

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Council**

**TUESDAY, 6 JANUARY 1920**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

TUESDAY, 6 JANUARY, 1920.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. W. Hamilton) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock p.m.

**APPOINTMENT OF CLERK-ASSISTANT AND USHER OF THE BLACK ROD.**

The PRESIDENT announced the appointment by the Governor in Council of Mr. Clarence John McPherson as Clerk-Assistant of the Legislative Council and Usher of the Black Rod, in the place of Mr. Thomas Dickson, transferred.

Mr. McPherson thereupon produced his Commission and took the oath of allegiance.

**ASSENT TO BILLS.**

The PRESIDENT announced the receipt from the Governor of messages conveying His Excellency's assent to the following Bills:—

Workers' Homes Bill;  
Stock Foods Bill;  
Co-operative Agricultural Production and Advances to Farmers Act Amendment Bill;  
Queensland Government Savings Bank Act Amendment Bill;  
Daraji Railway Bridge Bill; and  
Jimbour Selections Bill.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MEMBER.**

HON. J. LALOR.

The PRESIDENT announced the receipt from the Governor of a letter dated 11th November, 1919, intimating that His Excellency proposed to grant a request for leave of absence from the Legislative Council for the remainder of the present session to the Hon. James Lalor.

**PAPERS.**

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones) laid on the table the following papers:—

Report of the Public Works Commission on the proposal to remove the locomotive depot from Teowoomba to a site near Willowburn.  
Report of the Public Works Commission on a proposal to construct the Dirranbandi Extension for a distance of 10 miles from Dirranbandi, including the bridge over the Balonne River.  
Report of the Public Works Commission on a proposal to construct a tramway from the iron mines at Mount Biggenden to the Gayndah Railway.  
Report of the Public Works Commission on the question of constructing the railway from Goondoon to Kalliva Creek.  
Report of the Public Service Board for 1917 and 1918.  
Despatch conveying His Majesty's assent to an Act passed during session of 1919.  
Award for employees of the Commissioner for Railways.  
Report on the operations of the sub-Departments of Aborigines, Prisons, Government Relief, Diamantina Hospital for Chronic Diseases, Jubilee Sanatorium (Dalby), Dunwich Benevolent Asylum, and Institution for Inebriates.

Return of all schools in operation on 1st July, 1919.

Railway by-laws relating to the conveyance of passengers, goods, and live stock.

and moved: That all the papers be printed with the exception of the "Gazette" relating to the conveyance of passengers, goods, and live stock traffic on the Queensland railways.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: I would like to know why the Minister does not want that paper printed. Is he afraid of the increase of fares and freights getting to the public and of their being allowed to see exactly how high the Government are raising the rates? This is a most unusual proposal, and I would like the Minister to give us some reason for it. It is a thing that ought to go broadcast before the general public, so that they may see the way in which the fares and freights on the Queensland railways have been increased.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I may inform the hon. gentleman that the paper is very voluminous and the information has already been published. The hon. gentleman is not correct in saying that there is any attempt on the part of the Government to hide the fact that fares and freights have been raised as from 1st January. I take this opportunity of informing the Council, and incidentally the people of Queensland, that the increase in freights is not 30 per cent., as has been stated in the Brisbane Press.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: They are nearly 45 per cent. in some cases.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: The increase is more than 30 per cent. in some cases.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The increase is much less than 30 per cent. in very many cases.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: There is the zone system

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It may be interesting to the hon. gentleman who interjects to know that the fares and freights in Queensland in many instances are lower than those in America and other countries.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the question of fares and freights on the motion before the Council.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: I know that the question before the Council is that the papers tabled are to be printed, and I am not going to discuss the question of railway fares and freights; but I want the Minister to understand that, if we do not offer objection to the printing of the papers which have been tabled, that is not to be taken as implying our approval of the contents of those documents. It is a pure matter of form whether we pass the motion or not.

Question put and passed.

**LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL.****SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.**

HON. G. S. CURTIS: I desire to preface my remarks by saying that I am sure we are all in favour of temperance, and would like to see a reasonable measure of reform of the liquor laws of the country. But such reform should be based upon the principle of justice and equity, and not upon the principle of repudiation or confiscation, such as is

*Hon. G. S. Curtis.]*

involved in the schemes of nationalisation of the trade or prohibition which have been advocated in some countries. I am sorry to notice that there is no provision in the Bill for compensation in the event of either nationalisation or prohibition to those who may be deprived of the rights which they have legally acquired under the laws of the State. If the Bill gets into Committee, I shall be prepared to move the requisite amendments to supply the omission in that respect. It would have been far better for the Government to bring in a measure such as was passed in Victoria some thirteen years ago—a practicable, common-sense measure, and not an impracticable and undesirable thing such as this. The Victorian Act provided for a gradual reduction in the number of licenses, and also provided for compensation to be paid to those who were deprived of their licenses, the compensation being paid, not from the public Treasury, but by those in the trade itself. That measure has worked very satisfactorily in Victoria, where something like 1,000 licenses have been abolished. A measure such as that would have a much better chance of being carried than the Bill now before the Council. There is much more likelihood of an experiment being successful where it is the result of a reasonable compromise between extremes. Such a compromise as is involved in the Victorian Act is likely to be more successful than either prohibition or a continuance of the trade under existing conditions. What we wish to secure is greater control and greater restrictions on the trade instead of its total abolition. I have heard it said that many of the evils which at present exist in connection with the liquor trade in Queensland are due to defective and lax administration of the existing law, and I believe there is a good deal of truth in the statement. I maintain that the rights of individuals are entitled to consideration, but by prohibition we would deprive the great majority of people who do not drink to excess of the right to obtain what has become to millions of people a real need. The State exceeds its functions when it steps in and interferes with the liberty of the individual in regard to alcohol. The state of mind which actuates the extremists of the temperance party in connection with this matter is similar to the state of mind which existed in the case of the religious zealots of former times. Later on I shall quote a passage from an essay of John Stuart Mill, which is the masterpiece of all his work. I do not question the sincerity of the motives or desires of the extremists, nor do I say that they are actuated by any but the best possible motives, but I contend that they have become obsessed by the conviction that it is necessary to force their views with respect to prohibition on the great mass of the people, whether they like it or do not like it. They wish to compel the large majority of the people to act as they do. It should be borne in mind that the abolition of the trade would not only deprive a great number of people of their individual liberty, but it would also inflict a serious injury on the owners of properties who have spent large sums of money in erecting large hotels. If prohibition were carried out, and no proper provision were made for money compensation to the owners of hotels, that would mean a very serious loss to those persons. This Bill assumes the right of the State to take away a man's property without

[*Hon. G. S. Curtis.*]

paying for it, because there is no provision in the Bill dealing with compensation.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Would that not be an after-consideration?

HON. G. S. CURTIS: Provision ought to be made in the Bill dealing with the question of compensation, so that when people are asked by means of a referendum to vote on the question of prohibition they would know whether they are voting to take away the property of people without compensation, or whether the owners of hotels are to be compensated. If the majority of the people are in favour of nationalisation of the liquor trade, or of prohibition, they can obtain what they desire, but they should recognise the fairness and the justice of compensating persons who may suffer very serious injury by the reduction of the value of their properties in the event of prohibition being enforced. A license is, of course, an annual one, and has to be renewed every year. Some persons contend that the fact that a license has to be renewed every year does away with any claim a licensee may have for compensation in the event of his license being refused. I cannot say that I can see any justification for that argument. I happened to be in Sydney many years ago when I heard this very question discussed in the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales. I heard the late Sir George Reid speak upon the very point I have mentioned. Sir George said there was no doubt that there was an implied contract between the State and hotelkeepers or licensees that if their hotels were constructed in accordance with the provisions of the law, and they conducted their businesses properly, their licenses would be renewed from year to year. He laid that down very distinctly as his opinion. In the course of the same debate, another leading member of the House, who was afterwards Agent-General for New South Wales, stated, with regard to the contention that property-owners should be granted an extension of time as compensation before their licenses were cancelled, that that simply meant that they would not rob the owners to-day, but would rob them at some future time. I think Sir George Reid was right in his contention—that as the laws of the country regulate the liquor trade and make stipulations with regard to the construction of public-houses, the number of rooms those houses should contain, the size of the rooms, and the hours during which the licensee should conduct business, those laws recognise and legalise the liquor trade, and the Government cannot now turn round in response to any irrational demand of certain people in the country whose minds are obsessed with the ideas of temperance or prohibition, and take away those people's property without compensation. An important case came before the Appeal Court in England, in which this question of compensation was dealt with. The Imperial Government had commandeered and taken possession of an hotel for war purposes, and refused to compensate the owners for the use of the property, and an action was brought against them. All the records of the past were examined by the Master of the Rolls, and it was found that there was not a single case on record, even in the time of the Stuarts, in which the Crown had set up the claim that they could take a citizen's property without paying for it.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: This Bill does not propose anything of that kind.

