man could go to the grocer and would be supplied with a bottle of drink; but if he went to the public-house, he would not only get his bottle, but would get a "nip" as well, and the chances were that he would get two or three. He maintained that the object of this amendment was to restrict the temptation to drink. The hon. member had been arguing on entirely false premises.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member for Logan was entirely mistaken in his ideas with respect to this amendment. They were perfectly aware of the system of selling bottles which had been carried on by the grocers, and he knew that the publicans, as a body, would have no objection to see the existence of licensed spirit merchants. They might call them licensed grocers if they liked, but they were not entitled to get a license under this amendment unless they got a general spirit license. The Government were quite aware of the way in which the grocers had acted, and he was quite aware of the quantity of grog sold in Brisbane by them.

Mr. PERSSE thought there was nothing more likely to suppress drinking than for grocers to be able to sell grog to their customers instead of their having to go to the public-house for it. The hon. member for Logan said drunkenness at home was greater than formerly. He (Mr. Persse) did not think so. The hon. member might know more about it than other hon. members, and the increase might be more noticeable in his own part of the world; but from what he (Mr. Persse) knew of his own country he did not think this was the case. He thought there was less drinking than formerly. When sly grog was sold at home, every man drank simply because he was getting illicit whisky; but when he had to pay for whisky on which duty had been charged he never wanted to drink.

Mr. PRICE said his opinion was that the less temptation they gave a man to drink the less he would drink. He believed there was a lot of sly grog-selling among the grocers. He had had a lot of experience himself, and he had known a bottle of grog taken from a grocer's shop to a private shanty, the proprietor of which had sold it, and made a double profit out of it. The hon. member for Port Curtis seemed to take a great interest in this Bill. He (Mr. Price) did not know the reason for it. There was something preying on the hon. member's mind, but in endeavouring to remedy the evil of drinking he was inclined to put temptation in a man's way. He (Mr. Price) was not a Good Templar himself, but he liked an open-drinking man; and, if he sometimes got a little bit "off," everybody knew it. His opinion agreed with that of the hon. member for Logan. If they could devise some means to clear this drinking habit away he would help him, even if for his own benefit. He would give the hon. member his vote on this question, because he believed his heart was in the right place.

Amendment put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the word "five" was substituted for "three," in line 10, subsection 3.

On the motion of Mr. GRIFFITH, paragraph E of subsection 3 was amended by the addition of the words, "except as hereinafter provided in the case of a grocer's license."

Mr. MACFARLANE said this clause dealt with persons disqualified from holding licenses:—A—Any person holding office or employment under the Government; B—Any constable or bailiff; C—Any licensed auctioneer; D—Any brewer or distiller; E—Any wholesale spirit dealer, or wholesale dealer in wine or beer. He had two other amendments to follow paragraph E. His object was to prevent grocers holding licenses—either wholesale or retail. He need not state his reasons, which were numerous; but the principle on which he went was the prevention of the evil which would result, and had already resulted, from grocers holding licenses. He therefore proposed to insert, as a new paragraph to follow paragraph E, "Any retail grocer or other retail dealer."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY asked why should they prevent the retail grocer from holding a spirit license? He was not prevented now. A great many of the large retail grocers in Brisbane and other towns of the colony held wholesale spirit licenses; and why should they be prevented? Under this Bill no grocer who did not hold a wholesale license could get a bottle license: then what was the hon. member's object? It was precious like obstruction; and after the divisions that had been taken the hon. member should be satisfied that he could not carry his amendments.

Mr. BEATTIE said he did not want to obstruct; but, from the information given by the Colonial Secretary, he thought it necessary to introduce such a provision. The Colonial Secretary said that some grocers had told him that they were in the habit of breaking the law by selling bottles of grog. Men who had admitted openly to the Colonial Secretary that they were in the habit of breaking the law were not worthy of holding licenses. The publican was hedged round with restrictions; and why should

not the sale of liquor be kept in his hands? He believed none of the large wholesale merchants would sell a single bottle at any time; but anyone who knew anything about the system of grocers selling single bottles knew that it would do a great deal of injury. That was the reason why he should support the amendment.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was sorry the Colonial Secretary thought he was trying to obstruct. He was not in the habit of using the forms of the House, as a rule, to obstruct business; but this was a Bill in which he took a great deal of interest, and he was anxious to do what he could to improve it. The Colonial Secretary asked why a spirit license should be refused to retail grocers. But why should the retail bootmaker, the retail hatter, the retail draper, be refused? Why should the grocer be privileged above other trades? He was not asking anything unreasonable in the amendment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was no objection to the retail draper, the retail tinman, or the retail anything else getting a bottle licensé, provided he held a wholesale license.

