

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 2 DECEMBER 1941

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 2 DECEMBER, 1941.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. E. J. Hanson, Buranda) took the chair at 10.30 a.m.

ELECTIONS TRIBUNAL.

JUDGE FOR 1942.

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt of a letter from His Honour the Chief Justice intimating that he would be the judge to preside at the sittings of the Elections Tribunal for the year 1942.

LIQUOR ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, Ithaca): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1935, in certain particulars, and for other purposes.”

Motion agreed to.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(Mr. Gair, South Brisbane, in the chair.)

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, Ithaca) (10.36 a.m.): I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1935, in certain particulars, and for other purposes.”

The amending Bill that it is proposed to introduce this morning is one that has given rise to a good deal of speculation and discussion. Naturally, a licensing Bill excites a good deal of public interest at any time, more interest I think than any other legislation that is ever placed before Parliament.

The question of liquor consumption is one upon which feeling runs very high, one section of the community being violently opposed to the consumption of liquor, not merely by themselves but by the rest of the community, and another section, of course, resenting very vigorously any interference with what they believe to be their rights. The great majority of the people of this country—in fact, of all British countries—are very tolerant, however, of the use of alcoholic beverages. The appetite for alcoholic beverages has persisted throughout the ages. Notwithstanding the fact that the question of benefit or harm that alcoholic beverages bring to men and women has been argued over the centuries, the fact remains that the great majority of the people of the world still persist in attempting to satisfy their appetite for them.

Attempts made during recent years compulsorily to restrict or prohibit the consumption of alcohol by the people have resulted in disaster. Two of the largest countries in

the world have made attempts at the complete prohibition of the use of alcoholic liquor, and have found, to their dismay, that instead of reducing the consumption of alcoholic liquor the attempt to prohibit it increased it and led also to the consumption of a lower standard of liquor and created underworld problems that caused both these countries to revert to the controlled consumption of liquor that could be certified to as being at least pure and clean, and that could be served under decent conditions. Both the United States of America and Russia had a try at preventing the consumption of alcoholic liquor at all, but the experiment failed badly in both countries.

Parliament has the duty of controlling the liquor traffic in this State—not in the interests of the extremists of either side, but in the interests of the community as a whole. Parliament has a duty to the community as a whole and must not allow the financial interests of those engaged in the liquor trade or the prejudices of those totally opposed to the consumption of liquor to influence it in endeavouring to provide legislation that will be for the benefit of the community as a whole. It is in that state of mind that Parliament should approach a question such as this.

One of the troubles with the whole of the administration of the liquor law to-day is the abuse that surrounds not so much the liquor traffic as of the people engaged in the liquor traffic by those opposed to it and the abuse of those opposed to the liquor traffic by its supporters. We find, on looking fairly at the people engaged in the liquor trade, that they compare very favourably with the commercial community engaged in any other form of enterprise. Shareholders in the brewing companies throughout the whole of the Commonwealth are to be found amongst the shareholders of other industries also, and the average number of shares held in breweries by each shareholder is about the same as the average number of shares held by the shareholder in other major industries. We also find that the shareholder in any of these brewing concerns or large hotels held by limited-liability companies has only one concern in the trade—that is to say, the payment of as good a dividend as can possibly be received. That applies to any other form of industry. Shareholders in any departmental store in the city or in any factory, foundry, or engineering shop all demand from the directors the best results that can be achieved for the money invested, and the great majority of them are decent, law-abiding citizens. There are, however, in the liquor trade, as in other trades, people who will stop at nothing to get additional profit, and just as the law has had to police awards of the Industrial Court and an army of inspectors has to be maintained to protect not only the workman from the unscrupulous employer, but to protect the decent employer from the unscrupulous employer, so there has to be a continual policing of the liquor trade, not only for the protection of the public but also to give the decent hotelkeeper the chance of conduct-

ing his business in a decent way and to prevent him from being driven out of it by the unscrupulous shanty-keeper who will do anything for profit.

Mr. Barnes: About time you thought of it.

THE SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: If I had not thought of it before, the hon. member for Bundaberg certainly brought it forcibly before my notice. There are men in the liquor trade who will indulge in all sorts of practices to attract custom. Inspectors of the Department of Public Health are continually inspecting the stock-in-trade of hotelkeepers to prevent adulteration, because the adulteration of liquor has more harmful effects than the adulteration of any other form of food. Notwithstanding that, we have frequently had to prosecute the unscrupulous hotelkeeper for adulterating liquor.

The great majority of hotelkeepers will not allow a man under the influence of liquor to be about the premises, but endeavour to get him away home if he is showing signs of intoxication, but the unscrupulous shanty-keeper, on the other hand, will encourage the intoxicated man to stay there so that he may extract the last penny from his pocket. We have also found that a few hotelkeepers will encourage the selling of liquor to boys and girls under age; a few, too, will encourage prostitutes to drink at hotels so that the money-spending might bring about additional profit to them. We find, too, that— notwithstanding the fact that penalties have been provided for after-hour trading—after-hour trading, although not favoured by the greater number of hotelkeepers, has been indulged in by less scrupulous competitors.

It must be understood that the great number of hotelkeepers welcome the strict policing of the hours, and want the same conditions of trade as their competitors have.

That, I repeat, applies to all business interests. The city storekeeper and the large grocer do not complain because the small suburban storekeeper obliges a customer with a pound of butter or half-a-pound of tea or a pound of sugar that she has run out of; the objection to after-hours trading is that the suburban customer feels she is under an obligation to the suburban storekeeper for having obliged her and in that way trade is taken permanently from the big city storekeeper or grocer.

The same can be said of hotels. For instance, the hotelkeeper who rigidly refuses to serve after the prescribed hours feels that he is in danger of losing his customers to the more obliging and less law-abiding licensed victualler who allows a customer to get a drink after hours, and the customer who gets a drink after hours feels that he is under an obligation to the obliging licensee to bring him a certain amount of his trade. To a great extent the community judge the liquor trade not by the decently-controlled

hotels and not by the decent licensed victuallers, but by the sins of unscrupulous people.

When we turn to the temperance organisations in the community, we find just the same variety amongst their members as we do amongst the people engaged in the liquor trade. The great bulk of the people who are members of temperance organisations are sincere in their advocacy of a reform they think will be for the benefit of the community as a whole, but many of the people judge the temperance organisations by the more loud-mouthed section of them who confine themselves almost entirely to the abuse of their opponents. I venture to say that more harm is done to the temperance movement in that way, by the very intemperate members of the organisation, than is ever done to it by the liquor interests. The continual intemperate abuse hurled at anybody who does not agree with the small group of people who pose as leaders in the temperance movement, as the leaders of reform in the community, does more to wean public sympathy from the work of the temperance organisation than any attacks that may be made upon it by people interested in the liquor trade.

We have had many instances of that. A few years ago, when the State elections were on, when that famous or rather infamous sectarian war was waged against the Labour Party, we found that certain leaders of the temperance movement, who certainly left nothing out of their case that they could imagine, charged the members of the Government of Queensland with all kinds of corruption. They told the public then that the members of the Labour Party and the Government of Queensland had sold out to the breweries, that they were shareholders in breweries, and that we all owned hotels. No lie was too good or too bad to hurl at the members of the Labour Party, and that at a time when we were endeavouring to do a very difficult task to the very best of our ability in the interests of the community.

Mr. Barnes: Was not that true?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The hon. member knows that it is not true. He probably judges others by himself. His vicious slanders of other people are merely an attempt at self-justification.

The leading attack upon the Government on the temperance question during the campaign was made by a gentleman who at one time was a member of the Labour Party. I refer to Mr. Finlayson, who at one time was a member of the Federal Labour Party. It was during his political campaign, in which he was successful in winning Federal political honours, that I made my first public address from a public platform, but I am not going to say that my appearance on the platform was responsible for Mr. Finlayson's success. During the 1938 State election

campaign, Mr. Finlayson broadcast over the air that he was sorry to find that members of the Queensland Government had sold themselves to the liquor interests. Mr. Finlayson may say that he thought they had, but he certainly had no reason for believing that they had. He could not produce any evidence to justify such a statement. The fact that licensed victuallers might put a pound or a couple of pounds on an Australian Labour Party collection card for the conduct of an election is not sufficient to justify Mr. Finlayson's making the statement in that regard. However, Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Finlayson stood as a Labour candidate for the Federal House of Representatives, there was a subscription from almost every publican in Brisbane to finance his election. There was no criticism of the Labour Party by him at that time. It was not until he lost a profitable seat in the Federal House of Representatives that he decided that there was nothing but evil in the Labour Party, or that it had sold out to the liquor interests. I am pointing that out to the people of Queensland to show that Labour has many adherents when they think it is profitable to ally themselves with it, but whose views change when it is no longer profitable to support Labour.

It must be remembered that hotelkeepers are like grocers, butchers, bakers, and other tradespeople, and when customers come round and ask them for a subscription for the fund of a particular party or organisation they are supporting, they do not comply because they have any regard for the particular party or organisation but merely in order to placate their customers. Hon. members opposite who have business associations know very well that a business man contributes to a cricket club not so much because he loves the game of cricket, or that he likes the game of cricket, but merely to oblige his customer.

Mr. Decker: Do the breweries do that?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: There are shareholders of breweries on the Opposition benches, and the hon. member if he desires can obtain an answer to his interjection by making some inquiries from members of his own party.

An Opposition Member: You might be one of them.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The hon. member should make inquiries from members of his own party who are shareholders in order to see what the breweries do.

Mr. Macdonald: Give us a list of their shareholders.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I can give the hon. member a list. I can tell the hon. member quite frankly that any innuendo that the breweries or anybody else controls this party is absolutely wrong.

Mr. Barnes: Hooley!

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I throw that innuendo back in their teeth.

Mr. Barnes: Have a look at this!

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The Labour Party is clean and owes no allegiance to anyone but the workers. While the party is in existence it will serve the workers and will not care a rap for any attacks upon it, whether made in the open or behind cover by representatives in Parliament or people who live by exploiting the workers.

Mr. Macdonald: Give us the list of shareholders.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: As the Premier reminds me, the Labour Party is the only party that publishes a balance-sheet to its supporters. The Labour Party always publishes a party balance-sheet and shows what money it spends on an election. Hon. members opposite cannot do that. It seems that opponents of the Labour Party and representatives of interests represented by hon. members opposite seize upon the temperance organisation at election time to help them in their attempts to destroy the Labour movement, just as they seize upon any other opportunity to do so. They do not care what it is. Whether it is a sectarian campaign, a temperance campaign, or any other campaign that is started hon. members opposite and their organisations seize the opportunity to back these things up in every way.

Mr. Macdonald: Absolutely wrong; you know that. Running true to form. (Opposition interjections.)

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It is just the same to-day in this State. People who hate the Labour Party are united under a banner called "The Aid to Russia" organisation. It is composed of ex-leaders of the Tory Party in the Upper House, ex-leaders of the sectarian campaign, ex-Labour members who have been thrown out of the party for disloyalty, and Communists. They proclaim loudly their hate of Hitler, but they hate Labour more. All these people hate the Labour Party and seize with avidity any opportunity to destroy it. They are all united under the banner of "Aid to Russia," just as we find them united under the sectarian or temperance banners when the opportunity offers.

Mr. Macdonald: That is utterly untrue.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It is not untrue. If the hon. member wants a picture of that choice collection of Labour-haters who, despite their loud-mouthed antagonism to Hitler, hate the Labour Party much more than they hate Hitler and who would welcome Hitler quicker than they would welcome the Labour Party, let him look at that gathering in the City Hall recently. There were gathered poisoners

from all anti-Labour political sections, trying to play upon the deep sympathy which decent people have for this suffering people. They hoped to direct these same people against the Labour Party. They endeavour in the same way to capitalise the temperance movement.

As I said before, this is a matter that has to be looked at in the interests of the whole of the community. To-day they contended that business is to be regarded by Governments, State and Federal, from the point of view of the advantage or disadvantage of the people. Industry to-day can hardly operate without some aid, protection, or regulation by the Government. The time has come when the major industries of the Commonwealth depend on the Government for support to keep them going; and this industry, the same as every other, has to be regulated in the public interest.

We do not propose to attempt to placate the extremists on the one side or the other on this question. We propose to introduce an amending Bill that will go another step in the direction of reform. The 1935 Act was the greatest move forward in the matter of liquor reform in the history of the State. Before the Bill was introduced there was much inquiry and discussion with everybody interested in this question. Representatives of what was then known as the Prohibition League came to my office and discussed these things with me, and in the main they thought the 1935 Act was a great step forward in liquor control. Hon. members will remember that when they saw the Bill they were a bit bemused; they did not know whether to oppose or support it, but they finished up by damning it with faint praise and refraining from voting against it. It went a long way in the matter of liquor reform.