HON. G. S. CURTIS: No, but it omits provision for compensating owners or licensees if their licenses are taken away from them, and the Bill should not be silent on that point. When we get into Committee I hope that a suitable amendment will be adopted to show that this Council is not in favour of repudiation or confiscation.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Why didn't you raise your voice against the Denham Government when they did not provide for compensation?

HON. G. S. CURTIS: I was not here at the time, but I know that the Denham Government did several things I did not approve of. The Dean of Canterbury published an article in the "Fortnightly Review" of January last dealing with the question of prohibition. In that article his arguments are based upon a report brought up by a scientific commission on the use of alcohol, and the dean said that their report was in effect a strong plea in favour of toleration and moderation—a strong argument in favour of regulation and restriction, but not at all a strong argument in favour of prohibition. The dean was very distinct in his condemnation of what was proposed to be done in the matter of the abolition of the drink traffic, and he declared that the report of the Commission was not in favour of inflicting a great injustice upon the majority of the people by taking away from them their individual liberty to decide whether they would take alcohol or not. The first part of this measure deals with the question of nationalisation. In my opinion, it is not desirable that the Government should undertake the management of the liquor trade by nationalisation, because it is certain that in such a case the business would not be managed successfully and the loss would ultimately have to be made good by the taxpayer. The success of a large family hotel requires constant vigilance, supervision, care, and attention in its management, and this can only be secured by private ownership, or in other words by those who are financially interested and have their money invested in the business personally conducting the business. As Mr. Gladstone used to say, the business of government is not to trade, but to govern. The essentials of success in connection with the conduct of hotels cannot be secured by State management. The business would be badly managed by the State, and the result would be a continual loss to the public Treasury. Here is a passage from John Stuart Mill, dealing with the question of nationalisation, and this passage will apply equally to all businesses carried on by the Government which should be undertaken by private enterprise—

"The objections to Government interference.

"The first is, when the thing to be done is likely to be better done by individuals than by the Government. Speaking generally, there is no one so fit to conduct any business, or to determine how or by whom it shall be conducted, as those who are personally interested in it. This principle condemns the interferences, once so common, of the Legislature, or the offices of Governments, with the ordinary processes of industry."

[4 p.m.]

Later on he says this—

"The third and most cogent reason for restricting the interference of government is the great evil of adding unnecessarily to its power. Every function superadded to those already exercised by the Government causes its influence over hopes and fears to be more widely diffused, and converts, more and more, the active and ambitious part of the public into hangers-on of the Government, or of some party which aims at becoming the Government. If the roads, the railways, the banks, the insurance offices, the great joint stock companies, the universities, and the public charities, were all of them branches of the Government; if, in addition, the municipal corporations and local boards, with all that now devolves on them, became departments of the central Administration; if the employees of all these different enterprises were appointed and paid by the Government, and looked to the Government for every rise in life, not all the freedom of the Press and popular constitution of the Legislature would make this or any other country free otherwise than in name. And the evil would be greater the more efficiently and scientifically the administrative machinery were constructed—the more skilful the arrangements for obtaining the best qualified hands and heads with which to work it."

This condemnation of governmental control of industries is applicable not only to the proposal now before the Council, but to all the other enterprises which the Government have in hand. Prohibition will deprive of their individual liberty the large number of people who do not drink to excess. Many people have the opinion that the moderate use of alcohol as a sedative and a soother of the nervous system is a real need, and to deprive them of its use would be an arbitrary and tyrannical abuse of power which cannot be justified because of a small minority of the people who are liable to drink to excess. What is wanted is liquor reform, not prohibition. As I have already said, those were the opinions expressed by the Dean of Canterbury with regard to the liquor trade after the publication of the report of the scientific commission of inquiry into the subject. Reform can be secured by reasonable restrictions and better control. I have referred to what Victoria has done. The action of that State has resulted in a good deal of good. We all know what the United States has done. I will have something to say about that later on. In Mill's time several of the United States adopted prohibition, but they had to repeal the law; and I think they will have to repeal again the law which they passed recently. Mill says further—

"There is a limit to the legitimate interference of collective opinion with individual independence; and to find that limit and maintain it against encroachment is as indispensable to a good condition of human affairs as protection against political despotism."

That is the limited authority of the State with regard to interference with the liberty of the subject. I draw particular attention to this passage, and ask whether it should not count before the excessive enthusiasm of some of our friends with regard to this matter—

*Hon. G. S. Curtis.]*

"Yet, so natural to mankind is intolerance in whatever they really care about, that religious freedom has hardly anywhere been practically realised except where religious indifference, which dislikes to have its peace disturbed by theological quarrels, has added its weight to the scale."

The state of mind of those who are advocating total prohibition is precisely the state of mind of the religious zealots of previous times.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Which branch of the liquor traffic do you represent?

HON. G. S. CURTIS: I am in favour of regulation and restriction of the liquor trade. I am not in favour of nationalisation or total prohibition. Mill also has this to say—

"A people, it appears, may be progressive for a certain length of time, and then stop; when does it stop? When it ceases to possess individuality."

I have quoted from Mill because I think his views should be treated with respect. With reference to the liquor trade especially he says this—

"Under the name of preventing intemperance, the people of one English colony, and of nearly half the United States, have been interdicted by law from making any use whatever of fermented drinks, except for medical purposes; for prohibition of their sale is, in fact, as it is intended to be, prohibition of their use. And though the impracticability of executing the law has caused its repeal in several of the States which had adopted it, including the one from which it derives its name, an attempt has, notwithstanding, been commenced, and is prosecuted with considerable zeal by many of the professed philanthropists, to agitate for a similar law in this country. The association, or 'Alliance' as it terms itself, which has been formed for this purpose, has acquired some notoriety through the publicity given to a correspondence between its secretary and one of the very few English public men who hold that a politician's opinions ought to be founded on principles. The organ of the Alliance, who would 'deeply deplore the recognition of any principle which could be wrested to justify bigotry and persecution,' undertakes to point out the 'broad and impassable barrier' which divides such principles from those of the association. 'All matters relating to thought, opinion, conscience, appear to me,' he says, 'to be without the sphere of legislation; all pertaining to social act, habit, relation, subject only to a discretionary power vested in the State itself, and not in the individual, to be within it.' No mention is made of a third class, different from either of these—viz., acts and habits which are not social, but individual; although it is to this class, surely, that the act of drinking fermented liquors belongs. Selling fermented liquors, however, is trading, and trading is a social act. But the infringement complained of is not on the liberty of the seller, but on that of the buyer and consumer."

Later on he expresses this opinion—

"A theory of 'social rights' the like of which probably never before found its

[*Hon. G. S. Curtis.*

way into distinct language: being nothing short of this—that it is the absolute social right of every individual, that every other individual shall act in every respect exactly as he ought; that whosoever fails thereof in the smallest particular violates my social right, and entitles me to demand from the Legislature the removal of the grievance."

That is the attitude taken up by the advocates of prohibition here at the present time. Mill says—

"So monstrous a principle is far more dangerous than any single interference with liberty; there is no violation of liberty which it would not justify; it acknowledges no right to any freedom whatever, except, perhaps, to that of holding opinions in secret, without ever disclosing them; for the moment an opinion, which I consider noxious, passes anyone's lips, it invades all the 'social rights' attributed to me by the Alliance. The doctrine ascribes to all mankind a vested interest in each other's moral, intellectual, and even physical perfection, to be defined by each claimant according to his own standard."

Mill distinctly and emphatically condemns it as the most unreasonable and unwarrantable interference with the liberty of the subject. I do not think I need quote any further from him. To-day I came across an article in the "Edinburgh Review" of October last upon this subject. I will content myself with giving the conclusion of the article. I have no doubt hon. gentlemen are already tired of quotations, but, to my mind, they are very important in helping to elucidate the question of whether the great majority of the people should be deprived of their individual liberty because of the opinions held by a comparatively few persons in the country with regard to the prohibition of the liquor trade. The writer of this article condemns prohibition. He says that it would be a most irrational and unreasonable thing and a most unwarrantable interference with the liberty of the subject. He winds up in this way—

"It is not the object of this article to defend the consumption of alcohol, or to express any opinion as between total abstinence and moderate or occasional indulgence. Probably many people would be best suited by one course, and many by the other. The object is merely this; to deprecate drastic compulsory action on the ground that scientific knowledge is not sufficiently advanced to say whether the effect would be good or bad. Prudence strongly suggests the unwisdom of any vigorous State action. Moreover, the United States having now plunged into the experiment of total prohibition, we have before us a unique opportunity of observing the results of that experiment, and thus acquiring the necessary information for adopting a wise and safe policy.