Mr. GRIMES thought the argument used by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley a good one; and the Colonial Secretary had given a strong reason against bottle licenses. The hon. gentleman had an admission from the wholesale spirit-dealers that they were continually in the habit of breaking the law by selling single bottles, If they broke the law in that way, why should they not also break it in another—by allowing drinkers to go into their cellars to drink? When those gentlemen made that admission to the Colonial Secretary, the hon. gentleman might fairly, in justice to the licensed victuallers, have handed over their names, so that they might be looked after sharply by the Secretary of the Licensed Victuallers' Association.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the *rôle* of an informer might suit the hon. gentleman who had just spoken, but it did not suit him.

Mr. PERSSE said they had just heard a good lecture on the grocers who were manly enough to come forward and tell the Colonial Secretary that they were in the habit of selling single bottles. He believed there was not an hon. member in the House who did not know that there was not a single grocer in Brisbane who had not, and would not, at any time sell a bottle of grog to a customer. He for one had bought it in that way over and over again, and he was not ashamed to say so; but he would not say where. When those grocers had been straightforward enough to tell the Colonial Secretary that such was their custom, and that they wished to be enabled to do legitimately what they were now doing illegally, they ought not to be spoken of as they had been by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, the hon. member for Ipswich (Mr. Macfarlane), and the hon. member for Oxley.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he could tell the hon. member that he (Mr. Perkins) had not done anything of the kind, and he did not intend to do it either. He believed there was machinery in the clause, in the shape in which it was introduced by the Colonial Secretary, for overtaking these breaches of the law. Great praise had been given to grocers for their candour in admitting their offence. They all knew there was a certain class of traders who would evade the law, but he thought it would be quite easy to overtake the majority of these offenders; and, probably, others seeing this would become so frightened as to abandon their pursuit. His view of the matter was that the main principle of the Bill would be destroyed by increasing the number of licenses to be issued under it to four or five—by providing for private hotels and giving the bottle license to grocers. It was very hard on those who followed the business of hotelkeepers that they were to have so many conditions imposed upon them. They had policemen at their front doors, policemen at their back doors, who could break in at any time of the day or night if refused admission—in fact, all manner of restrictions were imposed upon them. Bad as many private lodging-houses might be as places where drink was sold without a license, he thought it would be found that, if once the principle was sanctioned for lodging-houses to get a license, what was now illegally done by a certain number would be multiplied tenfold. He would not like to say what the consequences would be, but they would be very bad for the colony; and he was satisfied that those hon. members who had a hand in this transaction to-night would, before many years had passed, have reason to repent of their conduct. With respect to every grocer indulging in the bottle trade, the Colonial Secretary had stated that he must first qualify himself by taking out the wholesale license. He would do that in order to do other things, and then other things would follow, which he (Mr. Perkins) thought would be prejudicial to the best interests of the country. A man must have a very small stock in his office if he could not manage to raise the wind to get a wholesale license; he would get the bottle license afterwards, but that was only a cloak for beginning to sell threepenny and sixpenny drinks in a wholesale manner, and the houses would be made places of appointment for drinking. He knew what the consequences would be from having seen the same system tried elsewhere; but on the heads of those who supported it those consequences must rest. He held that it was unfair to persons who had built large houses and established their business there. The facilities for obtaining liquor were so numerous at the present time that there was scarcely any person desirous of having a glass of grog who could not afford to buy two gallons, or if he could not afford to get that quantity he could go to a respectable publican and get a bottle within 6d. or 9d., or, perhaps, at just as low a price as it could be got at the so-called bottle stores—and he would get a superior article, because there were men in this town who had a character to maintain in this trade—men who did not look for a large profit, but to maintain their good name and the good character of their establishments. He thought this would be a very good measure. He did not desire to prolong the debate in any way, but wished to point out that the main principle of this Bill would be destroyed by the introduction of these amendments. He might say, on behalf of the Licensed Victuallers' Association—with which he was connected—that it was no part of their business to do anything to warrant the passage of the Bill with such amendments as had been admitted this evening.