Looking back over the years we see that prior to 1923 the liquor hours were from 6 a.m. till 11 p.m. Then in 1923 the 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. trading came into operation, not by referendum, as one of the self-appointed advisers of the Government has said, but by Act of Parliament. There was no referendum on the 8 o'clock closing, but it was established by an amending Bill. The fact that the newspapers said it was established by referendum does not alter the fact.

The liquor law, as long as I can remember it—and I have lived a good while in Queensland; I am beginning to feel the weight of years—has been more or less rigidly policed. There were times when a Police Force would get a burst of energy, probably spurred on by public criticism, and make attempts to police the law as to after-hour trading. Hon. members will remember the origin of the half-gallon bottles. When I was a boy the two leading men in the traffic squad were named Bennett and Bee, and because of their activities in supervising Sunday trading a new industry sprung up of making half-gallon bottles that would hold enough to carry the thirsty over till Monday. The names Bennett and Bee still stuck to the bottle.

In 1929 the Moore Government came into power. It is important that we should have a little historical review of the question, because there has been so much misrepresentation on this question that this Parliament and the people should know exactly what has happened.

In 1929 there was a change of Government and the Moore Administration came into being, and coincident with it came a complete slackening of the licensing laws of the State. Hon. members opposite know that from 1929 onwards the policing of the licensing laws almost disappeared, the excuse made being that the licensed victuallers were almost insolvent because the depression they said had come upon the country had accentuated the position and had left them with such greatly reduced trade that very few of them in Queensland paid any income tax for some years. The police were instructed to take no notice of any after-hour trading unless there were disturbances.

Mr. Muller: That is not true, and you know it.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was in this Chamber, I think, when I read a letter from the Premier in the Moore Government to the Commissioner of Police instructing him to withdraw summonses issued under the Liquor Act, and a letter from the Premier of the State to the Commissioner of Police is quite enough justification for the police to slacken up on the policing of hotels.

Mr. Barnes: Did you issue the same instructions?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: No. The position was never greatly altered, except in one way. This is what occurred: in 1932, when the present Government came into power, all-night drinking was indulged in in Brisbane. Hon. members will remember the series of serious motor accidents in which girls were killed, the inquiries into which disclosed that the party had left such and such a hotel at 2 o'clock in the morning. Hon. members will remember the case of a young girl being found drunk and naked on the streets of Brisbane, having been dumped out of a car. She was a girl of a respectable family. Hon. members will also remember the case of a policeman who heard screams early one morning on Ipswich road, raced out and found a man with a motor bike holding a naked girl in his side-car by the hair of her head, and she screaming for help—he did not bother to bring her clothes. Hon. members can remember that every hotel lounge in Brisbane had an “open go” in trading.

At that time the police were loaded with the greatest task the police of any State have ever had, the administration of the relief scheme. The suburban policeman was tied completely to his police station, so much so that policemen walking a beat in Brisbane or the cities of Queensland had disappeared almost entirely. Every police sergeant of every police station was tied to the station. If he had a big district most of his time was

taken up in making investigations of applications for relief, and there was no time for men to be standing outside hotels all night, and even hon. members opposite, with their love of long working hours, would scarcely expect the police to work from the early hours of the morning until after midnight.

About 1933 a licensing squad was put on at 11 o'clock at night to clear the after-picture and after-theatre crowds out of the lounges of the city. That started the reform. That started the clearing-out of this all-night drinking, and these offences I have referred to almost disappeared. The Commissioner of Police at the time seemed to think it was more important to save young girls and women from destruction than to stop somebody from getting a bottle of beer. He had a sense of values. I know there are some people who, in their hatred of liquor, would say, “Never mind anything else, but prevent any working man from getting a bottle of beer.”

And here is another strange thing: nobody ever raised the question of illicit drinking in clubs. While all the efforts were being made to save the soul of the poor working man by preventing him from getting a bottle of beer at night, nobody tried to save the soul of hon. members opposite and their friends who might be drinking to all hours of the morning in clubs. (Opposition interjections.) Every club was trading illegally. They never had a right to trade at night. Your Sandgate Golf Club and your Sandgate Bowling Club have been trading illegally ever since they started, and Mr. Chairman, I want to let these parties know the truth. I want to let everyone knows the truth about them. From the very day when the Sandgate Golf Club was established and from the day when the Sandgate Bowling Club was established both clubs were guilty every day of illegal trading and breaches of the Liquor Act until we policed them in November of last year. We prosecute them nowadays because we have no relief work—the police are free of that duty and can devote some time to policing the liquor laws.

Mr. Massey interjected.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I want to tell the hon. member for Toowong that his Auchenflower Bowling Club was also breaking the law and he raised no question about that at all. Hon. members opposite said, “Lord, protect and save the souls of the working people, but, Lord, do not interfere or try to save the souls of my friends. We want to have all the vice, all the liquor we want.” Never were the Opposition or their supporters sincere in this matter.

With the return to plentiful employment, and the disappearance of the amount of work the police had under the relief scheme, the Commissioner has been able to detail larger numbers of men to keep watch on the hotel traffic in the cities, and he has also been able to see that the suburban police visit the hotels at closing hours at night, and pay visits

during the night and see that everything is in order. That has been going on for 12 months now, with more or less success.

Of course, we have never been able to put down offences. You cannot prevent breaches of any law. Murder has been a serious offence for quite a long time, and we have done all we could to stop it, but murders are still committed. Burglaries are still committed, robberies are committed, assaults on females are still committed, notwithstanding the fact that very severe penalties are prescribed for these things. We cannot hope to make any law impossible of breach; all we can do is make it as unprofitable as possible to break the law.

Since the Licensing Commission was established in 1935 there has been a remarkable change in the hotel picture in Queensland. I venture to say that until that time Queensland had something like the worst class of hotels in the world from the point of view of accommodation for travellers. Even in the city of Brisbane the hotels were not up to the standard that one would expect from first-class city hotels. In the country towns they were an absolute disgrace to a modern community.

One of the reasons for this was that Queensland was over-supplied with hotels in certain districts. Although there were parts of Queensland in which travellers had to ask the station-masters if they could camp in the railway carriages overnight because there was no hotel accommodation, there were other parts of Queensland in which there were too many hotels, with the result that no one hotel-keeper could make enough money to provide decent accommodation for his guests. On several occasions before the Commission was established the licensing inspector would demand that bathroom or lavatory improvements be effected in the hotels, and the hotel-keepers would submit a case showing they were not in a financial position to do what was required. So the Licensing Commission was established to give complete control of liquor traffic to that body, and the only section of the Act that hon. members opposite fought strongly was that which gave complete control of liquor traffic to that Commission. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, how strenuously the Opposition fought to allow appeals to a higher tribunal from decisions of the Licensing Commission. That Licensing Commission has complete control of the hotel-keepers to-day and can impose conditions that it thinks fit, necessary, and just. Naturally, it is expected not to be unjust.

Let us have a look at what improvements have been made since 1935. It must be remembered that the Commission only began operations in 1936; the Act was passed in 1935 and the Commission took control in 1936. In 1939 this country went to war, and in 1940, four years after the Commission began operations, an embargo was placed on the expenditure of money without the approval of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works. This year, the maximum amount that can be expended on a hotel is £500, and that only with the approval of the Co-ordinator-General.

Hon. members will realise, therefore, that for the last two years the Commission has not been in a position to carry on the work it was doing. In the few years in which it was operating, the Commission closed 74 hotels in Queensland.

Mr. Barnes: They submitted themselves voluntarily. The Commission never closed them.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The hon. member should cease his chattering until this is over. This is serious. This is not something to chatter about.

Seventy-four hotels and three wineshops were closed. In 16 areas that were not provided with accommodation, new hotels were opened, leaving the net reduction in the number of hotels in Queensland at 61. That figure would have been larger had the Commission had funds whereby it could continue to close hotels.

It must be borne in mind that prior to the establishment of the Commission the Crown received nothing for the granting of new licences. If a police magistrate decided to open a new hotel at Kolan or Glenmorgan, all that was paid was the 2s. 6d. for the ticket the police sergeant wrote out. To-day, if a new licence is decided upon for any area public tenders must be called for the right to erect to a predetermined standard, and to conduct the hotel. The highest tenderer, if his character is satisfactory, must get the licence.

There is little or no clamour to-day for new hotels. There is no encouragement to work up such an agitation, for no-one can be sure who would get a licence. Stories, of course, are circulated. Some whisperers told the story that a hotel was going to be opened at Ashgrove, that I was going to run the place—that I was going to own it, and have a dummy in for me. That was supposed to be as a result of the Liquor Act Amendment Act of 1935. There has been no request for a new hotel from any place where there is a hotel in existence.

Mr. Nimmo: Ninety per cent. of the people in Ashgrove signed a petition against it. That might have stopped it.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Like the hon. member for Bundaberg, the hon. member for Oxley is judging people by himself, and I say no petition will stop this Government from doing what they think right. The hon. gentleman must get that into his head. The Government are concerned with the people, and will do what they think right in the interests of the community. Why, Mr. Chairman, I got a petition containing 7,000 names presented to me—most of them residents in my electorate—requesting the release of a man convicted of murder, who was sentenced to imprisonment for life. Needless to say, that man is still in prison, because 7,000 names do not mean

anything in comparison with what this Government think right in the interests of the people.

Mr. Barnes: You are a lilywhite.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the hon. member for Bundaberg that if he insists on interjecting I will deal with him.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I was dealing with the work that the Licensing Commission has done.

Mr. Muller: How many transfers?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: There is no such thing as a transfer, and the hon. member was in the Chamber when the Bill was put through, and surely to Heaven should know something about it. He should not depend on the "Courier-Mail" to tell him all about it. There is no such thing as the transfer of a hotel from one locality to the other.

Mr. Massey: Transfer of licences.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: One of the most disheartening features of introducing legislation in this Committee is to find the lack of knowledge of existing legislation displayed by hon. members opposite. A Bill is passed through the Chamber and they do not know the provisions of it.

Mr. Muller: Don't we know the provisions of it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Fassifern will have the opportunity of debating the proposed Bill, and I ask him not to interject.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I was saying that the Commission has made a net reduction of 61 licences in the State, but it has also tremendously improved existing accommodation. By the direction of the Commission, in the few years it has been in operation, £1,538,000 has been spent on rebuilding and renovating hotels. Would that have been done without the new order of liquor control in Queensland? Not at all. For instance, the Commission has compelled all hotels to provide fire escapes.

We had an instance at Wondai a couple of years ago of how necessary fire escapes are in any building. As a matter of fact, I found upon making inquiries that many a commercial traveller in Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria never travelled without a rope in his bag as a means of escape from a wooden building that had not adequate provision for the safety of its guests in a time of fire.

The Commission has also insisted that wherever a water supply is available and where well water can be got, there shall be running water in the bedrooms. It has also insisted on the installation of the septic system for the comfort of guests. It has insisted upon hygienic bathrooms with hot and cold water and, goodness knows, hot water was a very rare thing in country hotels

before the Commission took control. Even at this time of the year people must wash and hot water is very handy if one wants a good, clean wash. It has also insisted that there shall be a minimum of 1,000 cubic feet of air space for each person in bedrooms. It has insisted upon the provision of clean beds and clean bedding; and that was important. It has insisted upon better furniture, modern and clean dining-rooms and kitchen, and the fly-proofing of dining-rooms and kitchen, and it has investigated the character of applicants for licences to such an extent that the standard of licensee is already showing an improvement.

Let me give an idea of how determined the Commission is to see that undesirable people do not get licences. There is in Queensland an owner of two hotel freeholds who has repeatedly made application to the Licensing Commission for a licence to conduct her own hotel but the Commission has refused to grant it because of the manner in which she previously conducted a hotel. Notwithstanding repeated threats of litigation by her legal representative the Licensing Commission has stood fast and has said that in no circumstances will it allow anybody to maintain a hotel at the low standard at which a hotel was previously maintained by that person or permit her to conduct any hotel in Queensland whether she owns the freehold or not. That is an attitude that we can all approve. It is a very desirable one but it is one that could never be taken up by the Commission if it had not been given the power set out in the 1935 Act.

As I have said, we have made considerable progress both legislatively and administratively and we have gone a long way along the road of reform in the licensing laws of this State. The Bill simply proposes to go a step further in the matter of reform. To judge from the discussions that have taken place in the Press and amongst hon. members opposite one would think that it was being introduced simply to give improved facilities for drinking, but I want to inform the Committee that it is nothing of the kind, that it is a step forward in reform in liquor control in Queensland.