"No suggestions are made, therefore, as to what course ought actually to be taken. My only endeavour is to set forth a few deep principles, which have been overlooked in the shallow controversies of political life. The whole problem is merged in the larger question as to the rights of the State to interfere with the individual. A multiplicity of laws and regulations invariably produces a low standard of regard for law;

evasion becomes respectable, and the arm of the law is weakened by attempting too much."

"Moreover, law in a democratic community is merely an expression of the opinion of the majority; and how do we know the opinion of the majority is right? Where it can be tested against fact, as in the history of science and philosophy, the opinion of the majority on controversial matters has far more often than not turned out to be wrong. Let the majority guide their lives as they think fit; but let them not force their mode of life indiscriminately on all men; for among the minority there will be some wiser than they. The great new ideas, upon which civilisation has slowly grown up, have nearly always originated in the minds of a few men of unusual genius, and have gradually won by reason of their true merit against the unpopularity which at first beset them. If minorities are to be invariably dominated by the opinion of majorities, all hope of progress is at an end.

"Furthermore, anarchy and over-government go hand in hand. The excessive governmental interferences involved by the war—most of them necessary, no doubt, as measures of war—have already led by reaction to a far more anarchical state of Europe than when the hand of government was lighter; and the condition of anarchy is greatest where the weight of government was heaviest. Improvement cannot be otherwise than slow; it is certain also that improvement can only be achieved by a gradual but determined relaxation and ultimate abolition of arbitrary restrictions upon the liberty of the individual. Only in the pure air of freedom can the deadly virus of Bolshevism and social unrest be destroyed."

I commend that article to every hon. member as being well worth reading. There is no doubt that the decision arrived at by the United States of America has had a widespread influence in inducing many persons to think that other nations ought to do the same thing, but in that connection I want to quote an article which appeared on 7th September last in the Brisbane "Sun"—

"Mr. Stephen Leacock, head of the department of political economy at McGill University, Montreal, as well as a humorist novelist, writing on the warning of prohibition in America in the 'National Review' just issued, says—

It is time that people in England should have proper warning of the social catastrophe which has overwhelmed America. While there is yet time the danger should be averted.

From the crusade of a despised minority, a mark for good-natured ridicule rather than fear, the prohibition movement became a vast continental propaganda, backed by unlimited money, engineered by organised hypocrisy. Under the stress of war, it masqueraded as the crowning effort of patriotism. The war over, it sits enthroned as a social tyranny, backed by the full force of the law, the like of which has not been seen in English-speaking countries since the fires died out at Smithfield."

He points out that this question was never submitted to a national vote, but was carried by the State Legislatures because large funds were subscribed to pay professional agitators to go through the country, and they eventually succeeded in stamping their will on the members of the State Legislatures.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It first came in State after State by popular vote.

HON. G. S. CURTIS: He speaks of them as salaried agitators. I notice that Mr. "Pussyfoot" Johnson has gone to England and is endeavouring to convince the people there that prohibition is a desirable thing, but so far as I have been able to see they are not inclined to take it very seriously, and I have seen several very amusing incidents in the papers. I saw one cartoon depicting John Bull's house. Mr. "Pussyfoot" Johnson has an assistant at every door and at every window, and there are several men on top taking off the roof to see, of course, whether there is liquor there or not. John Bull comes out; he is very much alarmed. "Do not be alarmed," says Mr. "Pussyfoot" Johnson, "we are only making preliminary investigations. We have not made up our minds to take possession or not." Here is an opinion by an English writer, Mr. Chesterton—

"It may suit America to prohibit drinking, but it will not suit us.

"The Americans are a people without traditions, and consequently without a love of the beautiful. To them it means nothing, excepting a sort of double guard against allowing a negro to get drunk.

"They realise that to give the negro alcohol, so long as he exists under the conditions at present obtaining in the Northern States of America, is a dangerous and altogether inadvisable thing to do, and instead of recognising that what was really wrong were the conditions they assumed that the fault lay with the drink."

His letter is certainly a very strong one, and he makes out a good case against the English people's following the example of the people of the United States. He reminds us that man knows of something better to drink than water, knows how to make it, and drinks it for his own betterment and the good of his soul.

I have here some particulars of the results of the operations of the law in the State of Victoria, taken from the "Australasian" of the 9th November last. It gives the total number of houses and the number that were abolished. The printing is not good enough to enable me to read it, but at any rate the owners were compensated by a fund provided by the trade itself, and the amount came to a very considerable sum.

I do not think I need detain hon. members any longer. One the one hand I have said that I cannot conceive of the Government's possibly carrying on the trade successfully, for the reasons I have already stated and those given by Mill. The Government lack the two essentials of success, economy and efficiency, and the management of an hotel calls for constant and unremitting supervision in the interest of the comfort of those staying in the house. With regard to the other question, I have already expressed my view that abolition of all the hotels seems to be inconceivable, unreasonable, and absurd—it is impracticable and undesirable. If it were carried through our Australian wine

*Hon. G. S. Curtis.]*

trade would be destroyed. We would not be able to get even a glass of our beautiful light colonial wines, or of any colonial wines at all. I do not think the people will ever consent to anything of the kind so absurd and unreasonable. I have been a moderate drinker for many years past, and I do not feel any the worse for it. I think I feel all the better for it, and if I were deprived of the little alcohol I am in the habit of consuming after the day's work is over, I would feel very miserable. If such a law were passed it would help to make the world much more drab and sombre than it is at present, and if alcohol does shorten the lives of a few to a slight extent, it is pointed out by the article in "The Edinburgh Review," that is more than compensated for by the greater ease and comfort of those who have their glass of wine or whisky. (Laughter.)

I do not think it would be possible to abolish drink. If you tried to abolish it by statute, there would be an illicit manufacture and sale, and in a vast sparsely populated country like Australia it would be absolutely impossible to make such a law effective. Even if it were enforced, the natural craving on the part of most people for some stimulant would mean that if they could not get alcohol they would get some drug, something else that would be very much worse, which I feel sure would be very injurious, not only to individuals, but also to the State.

The truth in regard to this matter lies between the two extremes, between the proposal to abolish the trade and the proposal to give it unlimited freedom. It should be restricted and placed under sufficient control, and by that means the welfare of the country and the comfort and happiness of the people would be best conserved. I have here a letter by Lord Hugh Cecil on the question of the restriction of liberty. Lord Hugh Cecil is a statesman with very sound views and very sound principles. He is independent and able to express his opinions independently—political influence does not have to be brought to bear on him before he expresses his views. He writes to "The Times":—

[4.30 p.m.]

"It is no welcome task to oppose those who, animated by excellent motives, are striving to increase the national efficiency in waging war. But I feel bound to say a word in protest against the proposals now being put forward for the legislative prohibition of the sale of alcoholic liquor.

"These proposals are recommended, first, because some of the workmen whose labour is necessary to furnish munitions of war, drink so much as to interfere with their capacity to labour; secondly, because Russia has prohibited the sale of vodka, and France the sale of absinthe. Both these reasons seem to me unconvincing. We have not been told the number of the workmen whose drinking habits and impaired efficiency have caused the difficulty. I think we ought to be told. Until we know the extent of the evil, we cannot intelligently seek for a remedy. But I will guess the number to be about 100,000. I cannot think it reasonable, wise, or even right that the liberty of the whole community should be restricted

[Hon. G. S. Curtis.

because the habits of a few—in proportion to the whole, they are a few—are mischievous to the public interest. If liberty must be restricted—and every such restriction is lamentable—let it be the liberty of those who are in fault, not that of the entire people. Was there ever anything less reasonable suggested than that innumerable citizens, who are perfectly temperate, and who have nothing whatever to do with munitions of war, should be deprived of a legitimate satisfaction, because some of the workmen employed by Government are morbidly given to drink? And it would be not only the liberty of all citizens, but the property and even the livelihood of some which would be threatened. For the liquor business in all its branches is a great industry, and to destroy it would be to impoverish large numbers. This would not be rational law-making. It would be a destructive inundation of ungoverned emotion. We hear, indeed, of compensation. But compensation would be almost impossibly complicated, and would be an additional burden to the heavy laden national finances. And all this to correct the infirmities of 100,000 workmen! One has heard of expensive methods of roasting a pig.

"But we are told that Russia has suppressed vodka, and France absinthe, and that the suppression has been beneficial. One answer to this argument is that it is much too early to judge of the success of these experiments. The hand of authority in moral reform usually seems to succeed at first; it is only in the long run that the counsels of freedom are justified. Compulsory piety and compulsory chastity are proved failures. I doubt the ultimate success of compulsory sobriety. But the answer which I would emphasise is that our traditions of personal liberty are not shared by our great allies. Great Britain is a free country in a sense in which Russia does not pretend to be. And even the French, democratic and zealous for equality as they are, have never cared for the liberty of the individual as we care. In respect to liberty we stand almost alone. 'Slavery,' said Burke of the American colonies, 'they can have anywhere. They can have it from Spain, they can have it from Prussia. Liberty they can have only from you. That is the commodity of price of which you have a monopoly.' In respect to freedom we must not seek to learn from others—even from our allies. Let us walk by the light of our own wisdom.