Mr. MACFARLANE said this Bill, he understood, was drawn up to prevent sly grog-selling as far as possible, but what would be the result? Some grocers and spirit-dealers would get retail licenses to sell the single bottle. A great number of other grocers would not take out a license, but would try and evade the law, and the sale of small quantities of wines and spirits would continue. They were simply introducing "confusion worse confounded." Instead of preventing sly grog-selling, they were taking steps to intensify it ten degrees, and the Colonial Secretary would find his hands full of work in endeavouring to prevent it. He hoped hon. members would pause and think what might take place if this

grocers' license was passed. He had no more to say on the subject.

Amendment put, and the Committee divided:—

NOES, 20.

Sir Arthur Palmer, Messrs. P. Cooper, McIlwraith, Griffith, Dickson, De Poix-Tyrel, Persse, Lumley Hill, Groom, Foote, O'Sullivan, Kingsford, Lalor, Sheaffe, H. Wyndham Palmer, Black, Macdonald-Paterson, King, Norton, and Archer.

AYES, 8.

Messrs. Macrossan, McLean, Marfarlane, Hamilton, Beattie, Thorn, Grimes, and Francis.

The question was, therefore, resolved in the negative.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he had another amendment to propose—namely, "Any female, except the widow of a licensee"—to follow subsection E.

Mr. GRIFFITH thought this exclusion was too large. There used to be a rule that no unmarried woman could get a license. He had heard lately of cases of young unmarried women on the Northern goldfields getting licenses. That sort of thing ought not to be allowed. He remembered in the olden times it was understood that young unmarried women should not have a license; but at the same time he did not understand why old unmarried women should not get one.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, suppose the father and mother of a family died and there was no one left but the elder members of the family, and they were all daughters, why should not the elder daughter be allowed to take out a license?

Mr. BEATTIE said this was a matter that might be left to the licensing board. He quite agreed with the views expressed by the Colonial Secretary. There was a case of the kind mentioned came before the licensing board in the metropolis lately. An application was made by a young person whose sister's husband was the licensee of a public-house and who died, leaving a widow and young family. This young woman had managed the house during the lifetime of her brother-in-law, and as the widow could not manage the business this application was made. The board decided that it would be advantageous to that family to give this young woman, who had kept the house respectable for a long time, a license. Cases of that sort might fairly be left to the board, and he did not think it would be wise to introduce this subsection into the Bill. He hoped the hon. member would not press it to a division, as he should have to vote against it.

Amendment put and negatived.

Question—That subsection G stand part of the Bill—put and negatived.

Mr. BEATTIE asked if the latter portion of the clause was omitted with subsection G?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

Mr. BEATTIE said that portion of the clause might operate as a hardship. It said:—

"Nor shall any license be granted in respect of premises of, or in which the ownership or any interest is held by, a constable or bailiff, or any person who has forfeited or been disqualified from holding any license under the provisions of this Act, the period for such disqualification not having expired."

Now, supposing a constable was the owner of property that was let to a retail grocer who held a wine and spirit license under this Bill, the grocer would not be able to get a license, as the property belonged to a constable. That was not fair, and it was one of the effects of introducing the new subsection.

Mr. GRIFFITH said this appeared to be the same principle that was adopted in the Publicans Act. That only related to publicans' licenses, and, of course, it was not desirable that a constable should have an interest in a public-house. But this Bill related to other kinds of licenses, the clause having been extended beyond what it was originally. For instance, the owner of a public-house might be disqualified from holding a license for three years; but under this clause his property would also be under a disability, and the business could not be carried on, so that it extended a good deal further than it did before. He moved that in the 28th line the words "liquor retailers" be inserted between the words "any" and "license."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GRIFFITH said there was another part of this section which he considered was unnecessarily hard, which was to the effect:—

"Nor shall any license be granted in respect of premises of, or in which the ownership or any interest is held by, any person who has forfeited or been disqualified from holding any license under the provisions of this Act, the period for such disqualification not having expired."

It was a very serious thing that if a man should forfeit his license his premises should be forbidden to be licensed for three years; that was a terrible punishment. This was a new provision, and, he thought, a very hard one.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had no objection to an amendment from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFITH moved that all the words after the word "bailiff," in the 30th line should be omitted.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 21, as amended, put and passed.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he desired to move a new clause. Hon. members would observe that he had given notice of two other subsections to be added to clause 21, but after the amendments which had been made to the clause he should not press them. He should, however, move that the following new clause be inserted, to follow clause 21:—

But no new license shall be granted to any person in any town of more than two thousand inhabitants, where the public-houses already licensed are in proportion of more than one to five hundred of the population.