The most important new principle in the Bill is one that I think every hon. member will support if he looks at it from the point of view of public welfare and not from the point of view of, "Can we say something nasty about the Government." It is a clause to prevent any person from selling, consuming, or having in his possession any intoxicating liquor at a dance or dance hall. One of the major evils of recent years in connection with the liquor trade has been the ever-growing tendency to make drunken orgies of balls and dances. We know that to dance is as natural for the young people as to eat. Dancing is attractive for young girls particularly, and it is a pleasure that no-one has the right to ask them to renounce. Furthermore, dancing is a natural form of physical culture for young people.

Throughout the ages people have danced, and every race in the world has always

danced and dances to-day. To suggest that girls should stay away from dances if they want to remain clean and respectable is ridiculous. The way to tackle it is to see to it that the elements that go to make dancing undesirable are eliminated. The consumption of liquor in mixed dancing is undesirable and steps should be taken to keep liquor away from dance halls in order to make it possible for young men and women to go to dances and be secure from the possibility of being pulled about by half-drunken louts who more or less go there for a fill-up of alcohol.

Furthermore, the tendency when young people get into these parties is for the old hard drinker to try to influence young people to drink. That makes it doubly difficult for young people to keep free from the taint of liquor. We are making provision in this Bill for the imposition of a severe penalty on anyone who brings liquor into a dance hall or has liquor in his or her possession in the vicinity of a dance hall. By this means we hope to restore dancing to the position it occupied when it was enjoyed by a community as a happy, pleasant, and agreeable pastime before this habit of bringing large quantities of liquor by people into dance halls began.

Mr. Brand: Will that apply to every registered hall?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It will apply to every place where a charge is made, whether it be a registered hall or not. Dances are held in places that are not registered halls. They are held in schools of arts, golf houses, rowing-shed pavilions, and quite a number of other places that are not registered halls. It would be merely driving this repulsive practice from one hall to another if these provisions merely apply to a registered hall and not to any hall where a charge was made. Of course, we cannot prevent any girl or young man, if he or she so desires, from getting liquor. There is no method of preventing them from getting into the company of drinkers if they desire to do so. That is their own business. If they are of age they can exercise that right if they care to do so. What we are endeavouring to do is to allow them to practise this old-fashioned form of enjoyment in modern dance halls without the taint of the malpractice associated with it at present. We are hopeful of overcoming this evil, but like every other law it will depend on the co-operation of every person in the community to have it carried into effect. I am quite confident that the great bulk of the people of this country will give their wholehearted support to this proposal and aid the Government to put down what is becoming a very serious social evil indeed.

Mr. Sparkes: What is the position in regard to dances held in hotels?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Under this Bill liquor can be served to any person on licensed

premises up to 10 o'clock at night, but after that hour patrons of dance halls associated with licensed premises cannot be served with intoxicating liquor. If the place is licensed to sell liquor it can do so up to a certain hour—that is, the hour prescribed in this Bill—but once closing time comes, no intoxicating liquor can be sold.

The second important principle that hon. members will agree is necessary is the power that is being taken by the Governor in Council to close any hotels in any district, or all the hotels, or restrict the hours of trading of hotels at any time, should a state of emergency arise, if the Governor in Council thinks such a step is warranted. It may be essential at any time, should a state of emergency arise in our own country as a result of war, to close hotels completely in some part or other in the State. I can hardly visualise the necessity of closing all hotels throughout the State, but it may be necessary to close them completely in some place or another. Power is being taken in this Bill either to close certain hotels completely should that occasion arise or to restrict the hours of trading, or impose a lesser number of trading hours, but in any case those trading hours will not be more than 12 in all or extend beyond 10 o'clock at night.

Mr. Maher: In a given district?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: In the whole State or any part of it. We can proclaim the area in which it is desired to restrict the sale of liquor.

Mr. Yeates: Could the Governor in Council not do that previously?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: No. In the ordinary case a magistrate would have to read what is known as the Riot Act and call on the police, and we do not want that; we want to be able to deal with the problem in a proper and efficient manner. A proclamation by the Governor in Council will be sufficient to close any hotels in any part or the whole of the State; but the order will last for only three months.

Mr. Brand: And then it is only used in an emergency?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Only in emergency; and if it is desired to maintain it for more than three months a new order must be issued.

Mr. Nimmo: Would not the National Security Act cover that?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It may not be proclaimed. The Public Safety Act would only be invoked in extreme emergency.

Mr. Nimmo: I mean the Commonwealth National Security Act.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I do not know. We

are not in a position to say what the Commonwealth would do or want to do. Under this Bill we shall be able to act quickly. Otherwise we should have to communicate with the Commonwealth authorities and await their reply, which might be too long.

Larger penalties for breaches are provided in the amending Bill. We have to realise, Mr. Chairman, that with 1,264 hotels—I think that is the number—we should need 5,000 policemen to watch one door of each of those hotels for 24 hours a day, and, seeing that we have a total of 1,400-odd policemen in the whole of the State, it is obviously impossible for the Police Force to watch every hotel all the time; and, in addition to that, the Police Force have a multitude of other important duties to perform. We propose to make the penalties more severe, so that there will be an added incentive on the hotelkeeper to police his own premises. The penalties will be heavily increased, and, in addition, steps are taken to prevent dummying of licences. I believe the great bulk of hotelkeepers will be willing to co-operate with the Government in thoroughly policing the licensing law. I read this morning that one (the Rev. Mr. Mills), speaking in Rockhampton, said he understood the hotels would be open till 11 o'clock and, perhaps, 12 o'clock at night. I would let him understand, if he is thinking of buying a hotel with the idea of trading till 11 or 12 o'clock at night, that he will have to take what is coming to him. What we expect is that the licensee will police his own premises, and if he does not he will have to put up with the heavily increased penalty.

Provision is also made for the locking of bars and other places where liquor is stored. Under the present law some smart alec of a lawyer discovered there was no compulsion to keep a bar locked, consequently the publican could keep his bar open 24 hours of the day, and all he had to do was to avoid being caught selling intoxicating liquor. He contended that he was open to sell non-intoxicating liquor, and the police had to catch him selling intoxicating liquor before they could do anything about it. That is being corrected, and it is made compulsory to lock bars and other places where liquor is stored.

Mr. BARNES: I rise to a point of order. I resent the statement "some smart alec of a lawyer." I was the only person who sold liquor—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no point of order.

Mr. Barnes: I ask for a withdrawal.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Provision is made whereby the bar can be opened during prohibited hours for cleaning purposes and for restocking. The licensee must be allowed time to clean his bar, because the health authorities are getting very strict regarding the conditions under which liquor is sold.

The transfer of a licence from one person to another is another thing that has given the authorities a good deal of trouble in the

past. When a licence has a conviction recorded against it, it pays the licensee to change to some other licensee, because after three convictions a licence was liable to cancellation. Of course, that is a very heavy penalty. In the past the practice has been that when an unscrupulous licensee had two convictions recorded against his licence, he promptly applied for the transfer of the licence, perhaps to his wife, or possibly to his sister or some other relative. The licensee being so transferred, the sister or the wife could carry on and accumulate two more marks against her character, and then the licence could be transferred to another member of the family, who could also accumulate two additional marks and then transfer the licence again to some other relative; but actually the hotel remained all the time the property of the original licensee. That has been done quite a lot. In this Bill we are laying it down that it shall be the duty of the Licensing Commission to satisfy itself that any transfer of a licence by any licensee who has a conviction recorded against him shall be investigated, and shall not be made unless it is a bona-fide transfer—that the person taking it over is in a position to buy the licence, has a separate estate, and so on. If not, the transfer cannot be made. The licensee who flagrantly disregards the law will have to get out of the trade. We do not mind if the licensee who does not want to obey the law gets out of the trade. We should be quite happy at that. We do not want to have him remaining in the trade by using dummy transfers. It is laid down that it shall be the duty of the Commission to investigate such a transfer and satisfy itself that such a transfer is a bona-fide one before it is agreed to.

There is a provision in the amending Bill to deal with bona-fide travellers. There is a traveller's clause in the Liquor Act at present. It provides that a person may obtain liquor with his meal in prohibited hours on Sundays if he has travelled a distance of 20 miles. He has to show, of course, that he is staying in the hotel for the night, but there is nothing to compel him to do so. There is no way of preventing a man from changing his mind and going somewhere else. That has proved very unsatisfactory. We propose to alter the Act to provide that a bona-fide traveller shall be a person who has travelled 40 miles from the place of his residence on the day he claims refreshment, and refreshments can be provided only during the midday and evening meal hours—from 12 noon to 2 p.m. and from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. Otherwise the sale of alcoholic liquor to travellers is strictly forbidden during all the prohibited hours.

Mr. Maher: May he have it only with his meals?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Not necessarily with his meal. That means nothing. To prescribe that he must have it with his meals would mean that the publican could sell him a biscuit or a sandwich for a threepenny bit. "Having it with his meal" means nothing in actual fact. For a meal some people like a

pound and a-half of steak, whereas another person will nibble at a lettuce. We have no way of saying what a meal shall be. The provision in the law that a man must have a meal means nothing. A bona-fide traveller will always arrange to be in the vicinity of a place where he can get food at meal times. There are very few bona-fide travellers who will not arrange their travelling so that they can have their meals in some little town—say at a cafe or a grillroom, oyster saloon, or any other place. The bona-fide traveller will arrange always to be somewhere where he can get his meals at meal time. This is ample provision for the bona-fide traveller. It has been said that the bona-fide traveller should be entitled to a drink at any hour, but that would leave it too open—the police would have to be watching hotels day and night—but if there are only two periods in which the privilege is open to travellers the police can look after it. Railway travellers who travel long distances can obtain a drink at any hour of the day or night at railway refreshment rooms.

Provision is made that the hotelkeeper must, if he caters for travellers, keep a travellers' book. It is distinctly laid down in the Act that there is no compulsion on a licensee to keep his house open to serve travellers.

Under the present law it is compulsory for the licensee to provide refreshments for travellers. We are removing that and laying it down that he is not compelled to provide refreshments for travellers, so the great majority of hotelkeepers who do not want to be bothered with catering for travellers in this or any of the main cities can go away for the day and not have to open their premises at all. The small country hotelkeeper always caters for travellers, and consequently will always be open, but the city hotels, which do not bother with travellers on Sundays, are not compelled to open for that purpose.

It is provided that the publican must keep a travellers' book in which the traveller must sign his name and give his true address, under very heavy penalty.

Mr. Yeates: Is the onus on the traveller?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It is on both parties. We are getting them with both hands. We are putting the onus on the licensee to satisfy himself and on the traveller to tell the truth. No man or woman who is a genuine traveller need have any hesitation in telling the truth. Anybody who objects to giving his correct name and address must be doing so only because he is not a bona-fide traveller, and is therefore breaking the law.

Mr. Maher: When you say "refreshment," does that mean a drink or a meal?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: That is a matter of taste.

Mr. Maher: Do you mean that you can exempt the licensed victuallers from providing meals for travellers on Sundays?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: No, drink.

Mr. Maher: Drink only?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Yes. No traveller will be allowed to take liquor away from the premises. The Bill reads, "in his possession." I do not know whether he will say that what he has consumed is in his possession or not, but the intention is that it cannot be taken away in a jug, bottle, or billycan.

Mr. Yeates: But if a traveller wants a decent meal between the prescribed hours, can he get it?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Yes.

Mr. Yeates: At any hotel?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: No intelligent traveller asks for a meal at a hotel that travellers do not frequent, because he knows that if he does so he will only get a scratch meal.

Mr. Maher: Are you taking away his right to demand a meal?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: No.

Mr. Massey: But he cannot take any drink away with him?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Only what he has inside him.

Mr. Yeates: Under the present Act they are supposed to cater for that?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: For meals?

Mr. Yeates: Yes.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: That is not being altered. I repeat that if a man is foolish enough to go to, say, the Paddington Hotel on a Sunday for dinner, he will have to put up with some tinned fish or anything they can make up for him. No hotelkeeper is compelled to provide hot dinners for guests who never come along. As long as he provides a meal he is doing all that is required. The intention of the Act is to prevent a man's dying of hunger. If a man goes to the Paddington Hotel for a meal on Sunday he will be given a bit of tinned fish, or something that will enable him to stagger safely into town where he can get a decent meal.

It is interesting to note that in the other States the traveller's clause still retains a much shorter distance. In Victoria, 20 miles travelling qualifies a bona-fide traveller for a drink at any hour. In New South Wales the provision is 25 miles in Sydney and Newcastle, and 10 miles elsewhere.

Mr. Edwards: You said any hour?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Yes.

Mr. Edwards: In Victoria it is 6 o'clock.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I am talking about the traveller. At any hour at all he can obtain a drink if he has travelled 20 miles in Victoria, 25 miles in Sydney and Newcastle, or 10 miles anywhere else in New South Wales.

Mr. Brand: And a very good clause, too.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: We are making it 40 miles and providing all that is required for the bona-fide traveller, and making it harder to abuse the privilege and doing all we can to eliminate Sunday drinking.