"I will not discuss the proposal to voluntary abstinence so strongly urged by the Archbishop of Canterbury and others. I am not quite in sympathy with their language, nor is it my present intention myself to abstain. But all self-denying is admirable; and I do not at all desire to discourage anyone who is spontaneously disposed to this or any other self-denying practice. Each man must decide such matters 'in his own heart and conscience.' But if the Government should be so ill-advised as to propose the prohibition by law of the sale of all alcoholic liquors, or even of ardent spirits, I trust that they will be met in Parliament by an animated and unbending resistance."

There is a serious omission from the Bill,

inasmuch as it makes no provision for the compensation of owners whose properties are taken over by the State, or whose properties may be seriously depreciated in value if total prohibition is brought about. There should be a distinct provision in the Bill that they should be compensated. With respect to the third question—the continuance of the trade—I think it would be advisable to provide that the continuance should be subject to such restrictions and limitations as appear to be desirable. It might be a good thing to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the whole question, and upon its report the Government might be able to frame a suitable Bill. If the Bill goes into Committee, it is my intention to move amendments in the direction I have spoken of.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: Without attempting to traverse the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I would point out that his arguments, in the main, were arguments against something which this Bill does not ask this Council to agree to. They were arguments against the enactment of prohibition. What we have to decide is purely and simply whether the people themselves should have the right to decide to extend the provisions which are already in the law, giving them the right to decide upon the question of prohibition as a national issue. That, broadly, is the proposal of the Bill. I need not say that, after having devoted nearly a quarter of a century to agitating for the recognition of the right of the people just about along the lines on which this Bill goes, I am very much in earnest and anxious that the Bill should become law. I make no apology either for saying that in my opinion this settling—as I believe it is the only way of settling—the liquor problem, is as big an issue and as important an issue as has ever engaged the attention of this Council; and it is worth all the time which hon. members can give to it if, in the end, we can come to a proper and reasonable solution, which I believe will be found in the passing of the Bill. May I say quite frankly that what I fear is not that the Bill will be thrown out on its second reading, but that some amendment may be inserted in the Bill which will be unacceptable to those who, after very careful and mature consideration have framed the Bill, and which will result in its loss?

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Are you speaking for the Government?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I am not speaking particularly for the Government. I am speaking for the whole party. This Bill comes down to this Parliament as a distinct direction from the convention of the Labour party, who the Government represent.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You will have the Bill without amendment or else have no Bill at all?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I am afraid that that will be the position. I am afraid that it means that amendments will be inserted which will be obnoxious to those who framed the Bill and which will be obnoxious to the principle of the Bill, and that the insertion of those amendments will result in the loss of the measure. I hope hon. gentlemen will not allow that. There are several hon. members in this Council—in fact, quite a fair number of members in the Council—who generally vote against

Government measures on whom I think we can surely depend for a vote in favour of this Bill. I venture to warn any so inclined to examine very carefully any suggestion for the amendment of the Bill, with the knowledge that amendments are likely to be brought forward with the intention of jeopardising and losing the Bill. I warn them that those who know they cannot secure the rejection of the Bill on the second reading will be ingenious enough to devise and insert plausible, well-seeming amendments with a view to getting the support of hon. members, and thus secure the rejection of the Bill. If hon. members who in the past have been regarded as the friends of temperance reform will add their votes to those who sit behind the Government and who are pledged to support the Bill, then all will be well, and the Bill will become an Act, and will place the people of Queensland in a more favourable position to secure genuine, far-reaching reform—reform far in advance of what is to be found in any other State in Australia; I was going to say “in Australasia,” but that is not so. The liquor problem, towards the solution of which this Bill is a definite step, is a far-reaching, many-sided one. Harry S. Warner, in one of the opening chapters of his splendidly reasoned book, “Social Welfare and the Liquor Problem,” says—

“The magnitude and complexity of the problem is almost beyond comprehension. It infests every source of public welfare, and is intermixed with almost every social and political question of the day. The drink traffic and its effects on society, and the effectual final solution of the maze of evils that arise from and are fostered by it, is truly the greatest social problem.”

Probably there is no one question that has caused statesmen and politicians so much anxious thought as the liquor traffic and its concomitant evils and disastrous consequences. By deep design, wrought with Machiavelian cunning, the licensing system has been grafted into our politics and our public finance until many loose-thinking citizens have come to the conclusion that the traffic is a kind of public benefactor and cannot be done without. But democracy is awake, and realises that the cost in men and money is too great, the system too wasteful, and that we must find a cleaner and more economical method of collecting revenue. The liquor traders everywhere have subscribed to the motto, and lived to it, “Our Trade Our Politics.” They are in politics “for keeps,” and in every British-speaking community have become a very real, a very forceful, and a very powerful and essentially evil political force.

HON. G. S. CURTIS: They helped to put the present Government in power.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: They may have. That is just what I complain of—that they are a political force, and that they are able to put Governments in power, and that they are able to unseat Governments. They are able to put themselves up for sale all the time. They are an evil in politics, and it would be a good thing to get that evil out of politics. Whatever share they may have had in putting this Government or any other Government into power, I am opposed to them. Whilst the anti-liquor

*Hon. G. Page-Hanify.]*



forces have allowed themselves to be divided along party lines, the liquor traders, well organised, skilfully led, and rich, have been able to defeat every effort to secure the efficient public control of their trade, fully realising that once the power to prohibit is centred in the people, their day of doom is in sight. They fully realise that the evil inherent in their traffic is so palpable and self-evident that no free, liberty-loving people would long tolerate it. No one knows better than the liquor traders that once the people are given the unfettered power of deciding the issue by a majority vote the knell is sounded and the hour of doom is in sight.

HON. G. S. CURTIS: You know that majorities are not always right.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I am more prepared to abide by majority rule than by minority rule.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: That is not the case in New Zealand.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I do not know whether it is the case in New Zealand or not. I hope to be able to show a little later that, if the majority had been allowed to rule in New Zealand, they would have had national prohibition as far back as 1911. I do not know what the issue may be to-day. I realise that the war has upset many things, and probably opinion which was formerly stable in that country may have become unstable; but I am still hoping that hon. gentlemen will find, when the complete figures come from New Zealand, that continuance has not been carried, as has been asserted in our papers. However, at present we are in ignorance about that. The people have now learned the lesson that the licensed liquor traffic is a politically created and a politically fostered and protected evil; and they realise that the first step to secure its abolition is to get it out of politics. That is the essence of this Bill—"Let the people decide." But before leaving the question of the political protection afforded to this traffic, let me quote what the late Lord Randolph Churchill had to say on the subject. He, I take it, was not particularly a temperance advocate. I would ask hon. members to ponder and analyse his words, and see if they do not ring true, and if they are not in accordance with their own knowledge and experience. In the "Life of Lord Randolph Churchill," vol. ii., page 398, I find the following:—

"The great obstacle to temperance reform undoubtedly is the wholesale manufacture of alcoholic drink. These manufacturers are small in number, but they are very wealthy."

And these are the folk who would score if the Hon. Mr. Curtis were listened to and provision were made for the payment to them of monetary compensation. It is not the licensed victualler—he is only a pawn in the game—but it is the man behind the licensed victualler who scores always when there is any compensation to be paid. If you read through the proceedings of the Licenses Reduction Board in Victoria, of which the Hon. Mr. Curtis is so enamoured, you will find that the licensed victuallers have had a very small proportion of the compensation paid. In many cases you would find that, where a license was extinguished, the licensed victualler got a nominal compensation of £1. It is the big trader

behind who is the real danger, and that is what the people want to get at.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: What proportion of Queensland hotels are "tied" houses?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I could not tell the hon. gentleman.

HON. T. NEVITT: In Great Britain it is 92 per cent.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I know there is a very considerable proportion. The quotation continues—

"These manufacturers exercise enormous influence. Every publican in the country nearly, certainly nine-tenths of the publicans in the country, are their abject and tied slaves. There is absolutely no free will, and the wholesale manufacturers of alcoholic drink have an enormously powerful political organisation, so powerful and so highly prepared that it is almost like a Prussian army;

"It can be mobilised at any moment, and brought to bear on the point which is threatened. Up to now this great class has successfully intimidated the Government, and successfully intimidated members of Parliament."

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Does that apply here?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It applies here, and it applies to every British community.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: It does not apply to this Council?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I hope it does not, but I will answer the hon. gentleman's question after the Bill has been finally dealt with by the Council. It certainly applied to the Council when liquor reform was before it previously. Lord Randolph Churchill continued—

"In fact, they have directly overthrown two Governments, and I do not wonder. I do not blame Governments for being a little timid of meddling with them. But in view of the awful misery which does arise from the practically unlimited and uncontrolled sale of alcoholic drinks in this country, I tell you my frank opinion—the time has already arrived when we must try our strength with that party."