As the law stood at present, there was the greatest uncertainty as to who would be able to obtain licenses and who would fail. There was an impression among the members of the licensing boards that if an applicant was respectable, and fulfilled the qualifications as to accommodation to be provided, he ought to have a license. Members of boards would like to have some restriction put to their powers, and it was at their own suggestion that he had proposed the clause. If the new clause were carried some kind of order would be introduced, and members, when they went on the licensing bench, would know what to do. Hon. members would observe that it would apply only to the towns of the colony, and that it would not apply to any houses already licensed. It might be argued that such a clause would create a monopoly in favour of existing licensed houses; but that would be rather an advantage, as it would enable those who already held licenses to make their houses and the accommodation in them better. Things would gradually right themselves, and trade would not be disturbed in any way whatever. He knew that many members of the Committee took a great interest in the subject, and he would leave the matter in the hands of the Committee.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it would be a very great convenience to the Committee if the hon. member could be induced to go a little outside of and beyond Ipswich. This

was about the most absurd proposal he had ever heard. In Brisbane or Ipswich, which were towns coming within the scope of the clause, three-quarters of the population were women and children; whilst in a town on the diggings, which might also come within the clause, the greater part of the population were grown men; and yet the same rule was to be applied in both cases. The thing was a downright absurdity; fifty diggers would keep a good public-house going.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the reason given by the hon. member (Mr. Macfarlane) was quite as absurd as the clause. Instead of making the houses more respectable, it would create a monopoly and enable the publicans to do what they liked. The hon. member would not probably say that he could sell his goods a great deal cheaper if he had nobody on the other side of the street to contend with. If people wanted to drink they should be allowed a choice of where they should drink. He found, in travelling through the country, that where there was no competition a man had to put up with anything he could get, and sometimes got nothing; but, if there was another public-house or another store not far off, the tradesman generally gave good value, and would not allow a customer to go to his rival.

Mr. MACFARLANE said there was some force in the argument of the Colonial Secretary with reference to the different circumstances of various towns. That did not, however, interfere with the principle, and the measure could be altered to suit the requirements of different localities. To show that he was not inventing a new principle, he would read an extract showing what had taken place in Holland lately, on the occasion of the introduction of a similar measure. It was as follows:—

"The second Chamber has adopted, by sixty against eleven votes, clause 2 of the Abuse of Drink Repression Bill, fixing the number of licenses in communities above 50,000, at 1 for every 500 inhabitants; communities from 20,000 to 50,000, at 1 for 400; communities from 10,000 to 20,000, at 1 for 300; other communities, at 1 for 250 inhabitants. By decree, in special local circumstances, the maximum number of licenses may change for a fixed period."

If the Colonial Secretary would introduce a new clause adapting the number of public-houses to the wants of the community, he should be happy to support it in order to carry out the principle of the proposed new clause.

Mr. PERSSE saw no necessity for the proposed new clause. The licensing boards were appointed for the express purpose of ascertaining whether the applicants had complied with the requirements of the Act, and whether there was room in the town for the house for which a license was asked. It was entirely the man's own business to find out for himself whether there was an opening for him. It would be just as reasonable to say there were too many grocers or too many drapers, and to rule that there should be no more than a certain number.

Question—That the proposed new clause be inserted—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 4.

Messrs. McLean, Francis, Macfarlane, and Hamilton.

NOES, 18.

Sir Arthur Palmer, Messrs. Pope Cooper, Griffith, Dickson, O'Sullivan, Perkins, Archer, Groom, Foote, H. W. Palmer, Lalor, Black, Kingsford, Beattie, Norton, De Poix-Tyrel, Henry Palmer, and Persse.

Question, therefore, resolved in the negative.

On clause 22—"Accommodation required on premises within municipalities"—

Mr. NORTON said he thought, as he had stated on the occasion of the second reading, that it was quite unnecessary in the case of small municipalities that houses should be compelled to provide the amount of accommodation required by the clause. In many houses much less than five miles from municipalities it was quite useless to provide three sitting-rooms. Such a provision might be all very well in the large towns of the colony, where there was a considerable population outside the towns; but in many parts of the colony just outside the boundary of a town was bush, and there such accommodation was not required. He thought it would be better to dispose of the five miles altogether; either that or reduce the amount of accommodation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would give an instance of the effect of such an amendment. The Municipality of Brisbane was bounded by a street which was in the middle of Fortitude Valley. If they struck this out, anyone could go just on the other side of the street, put up any sort of building he liked, and apply for a license. The hon. member must be wanting to legislate for some outside town in his own district. There must be a distance.