The offences are all prescribed and the penalties are increased. At the present time there is a minimum penalty of £10 and a maximum of £20 for a hotelkeeper who commits his first offence. Under the amending Bill that is increased to a minimum of £25 and a maximum of £50. For the second or subsequent offence the law provides a minimum penalty of £20 and a maximum of £50. The amending Bill increases that to a minimum of £50 or a maximum of £100.

These increased penalties are designed to make it unprofitable for the unscrupulous licensee to interfere with the proper control of the business. Forfeiture is provided where three convictions are recorded against the licensee. Convictions are endorsed on the license of the licensee and the third conviction cancels the license completely.

Mr. Sparkes: You might make it revenue-producing.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: If you make penalties so heavy as to prevent the occurrence of offences, naturally you do not get much revenue from them.

We propose to change the trading hours, but not, as suggested in some quarters, to increase the hours. The proposal has been canvassed in the Press and elsewhere—in many cases in the pulpit—that we propose to extend the hours of trading, but that is not so. All we propose to do is to alter the times between which a hotelkeeper can trade. The present hours are from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. and under the proposed Bill they are 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Mr. Sparkes: It is generally admitted that more drinking is done at night.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The proposed alteration operates to the advantage of country people. It is rather difficult in a State like Queensland to design laws so that they will be suitable for the varying conditions that exist throughout the whole of the State. Hon. members will remember that the Local Government Act was completely revolutionary in that it gave a charter to any local governing body to make its own by-laws. We found over long years of experience that it was impossible to draft a Local Government Act that would work smoothly in the thickly-populated areas, the farming areas, and the sparsely-settled North and North-West of Queensland. The same difficulty

creeps in here and we have nobody on whom to place the burden of the liquor law except the State. In England local boards have the powers to vary the trading laws according to the requirements of localities. As the Premier has reminded me, it is possible for a drinker in one part of the country to take a taxi to another area a mile or two away where the hotels may be open later and have a "beano" there. We found the same thing operated in regard to the border of New South Wales and Queensland. When the New South Wales hotels were closed strictly at 6 p.m., there was an invasion of New South Welshmen across the border to the Queensland hotels that were open to 8 p.m. The Government gave consideration to the possibility of zoning. Hours that would be convenient to the people of Brisbane might be very inconvenient to the people of country districts.

Mr. Brand: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I think hon. members representing country constituencies agree with me. I know that every representative of a country electorate in the Labour Party was outspoken about it. As a matter of fact, a very interesting thing occurred the other day. When a deputation of ladies from various women's organisations came along to see me about this Bill, I was told that the Country Women's Association did not join the deputation because it was interested in the convenience of country people. Country people have much to put up with; there is much talk about the poor man in the country, but that poor old man does not mean very much to you unless you are prepared to give consideration to his problems. The man who works hard on a farm or a station in the country does not pass a hotel on the corner on his way home where he can have a drink. If he wants to have a drink he has first to go home, have a wash, come in to the pictures, and perhaps have a refresher. He is entitled to the same privileges as city people. If the present hours make it impossible for that privilege to be extended to the countryman, Parliament owes a duty to him to provide these services and privileges.

However, we went into the zoning problem and we decided that if we zoned the State parties would leave the city to go to areas where trading was carried on to a later hour, that they would come back to the city probably with too much drink and that would mean smashes, spills, and other evils that would create more damage and outweigh the good that might be done.

Mr. Yeates: What about the commercial travellers?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It is interesting to note the opening hours for trading in the various States. At the present time four of the Australian States have 12 trading hours a day, Queensland, New South Wales, Tasmania, and Western Australia, except that in the gold-fields of Western Australia, where an area

has been specially zoned, the trading hours are 14 a day. The goldfields are an isolated area, and no-one is likely to leave Perth to go to the goldfields for a pot. In South Australia there are 13 trading hours a day, and in Victoria nine hours. These are the trading hours in countries outside Australia—

Great Britain—10 hours (London); 10½ hours country.
New Zealand—9 hours.
South Africa—12 hours.
United States of America—14 hours;
Washington, 16 hours.

In Great Britain there is a trading limit, but it is left to the Licensing Board to say exactly in what number of hours trading shall be done. It is also interesting to note that the country that made the biggest attempt to carry out prohibition immediately swung back to longer trading hours when that experiment failed. The pendulum having swung so far one way swung back further the other way when the experiment failed.

These are the opening hours for trading in the Australian States—

South Australia—5 a.m.
New South Wales—6 a.m.
Victoria and Western Australia—9 a.m.
Tasmania—10 a.m.

These are the hours outside Australia—

Great Britain—11.30 a.m., and may be extended to 9 a.m. in the country.
New Zealand—9 a.m.
South Africa—10 a.m.
United States of America—10 a.m.

These are the closing hours in the Australian States—

New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia—6 p.m.
Western Australia—9 p.m.; goldfields, 11 p.m.
Tasmania—10 p.m.

These are the closing hours outside Australia—

Great Britain—11 p.m. (London); 10 p.m. country; may be extended to 12 midnight and 10.30 p.m. country.
New Zealand—6 p.m.
South Africa—10 p.m.

A few years ago the Imperial Government appointed a royal commission to investigate the licensing laws of that country and particularly the hours of trading. It recommended that the closing hour should be 10 p.m., but the present law in that country is that some hotels may close before that hour and some after it, but the recommendation was that 10 p.m. was a suitable closing hour. In the Bill we propose to alter the trading hours to 10 a.m. and 10 p.m. and not more.

Hon. members will also be interested to know that we are giving registration to two more clubs. When the 1935 Act was being prepared, amongst the bodies that applied for registration were the Masonic Club and the Caledonian Society. The Government agreed to give a licence to each, but for some reason,

not because of any fault of departmental officers but of the clubs concerned, the formalities were not completed in time and the clubs were left out. Subsequently, when a deputation waited upon me and later saw the Premier, the two clubs were informed that Cabinet had considered the matter and had decided that they would both be given registration on the next occasion when the licensing laws were amended. This is the first time since that the Act has been amended, and we are honouring the undertaking we gave that both those clubs would be registered. They have as much right to registration as any other club operating in the city.

The amount of liquor consumed is important. Hon members should be aware of the fact that Queenslanders are amongst the most abstemious people in the world. To hear the debates that go on here sometimes, to read some of the articles in the Press, and to listen to some of the speeches made on the public platform from time to time, one would be inclined to think that the people of Queensland were the heaviest drinkers in the world. The Australian Temperance Year Book publishes the drink bill of Australia over a number of years up to 1938-39, the last complete figures available. I will content myself with quoting the last year. These figures show that the drink bill of the States per head of population is as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
New South Wales	6	0	11
Victoria	4	13	8
Queensland	3	12	1
South Australia	4	9	10
Western Australia	7	18	3
Tasmania	3	18	1
Australia (as a whole) ..	5	4	8

The drink bill per head of population in Great Britain for the same period was £5 11s. 6d.

The gallonage of beer consumed for the same period also discloses Queensland in a favourable light—

	Gallons.
New South Wales	12.87
Victoria	12.61
Queensland	7.37
South Australia	10.12
Western Australia	16.38
Tasmania	9.15
Australia (average) ..	12.13

The beer consumed in Great Britain for that period was 19.37 gallons a head. Beer is consumed to a great extent as an ordinary beverage at meal time in Great Britain, and that makes the average figure there higher.

Mr. Nimmo: I do not think the alcoholic content is anything like what it is here.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I should not like to advise the hon. gentleman to consume too much English beer. If he takes my advice he will be very cautious about it, particularly Scotch beer. It is true that the beer consumed on the Continent is very light, but in England it is very strong.

The average consumption of spirits in the various States of the Commonwealth in 1938-39 was—

	Gallons.
New South Wales	.32
Victoria	.17
Queensland	.19
South Australia	.15
Western Australia	.26
Tasmania	.19
Australia (average)	.22

The average for Great Britain for the same period was .22 gallons a head. Queensland drinks a little more spirits a head than some of the other States, though her average is less than that for the Commonwealth. That is due to the peculiar enchantment of Queensland rum.

The figures for wine are—

	Gallons.
New South Wales	.60
Victoria	.25
Queensland	.33
South Australia	.75
Western Australia	1.07
Tasmania	.23
Australia (average)	.82

The average consumption in Great Britain is .32. In consumption of wine Great Britain is very much down.

These figures disclose that Queensland is a particularly sober State. The beer gallonage here is remarkably low. Most people in a tropical climate drink beer, but, notwithstanding that fact, the average in Queensland is particularly low, and all to the advantage of the people. I say myself that the people of Queensland are the most law-abiding and sober people in the world. I doubt whether you will find any community as law-abiding as the people of Queensland. There is a greater respect for the law amongst the people of Queensland than there is anywhere else.

You can see it in the feeling between the police and the people. As a whole, the feeling between the people and the police is in remarkable contrast to the feeling between the people and the police in some other parts of the Commonwealth and the world. The people are remarkably law-abiding. I say that, knowing as I do the crime and prison statistics for this State, particularly from the point of view of the comparative infrequency of the desertion of wives and children in Queensland compared with any other part of the world. We are remarkably free of deserted wives and children in this State, and that is due to the fact there is a higher and better state of morality in this State. I am not going to say that that is all caused by the cutting down of the liquor bill. I suggest the decline in liquor consumption in Queensland over the years is to a tremendous degree caused by the rapidly improving social conditions of the people in this State. If we look back over the years, we find from the time the Labour movement became a power in Queensland—when the workers organised themselves industrially into unions and won better wages and better conditions of labour

and more safety and cleanliness in industry—not only has there been a decrease in liquor consumption but the crime statistics have improved. All that improvement has taken place as the improvement in the standard of living has gone on. Thirty years ago you could hardly go past a block in any of the main streets in the city without meeting a drunk; you could not walk through the streets of Brisbane at night without being accosted by prostitutes, some drunk and some sober; you could not go to a back-street hotel without seeing women of all shades of character drinking there and associating with Chinese and other coloured people. That has all passed away. There is a tremendous improvement in the whole of the morals of the community of Queensland, not only in the amount of liquor concerned, but also in social standards. People drink and indulge in vice to a great extent to forget their misery, in the same way as many business people who get into difficulties on the racecourse have gone there in order to forget their business troubles and get a little mental relaxation.

Mr. Maher: And some headaches, too.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I always get the headaches anyhow; I do not seem to do any good there.

It is a notorious fact that people do drink to forget their misery. I have heard people pointing out the terrible evil of poor women buying shilling tickets in the Golden Casket. They say, "It is a terrible crime to see those unfortunate women, some on relief, buying shilling shares in the Casket." Such a woman gets a dream in the buying of a shilling share in the Golden Casket—something she can dream about and look forward to the possible solving of her economic position. It takes much more than a shilling's worth of gin to bring rosy dreams to the minds of people who are poor. (Laughter.) The disappearance of gin-drinking among poor people is due to the increased standard of the people. There is nothing to forget, and there is a better standard of education.

Do not forget that young well-educated boys and girls growing up play a tremendous part in disciplining the fathers and mothers. Girls who go to good schools and associate with girls from good homes expect their fathers and mothers to provide them with a decent home and surroundings; and the young people of this State have played a tremendous part in disciplining the older generation of this State. I can look round in Brisbane where years ago there were nothing but little two-roomed skillion cottages for working people at a rental of a few shillings a week, and now in place of many an old house one sees a modern worker's dwelling going up. It is as infectious as influenza. One sees in the older districts old houses coming down and new houses going up. That occurs so soon as one person breaks the line of old cottages. Much of that is due to the fact that the children see their school-mates living in better homes than those they live in, and they want to know of their father or their mother why they cannot have the

same type of house as that of their school-mate. That plays a tremendous part in social improvement.

Moreover, a woman has more interest in her home now that she has not to get down on her knees with a scrubbing-brush and scrub bare boards. Nor has she to sit up at night darning and patching to keep a few rags on the back of her children. She now has sufficient income to furnish her home decently and to provide her children with decent food and clothing and allow them a little leisure at the week-end. They have a better standard of home altogether. There are also better conditions in the shops and factories in which the people work. They have time for study and time for clean recreation. Another factor that is of immense importance to young people is the annual holidays they now get. That gives them an incentive to save their money. Years ago there was no such thing as annual holidays for workers in industry. There was nothing for them to look forward to. To-day, young people have to go somewhere for their annual holidays. As a matter of fact, many young people make their annual holidays their courting period. They take a pride in cutting a good figure during that time. These things have come about owing to the improved standard of living, and the Labour movement, both industrially and politically, can take a tremendous share of the credit for the improvement that has taken place.