"Do imagine what a prodigious social reform, what a bound in advance we should have made, if we could curb and control this destructive and devilish liquor traffic, if we could manage to remove from among us what I have called on former occasions the fatal facility of recourse to the beerhouse which besets every man and woman, and really, one may say, every child, of the working classes in England."

We have now reached our last obstacle as far as this Bill is concerned. The liquor traders confidently rely upon this Council.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: That is hardly fair. The publicans put in the present Government.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I shall be able to show you upon what grounds I make that statement. I say the liquor trade still rely upon this Council. I am hoping that their reliance will prove to be based upon a rotten reed—that this Council will show to them

[Hon. G. Page-Hanify.]

that during the past five years they have progressed with the trend of thought throughout the world and realised that this is a matter for the people to decide. I am not fearing the result of the Council's decision. I am very hopeful indeed that this Bill is going to become law, although, as I say, the liquor traders are relying upon the Council to throw it out. I say that because I realise what happened on a previous occasion, and in saying it I am not disparaging in any way the good intentions of many hon. members. Will the Council prove to be the insurmountable obstacle? For its credit's sake I hope not. There is probably no State in the world to-day, that, given the passing of this Bill, will be in a more favourable position to secure the annihilation of the crime-producing, home-destroying, misery-begetting, drunkard-making system known as the licensed liquor traffic than Queensland, and the responsibility of making or marring this Bill lies on this Council. Look out over the world. The licensed liquor traffic is doomed. Will members of this Council be so ill-advised as to oppose this Bill—to defeat it or to so amend it as to destroy it? If they do, a day of reckoning will surely come, and the wrecking of this Bill will count heavily in the indictment against the Council when the Bill comes before the sovereign people. This Bill goes to bedrock. It gives the people power to annihilate the whole hateful traffic. Most people when they mentally visualise the traffic see only the licensed victuallers, who are merely pawns in the game, and the main efforts of the anti-liquor forces have for years been mistakenly concentrated on closing the open bar. That is treating a symptom instead of getting to the source of the disease and rooting it out. Let me quote a few remarks made by Mr. W. G. Calderwood, one of America's great prohibition leaders and orators, in a magnificent address to the Methodist ministers of Minneapolis, as in those remarks he put the case in a nutshell. He told of a subordinate officer in the Civil War who was ordered with his division to support the general in command of the firing line. Reporting for duty and orders, he was told: "Pitch in anywhere: its blank good fighting anywhere along the line." Mr. Calderwood said—

"That was picturesque, but it was crude—the general who puts no more plan than that into his fighting will only deserve defeat—and get it."

He adds—

"Our fighting has been mostly on the 'pitch in anywhere' plan."

If this may be said of the fight in America, how much more true of our scramble in Australia? Mr. Calderwood continues—

"Indeed, we have not studied the evil comprehensively; we have known with every fibre of our manhood and every corpuscle of our patriotic blood that it was evil, and only evil. We have with that knowledge proceeded to damn it dogmatically and curse it by catechism. Through the lack of fuller knowledge, we have habitually mistaken the saloon for the head of the evil, and struck our blows at it.

"Had we pummelled its head, the brewery, with our civic fists as hard and persistently as we have pounded its fingers, the saloon, we should be less

winded and it would be taking the count. Had we swung for its solar plexus, the licensed system, with the same power and purpose and success that we have rapped its knuckles, the saloon, we would have already flashed the message to our Captain: 'We saw, we fought, we conquered in Thy name,' and hell would have crape on its door knob. Let us drive home the truth that 'local option' aims to crush the fingers, the open bar, whilst prohibition strikes at the vital organs—the head and heart of the 'trade'—the brewery, the distillery, the wholesale traders."

We hear much nowadays about making the world safe for democracy. Surely it is obvious that the world can never be safe for democracy whilst the liquor traffic survives! Let the people decide. The essence of democracy is the government of the people, by the people, for the people; hence the demand acceded to in this Bill, to let the people say by a simple majority vote what they will do with the liquor traffic. The sovereign people claim this as their right; and why should they not? Let me ask: Is there one hon. member in this Chamber who can stand up and give us even one sound logical reason why this evil-producing traffic should be allowed to continue—one reason that justifies the legislators in protecting it from the direct decision of the people?

Hon. G. S. CURTIS: Yes, you will find it in that article by the Dean of Canterbury.

Hon. G. PAGE-HANIFY: We have not heard any argument in that case, and I make bold to say that we shall not hear any argument of the kind on this Bill. To merely quote all the damning denunciations by great thinkers that are available would use up all the time that this House will be in session, and then we should not have exhausted the supply or have said enough. But let me quote just a few of those opinions. Richard Cobden—and I have as much respect for his view of this matter as I have for the opinion of John Stuart Mill, quoted by our friend the Hon. Mr. Curtis—Richard Cobden said—

"The temperance cause is the foundation of all social and political reform."

That is quite true; it is the foundation of all reform, and if you are going to uplift the people socially, you must begin at the beginning and make the foundation sure.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: Your Government have been four years beginning.

Hon. G. PAGE-HANIFY: The hon. gentleman knows that if I had had a say in the question as to when the beginning should be made, we should have had this Bill a long time ago.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: Did you support our Six o'Clock Closing Bill?

Hon. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I was not here at the time, but I may frankly say that I was opposed to the Six o'Clock Closing Bill, because I realised that, if that Bill was successful, that would end the reform. Although I admit that 6 o'clock closing is a very desirable thing to bring about, I do not regard it as reform at all when you place it in the balance against the Initiative and Referendum Bill, which would have given, or this Bill which gives, the whole people

*Hon. G. Page-Hanify.]*

the power to abolish the liquor traffic altogether. Abraham Lincoln said—

“The liquor traffic is a cancer in society, eating out the vitals and threatening destruction, and all attempts to regulate it will not only prove abortive, but will aggravate the evil. There must be no more attempts to regulate the cancer; it must be eradicated; not a root must be left behind; for until this is done all classes must continue in danger of becoming victims of strong drink. If it is a crime to make a counterfeit dollar, it is ten thousand times a worse crime to make a counterfeit man.”

And yet the liquor traders are making counterfeit men every day, and have made millions since Lincoln spoke. Mr. William McKinley, another great American, said—

“By legalising this traffic we agree to share with the liquor seller the responsibilities and evils of his business. Every man who votes for license becomes of necessity a partner to the liquor traffic and all its consequences—the most degrading and ruinous of all human pursuits.”

None of the men whose opinions I am quoting, except, perhaps, Abraham Lincoln, can be classed as temperance advocates. Theodore Roosevelt, who had immense experience when he was Commissioner of Police for New York, said—

“The friends of the saloon-keepers denounced their opponents for not treating the saloon business like any other. The best answer to this is that the business is not like any other business, and that the actions of the saloon-keepers themselves conclusively prove this to be the case. The business tends to produce criminality in the population at large and lawbreaking among the saloon-keepers themselves. When the liquor men are allowed to do as they wish, they are sure to debauch, not only the body social but the body politic also. The most powerful saloon-keeper controlled the politicians and the police, while the latter in turn terrorised and blackmailed all other saloon-keepers. If the American people do not control it, it will control them.”

The American people have done with controlling—they have fired it out, and it will never get back. They have the force of public opinion behind the firing out as we will have if we pass this Bill, and it is fired out in Queensland. Lord Rosebery, a British statesman, said—

“I am not a fanatic in temperance reform, but no one can deny that there is too much drink in this country, and that much of the crime and much of the pauperism, and almost all the degradation prevalent in this country, are attributable to the curse of drink. It is becoming too great a power in the State. I go so far as to say this—that if the State does not soon control this liquor traffic, the liquor traffic will control the State.”

Almost word for word what Roosevelt said. Britain has been trying to control the liquor traffic, and we know what a mess they have been making of it, but, notwithstanding what the Hon. Mr. Curtis said with regard to “Pussyfoot” Johnson, he is the forerunner of those who are entitled to have value given to their opinions, and Britain, with all its

[Hon. G. Page-Hanify.

conservatism, will probably be a prohibition country within five years. Economic conditions will force them into that position, because the great United States, with its teetotalism, will have a more than 10 per cent. advantage over all the producers of every other country.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Prohibition has not had a fair trial.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I have not prepared my address on those lines, but I can show the hon. gentleman where prohibition has had a fair trial for over thirty years in one great State, and where nothing but good can be said of the result. Joseph Chamberlain, another great British statesman, said—

“If there is in the whole of this business any single encouraging feature, it is bound to be found in the gathering impatience of the people at the burden which they are bound to bear, and their growing indignation and sense of shame and disgrace which they impose upon them. The fiery serpent of drink is destroying our people, and now they are awaiting with longing eyes the uplifting of the remedy.”