Mr. NORTON said the object of this Bill was to prevent shanties being licensed at all. The same amount of accommodation was not wanted in country places as in towns. He did not wish to press the matter if the hon. member objected to it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do object to it.

Mr. GRIFFITH thought the hon. member for Port Curtis was quite right. It would be absurd to require this accommodation in some places less than five miles distant from a municipality. He thought the matter might very properly be left to the licensing boards. Toowong was a municipality, and it was ridiculous to expect this accommodation in public-houses within five miles of its boundaries. The Maryborough Municipality extended down to Saltwater Creek, several miles in the bush, and this accommodation was not wanted five miles beyond that.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that if they just went outside Ipswich they would get into the bush, and there were public-houses there which did not require the accommodation set down in this clause.

Mr. BEATTIE wished to know whether this regulation would apply to private hotels? He hoped it would.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes; it will.

Mr. BEATTIE: There ought to be some restriction to prevent every little shanty getting a license. He hoped the Colonial Secretary would keep this provision in the Bill.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that this was quite a new provision, and an entire innovation on the present law. He would also point out what he had previously drawn attention to—namely, the interpretation of a "municipality." A municipality was defined to be "any municipality established under the laws in force for the time being relating to local government." This section, therefore, included the whole colony, unless there was to be some other definition of a municipality than that in the 4th clause. He would move the omission of the words "or in any place being less than five miles distant from any municipality."

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put, and the Committee divided as follows:—

AYES, 14.

Sir Arthur Palmer, Messrs. Pope Cooper, McLean, McIlwraith, Foote, H. W. Palmer, Lalor, Beattie, Archer, De Poix-Tyrel, Macfarlane, Francis, Hamilton, and Groom.

NOES, 9.

Messrs. Norton, Miles, Grimes, Fraser, Perkins, Persse, O'Sullivan, Dickson, and Griffith.

Question, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.

Some verbal alterations having been made, the clause, as amended, passed.

Clause 23 passed with a verbal amendment.

Clause 24 passed as printed.

Mr. NORTON proposed the insertion of the following new clause to follow clause 24:—

No private hotel license shall be granted for any premises which do not, at and after the time of applying for the same, contain rooms and accommodation, a bar only excepted, as required in the case of liquor retailers' licenses by section twenty-two of this Act.

Mr. DE POIX-TYREL said there was no definition of "bar" in the Bill. It might be any portion of the building. The word ought to be defined before the clause was passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We all know what a bar is.

Question put and passed.

On clause 25—"Notices to be given by applicants for new licenses"—

Mr. GRIFFITH said he noticed a change in the existing law with respect to advertising. The Act of 1863 provided that notice should be given three times in two newspapers. It was now proposed that notice need only be given twice in one newspaper. The notice ought certainly to be published in two newspapers. There were towns with two newspapers which were read by different classes of people. Why should notice be given only in that paper which the applicant chose to patronise?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There is a great deal too much advertising.

The clause was passed, with a consequential amendment moved by Mr. NORTON.

On clause 26—"Renewal of license"—after a consequential amendment had been made, on the motion of Mr. NORTON,

Mr. GRIFFITH said there was a great innovation in the clause, which gave an absolute vested right to every public-house that its license should be continued for ever, provided that the landlord did not do something to forfeit it. That was an entirely new principle. The words were plain:—

"Such applicant having delivered the notices required by this Act, shall be entitled as a matter of course to a renewal of his license, unless it be shown to the board or licensing authority that he has become disqualified from holding or is unfit to hold a license under this Act, or that the premises in respect of which he holds one have ceased to be adequate to the requirements prescribed herein."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: What else would the hon. gentleman have? Would he have him kicked out for nothing? The object of the clause was simply to let the publicans alone while they were conducting themselves properly. At present they had every year to come up to town and spend time and money at the court-house; and they were subjected to much annoyance in that way. The clause did not confer upon them a vested right. Why should publicans be annually called away from their business if there was no complaint against them?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could not follow the hon. member for North Brisbane. He could not see that the clause gave any vested right to the publicans. It was nothing more than a fair thing. Why should a publican be called up to the bench every year for his license, so long as he paid it and kept within the law?