The amendments that are now being made to the Liquor Act are not going to make for any falling-off in the morality of the community. All the Bill does is to alter the time during which people may drink to suit the people of the State better. There are in it also new provisions that will greatly improve the moral standards of the State, which already has a higher moral standard than any other part of the Commonwealth.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba) (12.2 p.m.): It is regrettable that an important measure, such as that which has come up for consideration this morning, should have been brought in during the dying days of the session. A measure such as this is entitled to more consideration than it will be possible to give it under present circumstances. I regret, too, that as such a short time is allowed to Parliament to consider this Bill, the Minister has not afforded the Opposition the courtesy of an advance copy of the Bill. Apparently others have had advance copies in the newspapers of this city. We have had virtually all the information the Minister gave us this morning about its contents. In view of all the circumstances, the Opposition were entitled to an advance copy.

The Minister, when introducing this measure in his usual capable manner, has endeavoured to justify an unjustifiable action on the part of the Government. If we look at the cold, stark, naked facts of the situation facing us at the present time, I ask, "Is this the time to consider giving a greater opportunity to increase the consumption of liquor in this State?" I venture to

say that there is no Parliament in the British Empire to-day in which the Government would be willing to give additional opportunities for the increased consumption of liquor. What has occurred in other parts of the world? What has happened in other parts of the British Empire? Since the war broke out there have been restrictions in the sale of liquor.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Where?

Mr. NICKLIN: To start with, in Great Britain.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: I have news to say that that is not true.

Mr. NICKLIN: Other countries are Germany, Canada, South Africa, and New Zealand. In the nations that are engaged in war at the present time there has been a restriction in the consumption of liquor. Yesterday, when making a Press statement to the "Telegraph," the Premier said that the public would find the Bill one of the best pieces of legislation ever framed in the interests of the community. I say that this Bill is a blot on the Government and a disgrace to the State of Queensland. It is tragic to think that any Government, under the present circumstances, would think of bringing in a Bill of this nature. The Opposition are uncompromisingly opposed to any change in the liquor-trading hours at the present time.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Did you arrive at that decision by a majority of one?

Mr. NICKLIN: No, not by a majority of one, as the Government did when arriving at a decision to bring in this Bill. We are also of the opinion that in times of peace, before a measure such as this is introduced, some indication should have been got from the people, by means of a referendum or by placing the question before them at the general election, as to their opinion on a matter such as this. I say that the measure is wrong for the following reasons:—

1. It is wrong to introduce a measure such as this in a time of war, as it is against the best interests of national efficiency and economy.
2. It is morally wrong to give greater opportunities for the sale of liquor to our young men in uniform at the present time.
3. It is against freely expressed public opinion.
4. The Government have no mandate from the people, who were deliberately misled as to the Government's intention at the last election.

Let us examine those points one by one.

I think everybody will admit that in time of war it is wrong that we should do anything that would be in any way detrimental to the nation's effort, the nation's economy, or the nation's efficiency. That is recognised

by the leaders of our nation at the present time.

Mr. Edwards: Even by the leaders of the Labour Party.

Mr. NICKLIN: That is so. The Leader of the Commonwealth at the present time, the Hon. John Curtin, recognises that. In a recent broadcast to the nation he said—

“If we are to have maximum effort it is imperative that not a single shilling be directed to purposes which reduce the war efficiency of the nation. A wasted hour in industry helps the enemy. A wasted shilling helps the enemy. Any wastage of man power lessens the efficiency of the country.”

I think that statement by the Prime Minister is adequate argument to bear out the first reason I have advanced. Undoubtedly, the overconsumption of liquor in war-time is detrimental to national efficiency.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Overconsumption of liquor at any time is detrimental to efficiency.

Mr. NICKLIN: That it is detrimental to national efficiency in war-time is proved by the fact that in England it has been necessary during this war, as it was during the last war, to reduce the hours for which hotels are open.

The Premier: There has been no legislation at all during this war. I got a cable from the Agent-General last week about that.

Mr. NICKLIN: There was no legislation during the last war to bring about that reduction of hours. That was brought about under the National Security regulations in the Old Country.

The Premier: You cannot get away with that.

Mr. Nimmo: Give him a chance.

Mr. NICKLIN: And I think there is no argument to be advanced against the contention that the alteration in the trading hours by an additional two hours of night trading will undoubtedly have a bad effect, not only upon the economy of this nation, but also on its efficiency as a war machine. We talk about reducing luxury expenditure, but what, after all, is more of a luxury expenditure than the money spent on liquor? There is talk at the present time about rationing clothing and other commodities, and conferences are being held to consider the curtailment of racing and other sports, but we in this State are considering a change in the liquor-selling hours that will bring about an increased consumption of liquor in Queensland. I think this is the wrong time to introduce a measure of this nature and the Government should have given greater consideration to whether this proposed alteration is going to help or act to the detriment of Australia's war effort.

The second point I made is that it is morally wrong to give greater opportunities for the sale of liquor to our young men in khaki. This is particularly important at

present because thousands of young men in khaki are frequenting our cities from military camps in close proximity to them. The extra two hours' night trading will undoubtedly give opportunities that will not be to their benefit.

Mr. Power: Our young men will have a drink whether they are in khaki or not.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Why should a man be deprived of his privilege? There are others besides wowers in the fighting forces.

Mr. NICKLIN: I object to being called a wower.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: The idea that only wowers can fight will not wash. The man who goes to war is entitled to have his drink if he wants it.

Mr. NICKLIN: I definitely make that statement and the Minister can deny it afterwards if he wishes. I say that the extra hours added to the liquor-trading hours will cause many heartburns in families of this State. One of the tragedies of the last war was the man who, unfortunately, took an excess of liquor. One of the greatest tragedies we had to deal with in our repatriation was with that class of returned soldier.

Mr. Power: It is a slur on the soldiers.

Mr. NICKLIN: It is not a slur on the soldiers, but a slur on the Government, that they should think so little of the welfare of our young men that they would put extra temptation in front of them.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Did you make any protest against officers and sergeants having wet canteens?

Mr. NICKLIN: I am not making protests against wet canteens in the camps because they are adequately controlled. If we can be certain that the hotels will be adequately controlled, the position might not be so bad. It is all very well for the Minister to say that restrictions will be placed on hotels that will prevent many of the evils that have crept in in the past, but what is the good of a pious hope? To be useful it must be put into effect. We have had 8 o'clock closing in this State for a considerable time and we know what has happened.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Your Government instructed the Commissioner of Police not to prosecute.

Mr. NICKLIN: I am talking about present-day conditions. So far as I am concerned, I gave no such instructions to anyone.

Mr. Sparkes: He was not in the House then.

Mr. NICKLIN: My third point is that this action is being taken by the Government against freely-expressed public opinion. Where has there been any request for a change in the trading hours of this State? On the contrary, there have been very strong opinions against any alteration, particularly in the present war-time conditions. Therefore, I

cannot understand why the Government have introduced the Bill at the present time.

Mr. Jesson: What were the closing hours during the last war?

Mr. Brand: Eleven o'clock.

Mr. Jesson: We won the war, didn't we?

Mr. NICKLIN: My fourth point is that the Government have no mandate from the people to bring in the measure, and it is interesting to note that the action of the Government in this regard is contrary to the Labour platform and contrary to the decision of the Labour-in-Politics Convention at Southport.

The Premier: That is where you are wrong.

Mr. NICKLIN: There was no mention of any change of liquor hours in the Premier's policy speech. In fact, during the last election campaign he was particularly careful not to make any statement that could be construed as meaning that the Government would introduce a change of liquor hours if they were returned to power. On the subject of liquor reform the fighting platform of the party says—

“State manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquor with ultimate view to total prohibition, subject to local or State option.”

Under the Labour platform there was provision for a Liquor Act Amendment Bill, the following points to be contained in it:—

1. Question of 6 o'clock closing of all liquor bars and wineshops to be submitted to the people by means of a specific referendum under the provisions of a General Initiative and Referendum Act.

2. Triennial, automatic State option polls, majority vote to decide the issues.

The Premier: You are not quoting the Labour platform.

Mr. NICKLIN: That is in the Labour platform.

The Premier: I challenge you now; you are not quoting the Labour platform.

Mr. NICKLIN: I am quoting the Labour platform as published in the “Worker.”

The Premier: What date?

Mr. NICKLIN: 1920.

The Premier: 1920! Twenty years ago.

Mr. NICKLIN: Have the Government ever published another platform? They have not. Have they ever altered it at any convention since?

The Premier: It has been up for consideration every three years.

Mr. NICKLIN: They have never altered it.

The Premier: I will get you an illuminated copy.

Mr. NICKLIN: The question of extending the liquor hours was raised at the South-

port Labour-in-Politics Convention, and the change was defeated, according to reports. I do not know whether the Premier is going to deny that.

Mr. Jesson: You are wrong again.

Mr. NICKLIN: If I am wrong, then let us have the correct decision. It was given out to the world that the Labour Convention was opposed to any alteration at the present time in hotel trading hours.

The Premier: You are wrong again.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Entirely wrong.

Mr. NICKLIN: That was the Labour platform on which the Labour Party fought the last general election. As I mentioned previously, in the course of the election campaign it was impossible to ascertain the opinion of the Government on this all-important question. On every occasion the question was asked it was evaded, but the impression was given that the Government would stick to the existing 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. hotel trading hours.

Mr. Collins: They said they would enforce the law.

Mr. NICKLIN: It is true they said they would enforce the trading hours, but if it were the intention of the Government to introduce this change of trading hours, which has occurred in this the first session of this Parliament, would it not have been honest for them to have told the people of the State that it was their intention so to alter them and thus allow the people to vote on the question? Why the change of hours now? What is the reason for the change? Who asked for this change? That is what the big majority of people are asking at the present time. Why should we, at such a time as this, when our country is passing through such dangers and difficulties, be asked to consider this Bill? To use the Premier's words recently, why are we adopting an “on with the dance” attitude by introducing a measure such as this? Why are we not doing as the Premier said at the same time as he used those words, girding ourselves like men, being strong, and doing the job for our country as our forefathers did, instead of breaking down the war effort of our country by giving a greater opportunity to increase the sale of intoxicating liquors in this State?

You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that during the last election a journal published in this city made a forecast which has been borne out to the letter—namely, that immediately the first session of Parliament was held a move would be made to extend hotel trading hours to 10 p.m.

Mr. Power: What journal was that?

Mr. NICKLIN: “The Clarion.”

Mr. Jesson: Do you subscribe to that paper?

Mr. NICKLIN: I do not subscribe to it; I am just quoting facts. This paper said during the course of the last election campaign that if the Government were returned,

during the first session of Parliament they would introduce a measure to bring about an alteration in the liquor trading hours from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. to 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. Everything that journal said has been borne out by the actions of the Government to-day. In view of that, I am quite justified in asking: why are the Government introducing this measure, a measure that is contrary to the expressed views of the Prime Minister of Australia, contrary to the Labour platform, and contrary to the views of the majority of the electors, and I venture to say, if it was submitted to a free vote of hon. members of this Committee, would be defeated in this Chamber?

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Power: The majority of your party would not support it.

Mr. NICKLIN: The majority of this side of the House would support it.

When we know the history of this alteration—we know that it only went through Caucus by one vote—

The Premier: That is not true.

Mr. NICKLIN: When we consider it from the point of view of a count of heads in this Chamber, I venture to say that if every hon. member voted according to his convictions, and in a free manner, the Bill would be defeated on the floor of this Committee. I am justified in saying we know the avowed opinions of many hon. members opposite as well as hon. members on this side of the Committee—on a question like this it is only natural that there should be a marked division of opinion—and I am confident that I am correct in saying that if a free vote was taken the motion would be defeated.

As I said at the outset, I am uncompromisingly opposed to the introduction of this Bill, and I have stated the reasons.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, Mackay) (12.26 p.m.): I listened very carefully to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, and he was guilty of a performance of which no-one holding high office in this Chamber should be guilty.

Mr. Barnes: You would know.

The PREMIER: Yes, I observe the hon. member occasionally. When the leader of a party makes a statement about another, one takes that statement seriously. The Leader of the Opposition should be treated seriously. Under the Constitution he is regarded as an alternative Premier; yet we find him basing a case on what he said was the Labour platform, and then he was forced to admit that the quotation he gave was 21 years old.

Mr. Nimmo: 1920, he said.

The PREMIER: Twenty-one years old. The Labour Party in this State, as you know, Mr. Chairman, has conventions every three years, and the whole objective of the platform is open to review, and if the hon. gentleman or anyone else with integrity can find what he quoted in the Labour platform,

I will donate 20 guineas to any charity he nominates.

Mr. Nicklin: Quote the Labour platform on the liquor question at the moment.

The PREMIER: "Liquor reform" in "The fighting platform." Liquor reform is in the Labour platform. The quotation the leader of a once-great party gave quotes a platform that has been subject to alteration not less than seven times in the last 21 years.