These are not the ravings of what you might call some temperance fanatic; they are the sayings of great statesmen who see the tremendous evil that is being wrought right throughout the civilised world. These forcible pronouncements of six great statesmen, leaders of men, surely carry conviction! Let us then take a like number of opinions of great leaders in another than the political sphere. John Ruskin said—

“The encouragement of drunkenness for the sake of the profit on the sale of drink is certainly one of the most criminal methods of assassination for money hitherto adopted by the bravos of any age or country.”

General Booth, who had the means of knowing—he was right down in the dregs of society for years and years—said—

“Nine-tenths of our poverty, squalor, vice, and crime sprung from this poisonous tap-root. Society, by its habits, customs, and laws, has greased the slope down which these poor creatures slide to perdition.”

It is pretty clear that the foundation of social reform is the abolition of the drink traffic. Archbishop Ireland said—

“The great cause of social crime is drink. The great cause of poverty is drink. When I hear of a family broken up, and ask the cause—drink. If I go to the gallows and ask its victim the cause, the answer—drink. Then, I ask myself in wonderment, why do not men put a stop to this thing?”

Well he might ask that. Cardinal Manning said—

“For thirty years I have been priest and bishop in London, and I now approach my eightieth year. I have learned some lessons, and the first thing is this: The chief bar to the working of the Holy Spirit of God in the souls of men and women is intoxicating drink. I know no antagonist to that Holy Spirit more direct, more subtle, more stealthy, more ubiquitous than ‘ntoxicating drink.’”

John Wesley said—

“All who sell liquors in the common

way to any who will buy are poisoners general. They murder His Majesty's subjects by wholesale; neither does their eye pity nor spare. They drive them to hell like sheep. And what is their gain? Is it not the blood of these men? Who, then, would envy their large estates and sumptuous palaces? A curse is in the midst of them. The curse of God is in their gardens, their groves a fire that burns in the nethermost hell. Blood, blood, is there. The foundation, the floors, the walls, the roof, are stained with blood."

Not one of these denouncements but is capable of proof. They carry conviction of their truth to every hearer. We know that the indictment cannot be refuted. And yet because the traffic has been and is politically protected it still survives. The definite issue before us to-day is not to decide between the continuance of licensing or the substituting of prohibition or a system of State control and management. What we have to decide is shall the electors who are so vitally interested be invested with the wider powers of decision that this Bill proposes? When the proper time comes I am prepared to argue the whole question, and am so satisfied of the logical soundness of the arguments and illustrations of results that can be adduced in favour of complete and absolute prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of alcohol for beverage use, and against the continuance of the traffic either in private hands as at present or under Government control or management, that I am absolutely convinced that the passing of this Bill will be but the prelude to the achieving of prohibition in Queensland from and after 1st July, 1925. Endless facts and figures could be quoted showing the terrible cost, financial and economic, of the drink traffic; but I take it that the case against alcohol is already proven, and that to needlessly dilate upon this aspect would be an insult to the intelligence and powers of observation of hon. gentlemen. This Bill is a crystallisation into legislation of practically all that the temperance reformers of Queensland have been agitating for and demanding from successive Governments for the past twenty-five years. The 1885 Act limited the vote to ratepayers. It was faulty in treating a State-wide problem as a parish matter, and also it duplicated and tripled the voting powers of owners of property, thus many times enabling absentee owners of vacant allotments to force the "pub" on the protesting residents. The first resolution under that Act provided for cancellation of all licenses in an area, but required a two-thirds majority. So that every license held since 1885 has been held subject to the right of the people to cancel it. The second resolution provided a reduction of licenses in an area on a bare majority vote. The third resolution provided against an increase in licenses in an area, also on a bare majority vote. The first resolution proved useless for reform purposes. The handicap in regard to the majority and the faulty franchise was too solid an obstacle. The second resolution, as reduction clauses everywhere have proved, was found to be of little value. The sense of fairness of the average elector revolted at depriving "A," "B," and "C" possibly, of his license and thus concentrating the monopoly held by all others in the area without materially affecting the matter of making any very visible reduction. The third resolution,

however, proved to be very effective in preventing the undue increase of licenses. Of course, it is well known that the licensed liquor seller who is already in possession of an area, and the temperance people who want to prevent any more licenses, work with a certain amount of harmony for the same object. Thus the third resolution did a great deal of good in populous centres by preventing undue increase. A great deal of the city of Brisbane itself has been benefited in that way.

Ceaseless agitation continued until 1911, when Mr. Denham brought in an amending Bill. This Bill, as introduced, changed the vote from the local authority roll to the electoral roll. It made provision for a triennial poll in an electorate or portions or groups of electorates. It required a 10 per cent. petition, and narrowed the issue to reduction by one-fourth or continuance. It also postponed the first poll until 1916, thus creating a close preserve for fire years, and made a further valuable present to the liquor traders by creating a vested interest, as it were, which previously was non-existing, by deferring the poll on no license until 1925.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Mr. Welsby accepted that time as compensation.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I will deal with that when that clause comes forward. This valuable gift of trade comprised a most pernicious form of compensation and more than counterbalanced any anti-trade clauses which the Bill contained. One pleasing feature was that the Bill as introduced and passed through the Assembly definitely affirmed the right of the electors to a decision by a bare majority vote. This feature was challenged, in the interests of the liquor trade, during the Assembly debates, and notwithstanding the usual bitterness of party conflict the Assembly upheld the principle of unreserved majority rule by a vote of 51 to 3. Needless to say, the three were pronounced liquor advocates. Not one of them is now in Parliament. One is dead. The Denham Bill was unsatisfactory to the reform forces when it left the Assembly; but when, after two years' wrangling and mangling, it finally left the Council, it was absolutely useless as an effective reform measure. If the trade influence had, for the moment, weakened in the Assembly, it certainly "ruled the roost" in the Council. I have here what I believe to be a fair, impartial, unprejudiced analysis of the voting on this Bill in the Council.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: Half a loaf is better than no bread, assuredly, if you are hungry.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: This analysis, summarised, shows that there were 110 amendments proposed in the Council. Ninety-one, or 82 per cent., were suggested and supported by the Hon. Peter Murphy, the Hon. C. F. Nielson, the Hon. G. W. Gray, and the Hon. F. M. Hart—all gentlemen who are known to be prominently identified with the liquor traffic.

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

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I will show what the liquor people thought they did. I will quote from a quarterly propaganda magazine, "The Queensland People." The matter quoted appeared in the "Sun" of 9th November, 1913. Hon. gentlemen can judge from this whether I was justified in making

*Hon. G. Page-Hanify.* }

the remarks to which the Hon. Mr. Fowles took exception—

"We reprint in full a report of proceedings at a welcome meeting recently tendered by the Rockhampton branch of the Licensed Victuallers' Association to the delegates attending the annual conference held in that city. We direct the attention of those who joined issue with our attitude at the time of last State election to the outspoken address of Mr. O'Connor, the president of the United Licensed Victuallers' Association. That the liquor traders expected more and were disappointed, does not alter the significance of his statement that there was a compact with the Government, and that 'liquor trade' moneys were used in the interests of Government candidates."

"The sentences that we have italicised are particularly interesting as an unusually candid admission of 'liquor trade' methods."

This was the editorial note.

The report from the "Sun" reads in part—

"Mr. Morrison, who had arrived in the meantime, briefly proposed the health of the visitors, coupled with the names of Messrs. O'Connor and Gralton. The toast was received enthusiastically. Mr. O'Connor, in responding, said that the delegates had not come to Rockhampton to enjoy themselves. They had come there to help the trade of Queensland. The time had arrived when licensed victuallers north, south, east, and west must pull together as one body. That was the great object they had in view at the 1911 conference in Brisbane. They would remember the Liquor Act which was introduced in the Legislative Assembly then and the long, arduous fight that was put up against it, especially in the Legislative Council, and eventually the Government declared the Bill lost. The Brisbane strike of 1912 altered matters very materially as far as the Government was concerned, and they went to the country a few months earlier than was expected."

This is the italicised portion—

"They then got an assurance from the Government that they were going to introduce a Bill into Parliament dealing with liquor reform in a very much modified form to the 1911 Act. The Home Secretary (Mr. Appel) stated that at Beenleigh. The association were also assured by the Government that the new measure would not sanction any confiscation of property. Naturally the executive in the Southern district, having a good deal of money at their disposal, decided that it was part of their duty to support a Government that would make such promises. They afterwards found, however, that the 1912 Bill was very much more drastic than the 1911 one. One of their objects in holding the conference at Rockhampton, therefore, was to get the trade in good fighting trim in the Central district the same as in other parts. It was their object now to adopt a scheme so that they would be united, not only in Rockhampton, but in the whole of the seventy-two electorates of Queensland. The Liquor Act would have been very much worse than it was but for the assistance the association received from the Upper House. The Bill would have

been a great deal worse if it had not been for the influence and money they had at their command. These people who got the money sold them, and therefore took their money under false pretences. They had told them that before, and the present Government knew it. The association had a good scheme now for raising money in the several districts."