Mr. GRIFFITH saw no reason whatever for the proposed alteration. In 1872 he had assisted to pass a Bill to prevent men having to attend every year. The Colonial Secretary did not seem to understand his own Bill. Under the second paragraph of this clause, anyone having once got a license was entitled to keep it for ever. He (Mr. Griffith) said that was a vested right. It might turn out on some future occasion that it was very undesirable for the house to be continued; the neighbourhood might change altogether and the house so become thoroughly unsuited to it. The Government might desire to build a school next to it, and the continuance of the house might, therefore, be thought undesirable. There were many other instances in which it might be undesirable for a license to be continued, and in which the licensing board would not think of continuing the license. He believed there had been cases lately in which the board had refused licenses because they thought the renewal was undesirable, but if this clause passed they could not do so if they wished. Suppose the board thought that three public-houses in the space of six houses were undesirable. If this clause passed, they could not alter it. This, too, was a new principle, and one which he thought was very objectionable. The House was always careful not to create vested interests, and only a few days since they inserted a clause in a Bill to avoid doing so. Here, however, they were putting in a provision which they could not abolish afterwards without giving compensation. They were absolutely tying their own hands—making a contract with the man.

Mr. NORTON did not think the words, "as a matter of course," were necessary to the Bill. The difficulty he thought was in regard to the disqualifications which were laid down now. Others might arise which had been now possibly omitted from the Bill.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that the words "as a matter of course" did not affect the result at all.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would try to meet the hon. member, although he did not think a man would desire to keep up a small shanty in an improved neighbourhood. He would propose to add at the end of the clause the words "or that in the opinion of the board or licensing authority the house is no longer necessary."

Question put and passed; and the clause, as amended, was agreed to.

Clause 27—"Transfer of liquor retailer's license."

On the motion of Mr. NORTON, the words "or private hotel" were inserted.

The clause, as amended, was agreed to.

Clause 28—"Removal of license."

On the motion of Mr. NORTON, the words "or private hotel" were inserted.

The clause was also verbally amended.

Mr. NORTON moved the insertion, in line 29, of the words, "being the holder of a liquor retailer's license," after the word "licensee."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was no reason whatever for making this distinction. The amendment was withdrawn, and the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 29—"Provisional certificate"—was put and passed.

Mr. NORTON moved the insertion of a new clause, which, after verbal amendments, was as follows:—

A private hotel license shall authorise the holder thereof to sell liquor for consumption on the premises specified in the license, and not elsewhere, to any person then being a *bonâ fide* lodger on such premises.

Mr. MACFARLANE thought this was a monstrous clause. If only *bonâ fide* lodgers were to be served, the question arose as to who were *bonâ fide* lodgers. He could see no difficulty in any person becoming a *bonâ fide* lodger by taking a bed for one night, under such a clause as this. He did not suppose these houses would come under the regulation hours, and be compelled to close at 12 o'clock at night, and the lodgers could sing their songs: they could sing "We won't go home till morning," and sit boozing and drinking all night. They would drink themselves dead drunk, with "beds provided." This was a fine state of affairs. He hoped the Colonial Secretary would study the morality of the colony, and not allow a clause like this to pass.

Mr. NORTON asked why people could sit up in a lodging-house and get drunk any more than in a public-house?

Mr. MACFARLANE: Because they will not be obliged to shut up at 12 o'clock.

Mr. PERSSE could not agree with this clause. These were a different kind of place from public-houses.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Make it a £30 license.

Mr. PERSSE said that would make it different, certainly; but he would support the hon. member for Ipswich in his opposition to this clause.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 30—"Packet license"—

Mr. GRIFFITH said this clause was a mistake. The notices required to be given by vessels trading on the coast were too long, and the transfers too cumbersome. He thought it would be better not to go on with this clause to-night.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the Chairman left the chair, and reported progress.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the Committtee have leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. DICKSON said it was very desirable that every member should have a copy of the Bill with the important amendments which had so far been made, and he would respectfully ask the Speaker to give instructions that such might be the case. He did not suppose there was such a pressure of work in the Government Printing Office as would prevent this work being done.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was no particular pressure of work in the Printing Office. If the Chairman of Committees had the Bill ready in time, he (the Colonial Secretary) would have it printed.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER moved that this House do now adjourn. The business for to-morrow would be the second readings of the Bills introduced to-day, and Supply.

Question put and passed; and the House adjourned at fourteen minutes to 11 o'clock.