Mr. Nicklin: Has it been altered seven times?

The PREMIER: It has been altered several times, and the matter the hon. gentleman quoted is no longer in the platform and has not been for a number of years. I suggest to the hon. gentleman that when he wants a copy of the Labour platform he apply to me, and not to the member for Oxley. I will give him the most up to date that is available.

I have shown that the Leader of the Opposition, in one of his main arguments, has quoted from the Labour platform and has given false testimony in quoting a document that is 21 years old and is not the present document at all. I also want to correct the Leader of the Opposition in another direction. He interpolated a word of his own in the resolution carried at the convention. The resolution carried at the convention was—

"That the liquor law of the State be strictly enforced."

He interpolated the word "existing." No word "existing" was mentioned during the debate, nor was it in the resolution. "That the liquor law of the State be strictly enforced" was the resolution, and both the mover and seconder of that resolution, as well as myself, suggested that the matter of the fixation of hours continue to be, as it was in the past, a matter for Parliament to decide.

During the election campaign I was perfectly frank on this matter and reference to the "Courier-Mail" in countless directions can testify to that. On a number of occasions I was asked if I would commit the ensuing Parliament to any change in the law. I stated quite definitely and without any ambiguity that it was open to Parliament to change the trading hours at any time it thought fit. No pledge of any kind was given not to alter the hours. Many people endeavoured to get such a commitment from me, but I made it perfectly clear, and I can quote the "Courier-Mail" and other journals to the effect that every time I spoke on this subject I said the matter of fixing hours for the sale of liquor was a matter for Parliament to determine.

Mr. Nimmo: Caucus, not Parliament.

The PREMIER: A matter for Parliament to determine. Ever since there has been a liquor law in this State it has been determined by Parliament.

The "Courier-Mail," in a leading article recently, said that this problem should be

dealt with by referendum as on former occasions, or words to that effect. There never has been a referendum on the question of hours in this State. Parliament has always taken the responsibility. I mentioned that frequently during the last election, and Parliament is being invited to take action now.

Mr. Nimmo: No, the caucus has decided it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Oxley is not entitled to vote on this Bill at all.

Mr. Nimmo: Yes, he is.

The PREMIER: No, he is not.

Mr. Nimmo: Yes, he is.

The PREMIER: Unless he has taken action very recently, because he is a shareholder and financially affected.

Mr. Nimmo: I am not.

The PREMIER: He must have sold his holding very recently.

Mr. Nimmo: You will say anything.

The PREMIER: He held 500 shares recently so he may have altered the position recently.

Mr. Nimmo: That is all right.

The PREMIER: But he held those shares, and if he continues to hold those shares he is not entitled to vote on this Bill.

Mr. NIMMO: I rise to a point of order. The Premier said that I hold 500 shares or held 500 shares. I deny that and ask for its withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Premier stated that the hon. member for Oxley held 500 shares. In what company he did not say.

Mr. Nimmo: He said in the liquor interest. I have never held any shares in liquor interests.

The PREMIER: If the hon. gentleman has disposed of his shares or placed them under immediate trust then I must, according to Standing Orders, accept his denial, and I accept his denial. He may have disposed of them or placed them under immediate trust. He was financially interested—

Mr. Nimmo: I will explain all that.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman is entitled to explain. I shall be interested to listen.

Mr. Nimmo: I can, very satisfactorily.

The PREMIER: Before I was interrupted I was pointing out that Parliament at all times has taken the responsibility of fixing the hours, and we are inviting Parliament to do so to-day. This Bill gives the opportunity to do so.

The Minister dealt very fully with the Bill, and gave a clear exposition of it. The alteration of hours, as he pointed out, is not

an extension of hours. The hours of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. were fixed because we regarded them as having the balance of public advantage throughout the State. We have to take into account the people who use hotels, the people who use the facilities afforded by them.

Mr. Barnes: I thought you would take that into account.

The PREMIER: That is the view we have taken. We are not entitled to take into major account the people who say there should be no hotels at all. It is lawful now to use spirituous liquors of all kinds. They are sold under control, and, consequently, the measure of control is determined by Parliament. It is no offence against the law to drink spirituous or any other kind of liquors that are sold over a hotel bar.

Mr. Nimmo: Parliament has no say. You know that.

The PREMIER: Parliament is the judge of where the balance of public advantage lies.

Mr. Nimmo: No, only caucus.

The PREMIER: I take the view that the hours of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. are reasonable hours.

Mr. Brand: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I take the view that it is better to be able to have a drink between 8 p.m. and 10 p.m. than it is to have it between 8 a.m. and 10 a.m. Anybody who has any experience—and I have some—knows that what I say is true. Take the men who work in industry throughout the State. Take the cane-cutters in my own electorate. By the time they knock off, have a bath, and have their supper and travel the distance to the hotel—they have not a hotel bar at the corner of the field in which have been working—the hour is past 8 p.m. Why should they not have a drink between 8 p.m. and 10 p.m. if they want it?

Mr. Macdonald: They do not go at night time, either. It is too hard to make a living now.

The PREMIER: Quite a number of them have gone in for the habit of having a case of beer in their camps, but I take the view that it is better to go the hotel for a drink than to load up in that fashion.

Mr. Clayton: What about having both?

The PREMIER: The hon. member can have both. I am not interfering with his tastes at all. I believe in the minimum of interference with private liberty, and that is something that is very important to remember in discussing this Bill. In recent years there has been a tendency to interfere too much with the liberty of the individual. That comes from the totalitarian ideas that have been spread throughout the world by various people. There is a tendency to try to dictate the terms upon which other people shall live.

If you are going to interfere with the people's social habits, obviously you must establish a case that the public interest is adversely affected by those social habits.

As to the charge that hon. members of this party are not in favour of the Bill, hon. members will see how true that is in the division. This Bill was voted upon at the party meeting last week, and there was no objection to it. That was the first time the complete Bill was at the party meeting. Hon. members of the Assembly are entitled, under the Constitution, to vote as they like. Every member of this party will vote as he voted last week. The canards that have been issued about these things have been widespread, but we need take little notice of that. No major political question is ever discussed without resort to fraudulent misrepresentation and false evidence.

Again, on the question of hours, let me say that we have tested the 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. trading hours by means of rigorous enforcement, and find that they are outside public consent, and that the hours of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. are more favoured by the people of this State, particularly those living outside Brisbane. Why should it not be so? It cannot be argued that because an alteration in the hours of trading is being made everyone is going to rush helter-skelter to become a drunkard straightaway. It would be folly to argue that way. And, as one hon. member interjected a few moments ago, the trading hours were to 11 p.m. during the last war. Can anybody argue that Australia's effort during the last war was not a splendid one? Is anyone suggesting that the soldiers who will win this war are not to be trusted and not to be allowed to go out alone at night without somebody to take their hands? Can you make soldiers of such men? It is against the teaching of all history. The best men I know in the community are those who exercise self-control. There are in the mind of every man and woman tendencies towards good and evil. You should practise the good and overcome the evil if you are going to be a good citizen. The character of the individual, the character of the nation, is not built up upon a series of prohibitions, but entirely by the exercise of self-control. I firmly believe that the people of this country have strong characters and they are not subject to the yielding to temptations that existed many years ago. Everyone knows of the practice of years ago of "doing in" your cheque at the nearest hotel, particularly in the shearing and sugar industries. Who ever sees that now? The majority of the people you see working in the sugar industry are either teetotallers or drink lager shandies. The diminution in the amount of drinking in Queensland is largely due to the fact that our young men have other and better habits to follow. That is the view I take.

I inquired of the Agent-General concerning this business, and received from him a reply to the effect that there has been no alteration in the law in England. I therefore inform the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that there has been a practice of establishing

canteens where men work three shifts, and no fault is found with that.

Again, I put forward this proposition: that none of the States that have early closing would have continued those hours if they had been rigidly enforced.

There is supposed to be 6 o'clock closing in Sydney and Melbourne, but that part of the law has not been put into full operation all over the State at the same time, and indeed, if there had not been this elasticity, shall I call it, in the administration of the law, the public would have altered the law long ago. The Government of New South Wales have intimated that it is their intention to alter the law early next session. Tasmania has already altered the law to 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., and the report of the Commissioner of Police for that State does not indicate that any bad results have followed that change—in the way of drunkenness, increased accidents, or any other way in which they could be shown.

Taking it all through, the Bill secures a better measure of liquor control than any other yet put on the statute-book. It provides for policing in a way never attempted before, and it puts the trade and the public on a reasonable basis, and the public interest is thereby served.

Mr. MAHER (West Moreton) (12.47 p.m.): There is much that the Premier has said with which I could agree if we were living under peace-time conditions. There is a great body of people in the community, a far greater body than temperance advocates think, who enjoy a drink because it gives zest to life by enabling a man to meet his fellow-man in pleasant surroundings, and enjoy a quiet drink of beer, wine, or spirits. It also helps to lessen the weary load of men with serious responsibilities in commercial, professional, and political life, or land industries.

In other countries they seem to have mastered the liquor problem reasonably well. For instance, in Germany a man can take his wife and family into a beer garden on Sunday afternoon—horror of horrors!—and there have a drink in pleasant surroundings with music and sometimes sacred music. He can sit there for an hour or two and consume perhaps only a pint of beer or a couple of pints. Can anybody say that any harm is thereby done?

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: It is a far better way of drinking than in our own club bars.

Mr. MAHER: It is far better because the drinking is done in garden surroundings. There is a bar at one end of the garden, staffed with barmen, but the patron is able to go and buy whatever he requires, take it to a table, and sit down and drink it. The Germans have been great beer-drinkers throughout history, but they are a brilliant, though somewhat turbulent people, and the drinking of beer does not seem to have interfered with their virility, because they are certainly very determined fighters, and

capable in other directions, too. I heard a broadcast by Mr. Wendell Wilkie, a candidate for the Presidency of the United States of America, made from a beer house in London, and I could actually hear the tinkling of the glasses and the talk of the beer-drinkers in the tavern, and he made his broadcast while bombs were being dropped on London. We can overdo this temperance advocacy altogether, and there must be a fair mean between extremes of opinion.

I have the utmost sympathy for all those good people in our midst who are genuine temperance people, eager to inculcate temperance principles into the minds of the rising generation, and to encourage older people to exercise self-restraint in drinking, but temperance advocacy is too often mixed up with the prohibitionists.

Even quite recently we had some leaders of the temperance party in Queensland—indeed, throughout Australia—waiting on the Prime Minister at Canberra, asking for the total prohibition of the manufacture of intoxicating liquors in Australia for the period of the war. That was a plain attempt to interfere with the individual rights and liberties of a free people. Why should I be prevented from having a drink of beer or whisky if I wish to do so? I do not attempt to interfere with the liberties of the teetotaler, nor do I ask him to adopt my views. I have no sympathy with the extreme temperance advocate; I have a great deal of sympathy with the honest temperate reformer. I have no sympathy at all with the liquor monopolist, or the great brewery combines that are growing up in Australia. I am not in the camp of the extreme temperance men or the brewery combines, but I am in the corner of the common man, who has his right to have a drink if he wants to, particularly in a country like Queensland, where a great many of our menfolk have to live under tropical conditions.

As the Premier has said, they work all day long in the canefields, or ride all day long in the burning Western sun after stock, or have to shear at a rapid rate in the shearing sheds in the hot north-west, western, or far-western portions of Queensland. It is the bushworkers, generally, I think of. I do not care what the people of Brisbane do. They can close at 6 o'clock if they desire, but in the climate of the West, where men have to work out in the sun, I think that after their daily toil is over they are entitled to have a drink if they like, but under reasonable methods of control. That is why I say I am behind the right of the individual to freedom and liberty of action in the matter of having a drink.

The only difficulty I see at the present time in Queensland is that there has in recent times been a complete disregard of the law. Many of our troubles arise from the fact that during the past eight years the Government have not rigorously applied the law as they should have done. There has not been that rigorous enforcement of the law to which the Premier made reference a while ago. It has been stated that there was

some kind of gentlemen's agreement between the Government, the police, and licensed victuallers, whereby trading could be continued to 11 p.m. Whilst I believe in individual rights—that is, that a man should be entitled to have a drink within the prescribed trading hours—at the same time I believe in law enforcement. There is a tendency for a great number of people to defy the law. I say it should be enforced. Now, you cannot blame a man who has worked up a thirst in a hot climate for trying to get a drink, but if there is a laxity in the enforcement of that law, then the law will get into disrepute altogether. That is where the present Government are deserving of our severe condemnation. They have failed to enforce 8 o'clock closing rigorously, and if the statement is true that there was some kind of unwritten agreement whereby the trade could carry on till 11 o'clock without interference, that is wrong. Such methods of government undermine the whole Constitution. It has been possible, in the past eight years, for anybody to go into a hotel between the hours of 8 p.m. and 11 p.m. and get a drink, and during that time the police have not attempted to interfere with them.