A bit further down he says—

"The organisation of Southern Queensland was first class; they would be prepared to fight local option there to-morrow. If the Liquor Act had gone through as it was first introduced they would have had to fight reduction and local option at the same time; but they had put off local option until 1925, and then it had to obtain a three-fifths majority. The temperance people had also to get the signatures of 10 per cent. of the electors to a petition for a reduction, and then obtain an affirmative vote of 33 per cent. Had it not been for the Brisbane association, they would have got the Liquor Act five or six years ago instead of last Parliament. They knew it must eventually come; but Queensland was the last State in the whole Commonwealth to amend its liquor laws, and they could thank the Brisbane association for having kept the amendment off so long."

There is a very frank confession there which I think it is worth while to record. No wonder that the Denham Liquor Bill was a disappointment to the temperance electors! Well might we ask, "Who shall rule—the people or the liquor traffic?" The temperance forces were divided for a time by acute differences of opinion with regard to the Denham Liquor Bill, but they soon woke up again to its imperfections and got together. I have here a draft of a memorial that was prepared in 1913, from which I shall read a brief extract to show just what the temperance people were asking of the Government, and for which they have been asking ever since. I may say that this memorial was never presented. Although an amendment of the Liquor Bill was coming before Parliament, Mr. Denham refused to receive the temperance people. He had had enough. He had been getting abuse from both sides. He had tried to please both sides and had pleased nobody, and he was unable to see them at all, because he was too shy. So that second amending Bill came forward without any opportunity to the reform party to place their views before the Government, but those views were placed in this shape, and they have stood ever since—

#### "AMENDMENT OF 1912 LIQUOR ACT.

"That, in view of the intended reopening and amending of the Liquor Act, we respectfully urge upon the Government the pressing need for the amendments noted below—

(a) The inclusion of a provision for taking a triennial State option vote for and against the prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of alcoholic beverages.

(b) Triennial polls throughout the State, automatic and without request, on prohibition or continuance, the first such poll to be taken in 1916.

(c) All polls to be decided on majority vote, irrespective of the number of electors voting.

[Hon. G. Page-Hanify.]

(d) No time notice and no compensation for licenses forfeited as the result of closing by vote of the electors."

As hon. members are aware, in 1915 the elections unseated the Liberal or Denham Government. This Bill presented now is just what the organised temperance forces have all along been declaring to be necessary to enable the people to get rid of the liquor evil, and it is, further, a proof positive of the steadfast adherence to principle and the political consistency of the Queensland Labour party. The Labour party, when in opposition, endeavoured to amend the local option clauses of the Denham Liquor Bill, and the text of the proposed amendment will be found in "Hansard," volume cix., page 2002. It is in the form of a contingent notice of motion in the name of Mr. Lennon, who at that time was leading the Labour party, Mr. Bowman being in England:—

"That it be an instruction to the Committee—that they have power to recast Part VIII. of the Bill to make provision for—

(1.) State option in lieu of local option.

(2.) Substitution of the following resolutions for those in the present Bill:—

(a) That no more new licenses shall be granted in the State;

(b) That the State shall manage all new licenses, if new licenses are to be granted;

(c) That the sale of liquors in the State shall be prohibited;

(d) That the State manage the whole liquor trade, if the sale of liquor is not prohibited.

(3.) A poll on (a) and (b) to be taken on such day in the month of June, 1915, as the Minister may fix by notification in the 'Government Gazette.'

(4.) A poll on (a), (b), (c), and (d) to be taken in the month of June, 1918, and thereafter every three years.

(5.) All consequent amendments."

That motion did not come before the House because the Speaker ruled it out of order, but I read it to show the consistency of the party to which I belong, which, when in opposition, advocated a particular line of policy, and now, when in power, bring forward a Bill to give effect to it, even though it is after several years, as the Hon. Mr. Fowles says. It is a Bill which throws the right of decision on the people in a matter in which they are so vitally concerned.

Another reason why the Council should pass this Bill is that it has the approval of those who are entitled to speak for the organised churches and temperance forces of Queensland. Hon. members have doubtless received similar communications to those which have been sent to me.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have allowed a great deal of latitude to the hon. member, who has been reading not only extracts, but really the whole of his speech. I did not interrupt him for some time, but he is contravening the rules of debate. "Max," which is our guide where our own Standing Orders are silent, says on page 277—

"A member is not permitted to read his speech, but may refresh his memory by a reference to notes. The reading of

written speeches, which has been allowed in other deliberative assemblies, has never been recognised in either House of Parliament. A member may read extracts from documents, but his own language must be delivered *bonâ fide* in the form of an unwritten composition. Any other rule would be at once inconvenient and repugnant to the true theory of debate."

I ask the hon. member to confine his extracts to something within reasonable limits for "Hansard."

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It might be worse if he relied on his memory.

Hon. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It might be. What I am proceeding to read now are communications from various bodies entitled to speak on this matter, and I claim the right to read them so that they may be placed on record.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: I think every member has received them.

Hon. G. PAGE-HANIFY: That may be so, but I want them to appear in "Hansard," to show that the Bill is of such a nature that it meets with the unanimous approval of all the organisations entitled to speak on the matter. It is remarkable that no voice is raised in disagreement.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Could you not tell us that, and we would accept your statement?

Hon. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I prefer my own method.

Hon. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: It has been ruled as wrong.

Hon. G. PAGE-HANIFY: It has not. The President rules that I may not read my speech. I do not read my speech; I have very ample notes. Now, the Strength of Empire movement, which represents the organised forces dealing with this and other matters of social reform in Queensland, has sent circulars to other hon. members besides myself, I dare say. At any rate, I received this—

"17th December, 1919.

"THE LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

"Sir,—My executive instruct me to write, expressing the hope that in the coming session of the Legislative Council you will do your utmost to secure the passing of the Liquor Act Amendment Bill of 1919.

"The Strength of Empire movement, representing in this and kindred questions the convictions of all moral reforming forces of the State, would respectfully urge upon you the necessity of giving the electors of Queensland an early opportunity of dealing with the liquor traffic, believing it to be the greatest of all hindrances to our social and economic progress.

"The movement values the opportunity the Bill offers for a direct approach to the people, and because of that desires your aid and co-operation. May I point out that whilst the movement is strictly non-party, it welcomes reform from any direction.

"Hoping for your sympathetic assistance in this vitally important matter,

"I am, dear sir,

"Yours faithfully,

"H. C. MOORE,

"Acting State Superintendent."

*Hon. G. Page-Hanify.]*

[5.30 p.m.]

I also had a letter when the Bill was before us last from Mr. A. B. Taylor, district chief templar of the International Order of Good Templars; but, as the Hon. Mr. Fowles read a similar letter on that occasion, I will not read it now. I have a letter from the Grand Lodge of the International Order of Good Templars, which reads—

“3rd January, 1920.

“LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Hon. G. Page-Hanify, M.L.C.

“Dear Sir,—We have the honour of conveying to you the following resolution carried unanimously at the last meeting of our grand lodge executive, viz. :—

That we express our approval of the main provisions of the Liquor Act Amendment Bill which has passed the Legislative Assembly, and would urge the members of the Legislative Council to give the measure their support.

“By direction we now write you with reference to the Bill, which now stands at the head of the business-paper of the Council.

“The hopes and fears of the Good Templars and the temperance electors of the State are now centred on your honourable House as never before. For many years past the temperance forces of this State have been agitating and pressing for legislation granting the electors the unfettered right to prohibit the liquor traffic. The 1912 Act, as finally passed, was unsatisfactory, and, as was anticipated, proved ineffective as a reform measure, and our agitation has necessarily continued.

“In 1913, when some minor amendments of that Act were before Parliament, the temperance and religious bodies stated their requests as follows, and they have stood without material alteration :—

(a) The inclusion of a provision for taking a triennial poll (State option) for and against the prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of alcoholic beverages.

(b) Triennial polls throughout the State automatic and without request, the first such poll to be taken in 1916.

(c) All polls to be decided on majority vote irrespective of the number of electors voting.

(d) No time notice and no compensation for licenses forfeited as the result of the vote of the electors.

“The Bill now before you, which has passed the Assembly without amendment, meets those requests, and has been accepted by the temperance bodies and churches of Queensland as entirely satisfactory.

“From our knowledge of the personnel of the Legislative Council, we anticipate that the Bill will pass its second reading, but we have reason to fear that attempts will be made to insert ‘killing’ amendments when in Committee.

“We confidently appeal to you to support the measure as passed by the Assembly, and to help frustrate any attempt to amend, no matter how well intentioned such an amendment may be, as amendment involves a risk of the Bill

[Hon. G. Page-Hanify.

being lost or dropped on its return to the Assembly, in which case the onus of blocking this pressing and necessary reform would rest with the Legislative Council.

“Earnestly soliciting your needed help, we are respectfully,

“A. FREDIN, G. Chief Templar.

“GEO. MERSON, G. Electoral Supt.

“W. L. DUNCAN, Grand Secy.”

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: We don't take instructions here—at least not on this side.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I am not suggesting that you should. I also received to-day a letter from the Rev. G. L. Hunt, which reads—

“‘Sussex,’

“Hardgrave road,

“West End.

“5th January, 1920.

“Dear Sir,—I have to remind you of the following resolution, carried on 14th June, 1918, by the Synod of the Church of England for the Brisbane Diocese :—

That this Synod welcomes the recent amendment of the platform of the Queensland Labour party by which provision is made for a Liquor Act Amendment Bill, appointing triennial automatic State option polls, in which a majority vote will decide the issues, including total prohibition, and urges the Government to give effect to those proposals during the current session of Parliament. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Premier and all members of the Legislative Council and Assembly.

“As I understand that there is now a Bill before the Legislative Council giving effect to these proposals, may I ask you to be good enough to do your best to ensure its becoming law?

“Yours obediently,  
“G. L. HUNT,

“Secretary, Committee of Social Service,  
Diocesan Synod.”

I am quite sure that that none of these bodies desire in any way to dictate to this Council. I have read their communications because they show that there is a unanimity amongst the reformers—the men who have been giving their minds, and thoughts, and attention to this reform for many years. I have read them because hon. members generally cannot know the ins and outs and intricacies of this traffic.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: You have explained them frequently.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I have not; I have not had much opportunity to explain them. Surely in this matter, as in all other matters, we are wise to take the opinions and guidance of those who may be considered to some extent as experts in this matter!

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: We are wise to consider them, but not necessarily to adopt them.

Hon. E. W. H. FOWLES: Didn't your Government establish the State hotel?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: This is a just Bill. It gives to the electors the right of decision. It is just also in that it safeguards the legislative compact made by the Denham Government with the liquor trade by

which they were protected from prohibition by any vote of the people until 1925.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Do you say that this is a just Bill?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I say it is a just Bill.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Then how does it happen that this Government introduced it?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: Most of the measures introduced by this Government are just when you come to look into them and analyse them, without bringing your party prejudice to bear upon them. At any rate, this Bill is just. It is just in that it gives to the people who are concerned the right to decide the issue, and while doing so it does not arbitrarily say, "You shall have that right to-day or to-morrow, or, if you decide that the hotels shall be closed, that they shall close on 30th June of next year," as it might have done. It says that the changed conditions will not operate until 1st July, 1925, thus safeguarding the legislative compact which was practically entered into by the Government of the day with the liquor traders. I hope that the Bill will pass. It will greatly redound to the credit of this Council and of this Parliament if it does pass without anything being inserted into it that will be obnoxious either to the people or to the other branch of the Legislature. During the recess I heard a good many rumours with regard to this Bill. Political wiseacres, who cannot believe that any Government will seriously interfere with the power of the liquor traffic—political wiseacres say that the Bill is doomed to be lost in the Council; and they did not hesitate to say that it is going to be lost by the connivance of this party. Well, I am quite satisfied that such is not the case, and that Government supporters in this Council will be found voting in full force if a vote is taken on the Bill. If it were not so, they would cast discredit upon themselves, upon their party, and upon the country.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: You have only four out of sixteen present this afternoon.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: Hon. members are not anticipating a division this afternoon. I am quite satisfied that we shall have our full voting strength when the time comes for a vote to be taken on the Bill.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: As you had on the question of raising the salaries of members of the Assembly.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I hope so, and I hope there will be sufficient recruits from the other side who are prepared to regard the interests of the people as far above party, and, even though it may redound to the credit of the Labour Government which introduced the Bill, that they will help to pass it and thus do the best service to Queensland that Parliament has done for a very long time. Another persistent rumour I have heard is to the effect that certain legal members of the Council have been specially retained by the liquor interests to fight this Bill.

HON. A. G. C. HAWTHORN: You are looking at me, and if you mean to apply that remark to me, it is a lie.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I am not looking at anybody. I am not going to mention any names. Names are mentioned. I hope it is not so, for the honour of the Council and the hon. gentlemen themselves.

Something came under my notice the other day which seems to me apropos and worth remembering, and worthy of emulating. I am quoting from "The Union Signal" of 6th November, 1919, which contains the following extract from "The Christian Century," a great American publication—

"WEALTH OF THE WETS NO TEMPTATION  
TO GREAT STATESMEN.

"When the liquor men began casting about for a man to contest constitutional prohibition in the courts, they decided to look for someone of social prominence.

"They laid down on a table in front of Charles Evans Hughes a cheque for 150,000 dollars. The great jurist replied: 'I would not champion this cause before the courts for any sum of money you could name.'

"Failing to buy Mr. Hughes, they went next to William Howard Taft, and placed before him a signed cheque, telling him to fill it in for any amount he wanted. The reply of this statesman will be memorable: "Gentlemen, you couldn't pile enough gold on this continent to induce me to take your case before the courts and before the public, for I will have you know my conscience is not for sale.'"

HON. P. J. LEAHY: He is something like this Council.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: The late Czar Nicholas of Russia was on sound ground when he described the Government liquor monopoly as an economic desolation.

HON. P. J. LEAHY: Did that help him to lose his Empire?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I dare say it may have helped him to lose his Empire, for the people when they ceased to drink became clearheaded, and revolted against the tyrannies they had lived under in those bad days in Russia.

HON. G. S. CURTIS: Some people in Russia attribute Bolshevism to the suppression of vodka. (Laughter.)

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: Thomas Edison, who travelled through England during the war, was asked to give his impressions, and amongst other things he said—

"The British people are too much given to sport and drink; they endure too many cheap clerks and beer barons in Parliament; they have stupefied their men with beer to keep their wages low and to make money for the titled brewers, until, underfed and overbeered, they have lost the power to think. It sounds a bit harsh, but it won't stand contradicting."

HON. G. S. CURTIS: That is a gross exaggeration, I think.

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: I thank God that Queensland men and women have not lost the power to think, and have decided that the people should have the power to do away with the liquor traffic, because they realise that there is no greater enemy to the Labour movement, or to any reform movement, than the drink traffic, and once power is given to the people to vote it out then the time will not be long before it will go. Dr. Saleeby, in closing a great address, said—

"He who is for alcohol is against England."

*Hon. G. Page-Hanify.]*



I repeat the challenge, and unhesitatingly say that he who, either in this Chamber or out of it, is for alcohol is against Queensland and Australia.

Hon. P. J. LEAHY: Was not the Government for alcohol a few years ago?

HON. G. PAGE-HANIFY: The Government are showing their bona fides by introducing this Bill. If hon. gentlemen in this Chamber will pass it, believe me it will have driven nearly the last nail into the coffin of the liquor traffic. What is the use of complaining because the Government believe in whole-hog methods and do not believe in tampering with liquor reform? They brought this Bill down realising that this is the one way of enabling the people to get rid of the evil. They do not throw the responsibility on hon. gentlemen of voting whether there is to be nationalisation or continuance, but let the people decide it for themselves. I will have very great pleasure indeed in voting for the second reading of the Bill. If I have been somewhat lengthy, and have perhaps tied myself too much to my notes, it is because of my overwhelming sense of responsibility in this matter. I know that hon. gentlemen will debate the Bill seriously, and I hope they will pass it; in fact, I should be glad to see all hon. gentlemen on this side of the Chamber when it comes to the vote on the second reading.

HON. T. M. HALL: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I move—That the Council do now adjourn. The first business to-morrow will be the resumption of the debate on the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, to be followed by the resumption of the debate on the second reading of the Profiteering Prevention Bill, the second reading of the Officials in Parliament Act Amendment Bill, and the other items on the business-sheet.

HON. E. W. H. FOWLES: May I ask what the intentions of the Government are in regard to sitting days this week and next week? Some hon. members have come hundreds of miles in order to be present to-day, in the midst of their very short holiday, and they would like to have the shortest session possible. Everyone knows that we are only marking time in the Council in order to enable business in another place to go through.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I intended to-morrow to ascertain the feeling of all the members of the Council regarding our future sitting days. I intended also to adjourn the Council to-morrow at least until Tuesday next. I think it would be wise and would probably meet the convenience of hon. gentlemen on both sides if we concentrated our business. I do not propose to sit on Thursday this week, but I have an open mind, and if hon. members opposite will confer with us on this side we will endeavour to concentrate the business to as few days as possible, and perhaps not meet next week at all.

Question put and passed.

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

[*Hon. G. Page-Hanify.*]