This illegally exercised privilege came to be regarded by usage as a right, so, of course, when the Government last year determined to enforce the law rigorously at 8 p.m. that created many heartburnings, and the natural reaction is that the Government have been obliged to meet the criticism and objections of people who have become used to the 11 o'clock trading by introducing a measure of this kind. That is the history of the whole thing in a nutshell, and it is rather a sorry episode in the political life of the State.

If we do not insist on the maintenance of the law in one direction then the law as a whole would be discredited. It is quite illogical and wrong to send industrial inspectors out to trap bakers and butchers for selling a loaf of bread or a pound of corned beef to some drover in the early morning, or to some housewife late at night—it is wrong to employ industrial inspectors to catch those people and impose heavy penalties upon them while the hotels are allowed to trade with impunity after the hour laid down by Parliament. There is no justification for that. Whatever hours are fixed by Parliament should be observed. There has been a contrast in the administration of the law in the past. One section of the community were the privileged ones and other sections had to bear the full rigorous application of the law when they were guilty of breaches of it. It can only cause resentment in the minds of traders who are obliged to observe the law when they see other more favoured sections of the community allowed to disobey it. The Government have introduced this Bill to try to meet this situation and overcome the effects of eight years of easy-going administration of the licensing law.

If the Government were introducing this legislation under peace-time conditions I should support it. There is nothing in it that I could take exception to under peace-time conditions, particularly the clarification

of the traveller's clause, which is important to people who are travelling hundreds of miles by road in a hot climate. They are entitled to get a drink at some time during the day. Our country people particularly are entitled to that consideration. We do not want to have a Queen street outlook on a matter of that kind. Under those conditions this is a Bill I should personally welcome and give my complete support to in every respect, but I think we cannot overlook the serious warning issued recently by the Prime Minister, Mr. Curtin, by Mr. Fadden when he held that high office, and by his predecessor, Mr. Menzies, that to-day we must divert all the money possible to one paramount objective—that is, the prosecution of the war to a successful conclusion. The Leader of the Opposition quoted the exact statement made by Mr. Curtin in which he said not one hour should be lost, not one shilling should be devoted to any cause that did not assist in making the war effort complete. These men are our national leaders, who are in touch with the whole situation. So it seems to me incongruous, at a time when conditions in the Pacific are so dangerous, that we should be sitting in this Parliament giving a value to this liquor question that is altogether out of proportion to its true worth.

The projecting of this question into the political arena of Queensland is giving it more value than it deserves in relation to the terrific background of war. There are dangerous portents in the Pacific. Surely we could engage ourselves in matters of far greater importance to the country than this question of an extra two hours' trading for hotels. It is difficult to understand the extraordinary public interest in a matter of this kind, in view of the grim realities of war all round us. Since the session began we have had important debates in this Chamber dealing with the lag in recruiting, the war effort, the problems of unemployment, and post-war planning, but they have never attracted a gallery such as we have this morning. It appears to indicate that a measure of this kind is attracting a degree of public interest not warranted by the circumstances.

I do not think the Government are entitled to bring a matter of this kind before the country just now. As I say, I support the principle in times of peace, but in times of war the hours could well be left as they are—namely, 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. There may be instances of hardship amongst many licensed victuallers who have incurred losses in profit owing to the enforcement of the closing hour at 8 p.m. by the Government last year, but then many losses have been incurred by all sections of the community since the war began. I notice that in Great Britain recently 2,000 apothecaries—chemists—were called up for active service and had to close their business undertakings altogether. No compensation was made. They could not get other apothecaries to run their businesses for them whilst they were absent in the service of their country. The liquor industry has been picked out specially and is being given an extra two hours' trading at a time such as this, and under the circumstances such a

course is not warranted. The Government are ill-advised in bringing forward a measure of this kind at the present time. There are so many worthier objects to which attention could be given.

Nobody can be really satisfied that we are doing enough to maintain our war effort. Admittedly we have done much, but we cannot be satisfied until we are making a full 100-per-cent. effort. Of course, there is the fear in the minds of many parents whose sons have enlisted for active service that they will learn the habits of drink and be injured thereby.

Every one of us knows from the history of the world that the men who go to war are a fair cross-section of the people, and under conditions of war men will drink. It is the custom of the British Army to give a ration of rum to soldiers who want it. In the British Navy, of course, they "splice the main brace." The sailors get rum. As a matter of fact, every red-blooded race of men in the world will drink. In war, of course, stimulants of that kind are essential to hold men together in certain circumstances. No matter how much we may express abhorrence at the fear that young fellows run the risk of going astray from excessive drinking, at the same time everything seems to be disturbed, topsy turvy, under conditions of war. All our moral values seem to be upset; that is one of the sad results of war. I always have the feeling that if Hitler, who is a sort of anchorite, were the type of man who could get round a table with statesmen from other countries and have a "spot," to use a colloquial expression, this war might not have happened—he might be sufficiently human to sit round a table with fellowmen from other countries and discuss problems of State in front of him and in a convivial atmosphere.

The Premier: You think he might have been quite human?

Mr. MAHER: He might have been quite human. Hitler is one of those serious-minded people who have the idea that he is divinely inspired. He said so at Vienna when he told them he had a Divine mission. That was on the occasion of the celebration of the Anschluss. I suppose he is like many people who seem to think that they are acting under some kind of Divine guidance for the benefit of their fellow creatures. To use the Premier's words, if he had been human and sat round a table to discuss the problems affecting Europe, we might not have had this war and the unhappiness of millions that has come with war because of his serious demeanour and his ascetic outlook on life. I have found at all times that the most likable, reasonable, and logical men were those who had a drink occasionally, not necessarily the men who drink to excess. Of course, the percentage of men who drink to excess is small. The great body of the people are moderate and like, on special occasions, to meet their fellowmen and have a drink or two whilst they discuss something or other, and I think life is all the better for that.

The English law appeals to me greatly because of its liberality. The Premier said this morning that the Agent-General had

informed him that there had been no actual alteration of the law affecting hours for the sale of liquor in Great Britain. As the hon. gentleman has stated, there is a certain elasticity in Great Britain. Local boards can fix the times for sales of beer to conform with local requirements. If, for example, men are changing shift at midnight in a district, it is possible for the licensed victuallers in that locality to open their hotel doors from 11 p.m. till about 1 a.m. to cater for the needs of the men going on and off shift, and there is much common sense in that.

The Premier: Some of the big factories have canteens.

Mr. MAHER: Yes, some of the big factories have canteens of their own where men can have a drink. In Queensland, at Mount Isa, for example, men work under terrific conditions of heat, yet there they are restricted as to the hours in which they can have a drink, despite the fact that there might be midnight shifts. In other words, our State laws are wrong in certain areas, in that they do not meet the needs of the people living under hot, tropical conditions. If this were peace-time I should be prepared to go even further than this Bill goes, so far as the inland districts of the State are concerned, in which big bodies of men have to work under difficult conditions. But as things stand I feel we should be satisfied for the present with what we have, and not give cause for umbrage to any section of public opinion by a radical change in this direction. There is no doubt that many parents have the fear that their sons who have not tasted strong drink may, when they go into military camps and away from friendly influences and home environment, be led astray, and drink to excess. That is a risk every young man takes, and I submit that it largely depends on the individual. In my life I have spent a great deal of time in and out of hotels because of the nature of my calling, but at the same time I have not learned to drink excessively. I like a drink, and remain a moderate drinker after all these years. There are tens of thousands of others in the same boat, and it would be hard luck if because one poor fellow falls by the wayside and becomes a drunkard and an outcast of society, the rest of us, who are probably moderate drinkers, should suffer—suffer because of the horrible example provided by a small percentage who are not strong enough in make-up to resist the temptations of strong drink.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BRAND (Isis) (2.27 p.m.): I think this is a motion upon which every hon. member must vote. We have had submitted to us a proposal to alter the liquor laws in certain particulars, and the Minister has given his reasons for the alterations. I want to say quite candidly, after listening to him on the question, that I intend to support his motion.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRAND: I do not think there is any need to be hypocritical in approaching a question such as this, the context of which was known by all hon. members before the motion

came into the Chamber. I do not know where the hon. member for West Moreton stands. I have been listening to him for a while, but I think this is an occasion for plain speaking. I believe that there is a very important place in society for temperance organisations—

The Premier: Under the Standing Orders, he must vote as he spoke.

Mr. BRAND: I should say so. I repeat that I think there is a place in society—a very important place—for temperance organisations, and for liquor reformers, but I cannot understand, as a public representative, why any temperance organisation should object to trading hours of 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., when concurrently with that alteration liquor is to be shut out of the ballrooms and dance halls of this country. The Minister, in introducing the Bill this morning, said that he was determined to stamp out the sale and consumption of liquor in our dance halls and ballrooms which, after all, as we all realise, is one of the evils of the liquor traffic. I say that, if for no other reason, I will support this legislation, even though it opens up the hotel trading hours in Queensland from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.. I say, too, at this stage of my speech, that I agree entirely with the Premier, that it is far better to stop men from drinking before 10 o'clock in the morning than after 8 o'clock at night.

Those of us who have had experience can speak in a manner that those who have not cannot understand. If we are to have liquor reform, it should be in the direction of trying to prevent drunkenness. The question of the trading hours is not the most important at all. Indeed, it should be the most important purpose of the temperance organisation to prevent drunkenness. I believe that 100 per cent. of the people, even including those who may drink to excess, desire that we should prevent drunkenness in this country, but so far in the campaign for liquor reform no-one has suggested that that should be our aim. No-one can logically say that by allowing 12 hours' trading a day, from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. instead of from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., we are going to increase drunkenness. The advocates of temperance would find it an advantage to work for the prevention of drunkenness rather than confine their criticism to the alteration of the trading hours from 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. to 10 a.m. and 10 p.m.

Mr. Edwards: Nonsense!

Mr. BRAND: Does the hon. member not understand? If he saw the men who were endeavouring—

Mr. Edwards: You are one.

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member who says "nonsense" is possibly one of those who would prevent me from having a drink. The man who must have all the drink he wants between the dinner-hour and 8 o'clock p.m. is more likely to become intoxicated than the man who can drink in leisurely fashion until 10 o'clock.

Mr. Dart: Is that your experience?

Mr. BRAND: That is looking at the matter in a practical way; I am more temperate and tolerant than the hon. member for Wynnum, and am giving the Committee my opinion. I do not subscribe to the view that the temperance organisations should be denied their right under the existing law to have their profits from such a great undertaking as the Canberra Hotel exempt from income taxation. They should enjoy the exemption that is given to others, particularly when their profits are used for philanthropic and, shall I say, patriotic purposes. They have already shown that not one penny of their profits goes to individuals but all are given to objectives that are a boon to society generally. I agree with that, but at the same time I have a deep-rooted objection to a man's making me drink milk or soft drinks, which I do not like.

The Minister has travelled a long distance along the road of liquor reform, and he has given many reasons why the Bill should be introduced. He has referred to the actions of other Governments, which I thought amounted to an apology for having introduced the Bill. The Bill does not call for any apology. Nor do I think it was quite fair or right that he should accuse other Governments of something that did not happen. The Government led by the Hon. A. E. Moore, former member for Aubigny and Premier of Queensland, believed in doing honourable things in society. Nobody in this country can cast any reflection on the honour and integrity of the Hon. A. E. Moore. He is a very fine man.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to get back to the question and not deliver a panegyric on Mr. Moore.

Mr. BRAND: I will.

I was discussing the reason for bringing down this Bill and in standing by a man whose Administration endeavoured to carry out the laws as they should be carried out. Liquor reform must be considered from the viewpoint of Queensland as a whole, not from a Brisbane point of view. The country has now to submit to penalising conditions in many respects. Undoubtedly, the question of trading hours of hotels is a burning one in country towns. Recently, I was in Gladstone where quite a number of meatworkers were working overtime to supply meat to troops fighting our battles overseas. They knocked off work at 8 o'clock at night, and on their return to Gladstone at 20 minutes past 8 found they were unable to get drink. I was told that their wives have a deep-rooted objection to their children having to go to the hotels to get liquor for their husbands on their return from work. I find, too, not only in Gladstone, but in agricultural towns in my electorate that sugar workers, as the Premier said this morning, after a very hard day's work had, perforce, if they wanted a glass of beer after work, to send their children to get that beer before the closing hour.

Mr. Massey: Would they be served if they were under age?

Mr. BRAND: The hon. member for Toowoong may know of many abuses. I want to tell him that is one. If he went to the countryside, he would find it out for himself. Men in country towns who have no hotel accommodation close to them, find it almost impossible to get liquor unless they do so behind closed doors. I want to say again that we in this Chamber should not be hypocrites. Every hon. member knows, as admitted by the Minister this morning, who gave the figures, that it is a physical impossibility, with the police at his disposal, to close every bar door in the country. Every attempt might be made to do so, and the police are doing a good job in that respect. Excellent citizens in this country who, fortunately or unfortunately, are compelled to live in the country to earn a livelihood, must drink behind closed doors to-day if they want some refreshment. That is in defiance of the law, and it is not a fair thing. We should stand for a square deal for them.

In my opinion, 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. seem to be reasonable hours. To adopt them would prevent a man from getting drink too early in the morning and affecting his efficiency, and would destroy the desire to drink as much as he can before 8 o'clock at night, as it would enable him to get refreshment over a longer period.

I know the position thoroughly as it affects the country districts. As the Premier and Minister said this morning, those districts require some consideration. Those considerations must not be thrown aside, nor should it be said that country people must put up with penalising conditions all their lives. If we arrive at reasonable hours of trading, then they should suffice to meet the needs of the people.

In my opinion, there could be only one objection to the Bill at this stage, and that is the objection that has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

It is not a good thing to increase the opportunities for spending money and indulging in alcoholic liquor when we are at war. But as far as that is concerned we have to take into consideration the behaviour of the boys who have enlisted for active service since the war began. I say emphatically that nobody could take exception to the general behaviour, taking it by and large, of the boys of the A.I.F. Furthermore, it must be remembered that during the last war the liquor hours extended to 11 p.m., and the A.I.F. did a very good job. I have never heard of any slur cast on the old A.I.F.—any suggestion that they misbehaved themselves owing to the increased opportunities for getting liquor. As a matter of fact, we know the A.I.F. in the last war won worldwide fame and behaved themselves wherever they went. The extension of the trading hours to 11 p.m. did not affect them any more than it affected the ordinary citizen.

Just as the Leader of the Opposition said that he uncompromisingly opposes this Bill, so I say I intend to support it. I believe

it is a good thing to take away from the dancing hall and the ballroom the opportunities for young men and women to consume liquor. We must support that proposal, and I do. We cannot be unpromising in our opposition to that phase of the Bill; indeed, I believe that that provision alone justifies its introduction. The only reasonable objection that can be levelled against the Bill by the temperance organisation is to the alteration of the hours from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Taken by and large, the Bill seems to me a very happy compromise, and one that will be an advantage to the people of the State.

Mr. BARNES (Bundaberg) (2.44 p.m.): At the outset I would like to know why although the people pay us something like £2,000 to £3,000 a term to sit in this Chamber we are only allowed 25 minutes to speak on an important matter such as this. We work approximately six calendar months in three years—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in commenting on the Standing Orders. I point out to the hon. member and every other hon. member that hon. members have 25 minutes to debate a Bill at this stage, and they have 40 minutes on the second reading and another 25 minutes on each and every clause of the Bill in the Committee stages.

Mr. BARNES: To-day I am a very proud man, for the simple reason that I am the only person in this Assembly who got a mandate from the people to extend the liquor hours. So I thank the Government from the bottom of my heart, because recognising the trend of public opinion I created throughout Queensland, I not only got this mandate from the people, but I went further. I went out on a barnstorming campaign in Queensland. I might mention it cost me about £250 and the publicans sent me about £21 to pay for it. I worked Maryborough particularly well. In that town I issued 20,000 pamphlets, the total cost of the complete work being £42. I might add that the hon. member for Maryborough was the last to say whether these hotels should be opened or not, the vote in in caucus being 21 to 20. He can deny it if he likes. Despite rumours to the contrary I, and I alone, opened hotels in Queensland. It has been said that one man on the right track is worth more than 42 on the wrong track. In this case, despite the fact that the honourable Mr. Jack says I am only a voice in the wilderness and despite the fact that the Gestapo Press, the "Truth," of 17 August, before this House met, said in an article, with photos of the Premier, the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs, and the hon. member for Bundaberg, that the liquor hours will not be altered. The article says in the last couple of lines—

"However, failing a Government move, the new member for Bundaberg, Frank Barnes, is expected to fulfil his electoral promise and produce a private Bill for 10 to 10 trading."

I will not bore the Committee with the remainder, but having got a mandate from my own people and in the discharge of my obligation to democracy, I want that known throughout Queensland. I set about doing it at colossal expense to myself until finances ran out. I can say, and no hon. member on the opposite side of the Chamber can deny it, that I have forced that opinion on these people. There must be some reason why this Government can bring in this Bill to open hotels, and the only reason, so far as the public are concerned, is myself. For once I congratulate the Government on recognising the need for opening hotels in Queensland. This was forced on them by me.

A Government Member: Are you in favour of the Bill?

Mr. BARNES: I am not in favour of this Bill. I mean that I am in favour of a much better one, but in the meantime I have no alternative but to vote for this. It was my intention to open hotels to 11 p.m. and have them open also for two hours on Sunday morning and two hours on Sunday night.

As I see the traveller's clause, the Government now think it wise for the hotels to be opened for two hours on Sunday morning and two hours on Sunday night. That is a step in the right direction. That was instituted by the hon. member for Bundaberg. Who is to prove that a person in a hotel has not travelled 40 miles that day? I thank the Government, however, for some agreement with me in that respect.

A Government Member: You would be in a bad way if they had not done so.

Mr. BARNES: I am in no bad way. I might add that I, in the first place, was responsible for the closing of hotels in Queensland at 8 p.m. It cost me £5,000, inasmuch as there is such a thing as a gentlemen's agreement prevailing; as to persecution I have complained of, I was left out of the gentlemen's agreement, and I decided, Mr. Chairman, that no other person would be persecuted whilst I was a member of Parliament and had any power to alter the position. I wrote the Minister and he can produce the letter, despite the fact that he has denied it. He can produce and lay on the table of the House the correspondence that passed between him and me and also his Licensing Commission and the head of his Police Department. In that I threatened to take—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest to the hon. member that he deal with the proposed Bill.

Mr. BARNES: In the first place, the Bill is a Bill to provide for certain things "and for other purposes," and despite the fact that I have done some mighty things in my day I am not a clairvoyant. The motion concludes with the words, "and for other purposes" and, therefore, I take it that I am right in speaking collectively on the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is devoting most of his time to himself.

Mr. BARNES: The whole Bill is centred round me, every clause introduced centres round me, and, therefore, it is only natural that I should—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BARNES: The Government, in a previous session, called the Hon. Randolph Bedford to order because he dared to express his opinion in this House, despite the fact that the Hon., the Premier—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That matter has no bearing on the proposed Bill.

Mr. BARNES: I venture to say that the Government had no intention of extending the hotel hours this session, but did intend to do so next session, when the hotel people were being forced to sell at the breweries' prices.

After all the debate that has gone on in this House this session, and outside the House, as well as what we saw in the newspapers this week about what the Bill would contain, why did the Minister not include this morning the elimination of the £300 maximum for hotel licences, and compelling the bigger hotels and breweries to pay 2½ per cent. of the whole of their alcohol purchases? This is a Labour Government. Its members are supposed to legislate for the Labour people. I ask you, is this Bill Labour legislation? It has no likeness to Labour legislation. If the breweries who own big hotels and the big hotels were paying on the same basis as the other hotels, 2½ per cent. on all alcohol purchased, those brewery-owned and bigger hotels would be paying licence fees of £1,200, yet the Minister makes no mention in his speech of any proposal to eliminate the maximum of £300.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: The maximum is eliminated.

Mr. BARNES: The Minister did not tell us that this morning, but I am thankful that he has accepted my advice once again.

Much has been said about the fact that John Curtin said so and so about spending unnecessary money, and that was used as a reason for not altering the Liquor Act. Mr. Curtin is only one person whose opinion is not necessarily the right one. He wrote to me and told me that he would not do certain things, despite the fact that I had demanded that he do them, which proves that he was wrong. If he was wrong about that, why can he not be wrong about the liquor question?

Mr. Riordan: A new Messiah.

Mr. BARNES: I thank the hon. member.

Mr. Jesson: A new messer. Sit down; you are finished.

Mr. BARNES: Do not be anxious.

This morning the Minister referred to the Liquor Acts Amendment Act of 1935 as being the greatest liquor reform in our history. That Act was so good that they had to abandon it and continue with a gentlemen's agreement. In view of that fact, why should the Minister be allowed to make such pretty

speeches? He said that the Liquor Acts Amendment Act of 1935 was the greatest piece of liquor reform in the history of the State, yet a gentlemen's agreement has prevailed ever since. Why should men be allowed to say such ridiculous things in this Chamber?

The Minister went on to deal with the delicensing of hotels and stated this morning that 74 hotels were delicensed. I interjected at the time that those hotels were delicensed voluntarily by the licensees, and I am game to bet that at least 85 per cent. did delicense their hotels voluntarily. That being so, how can the Commission take credit for it?

This morning the Minister said that after three convictions a licensee loses his licence. That, like most things the Minister says, is ridiculous. It is rot. I have had four convictions already and I did not lose my licence.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: You have no chance of getting another.

Mr. BARNES: I will tell the Minister that his is not the true Labour Party. I shall form a new party and then I shall get the licence if I should want one, and I shall not.

Much has been said this morning about closing hotels in the event of an emergency. Most things introduced into this Parliament by the Government are in the nature of either lip-service or something similar to it, and this is no exception. Section 79 of the Liquor Acts of 1912 to 1935 says—

"When a riot or tumult arises or is expected to arise in any district, the police magistrate or any two justices may order all or any licensed victuallers and wine-sellers within such district to close their houses at and during any time which the police magistrate or justices may direct."

Why are we to have another Act to take the place of the one already in existence, one that gives us the provisions that are sought in the amending Bill? The Minister spoke in glowing terms about the Bill he was introducing this morning, saying that he would provide for this and for that. The section I have just read was from the existing Act. Is this Bill being introduced to gull the people? The Act is clear enough.

The Minister also told us this morning something to the effect that it would take 5,000 policemen standing at even one door of each hotel to control the liquor business. It does not matter whether the number is 500 or 1,200. I forget just how many there are in the Police Force, but there are only 1,200 hotels in Queensland. Why should he make a statement like that? Why make a statement like that and talk about controlling the Liquor Act.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: A policeman does not work 365 days in the year.

Mr. BARNES: If the Minister would take notice of me he could "fire" half the Police Force. Some reference was made to the effect that a smart alec of a solicitor

said you could sell soft drinks after hours. The person who did sell soft drinks after hours was I and nobody else, and there was no smart alec of a solicitor behind me. I found out that there was nothing to stop my selling soft drinks after hours, because on the advice of the licensing inspector at Bundaberg I bought a Liquor Act. It did not take a smart alec of a solicitor to advise me; I have the habit of thinking for myself, which is more than I can say for the present Government. Their seats are going from underneath them, and they cannot see them move. How could I ask them to think?

Reference was also made this morning to the laws of England in regard to liquor, which provide for trading up to 11.30 p.m. in many places, and if there is something special on you can apply to the authorities for an extension of time. Look at the way the liquor laws operate in England, a place that is being bombed. I have seen pictures of a fellow having his pot of beer despite the bombing. We in Australia are not directly connected with the war, and why should we have to close hotels in this un-Christian country, as the Secretary for Mines described it? He accused me of introducing something un-Christian in the Assembly. Father England is a Christian country, and it opens hotels on Sundays. Why can we not follow the conventions of England in this regard? I agree that most of the conventions of the world are wrong, but I say that the liquor conventions of England are right. The number of "drunks" per head of population is not enormous in England. I am better qualified to judge than anybody else in this Committee. I was born in a hotel, and with the exception of eight years lived all my life in hotels. I travelled for years and visited hotels in various parts of the State, and that is why I said that the Canberra gives the best service for the money.

Much has been said about the accommodation in hotels, how some is good and some is bad. I would impose heavier penalties than those suggested by the Minister this morning on persons breaking the Act, provided the hotels were open for two hours on Sunday morning and two hours on Sunday afternoon, and until 11 o'clock at night. There is nothing wrong in opening hotels all night. We know what happened in the United States of America. America had experience of total prohibition, and now the hotels have the longest trading hours of all the countries mentioned this morning. I was going to say, "of the world," but that would not be correct.

The Minister made a very glowing speech this morning about the various things that happened in the past, and how this Bill would stop all these things from ever happening again. Stop what? Rats! I say that for the plain and simple reason that every provision in the Bill is in the present Act, and if the Act was carried out there would be no need to have the minority stopping the majority from enjoying themselves, which happens in Queensland to-day. For instance, there is provision in the Act to prevent people from abusing themselves and

abusing others by drinking to excess. The hotels could remain open all night, provided the authorities controlled them.

It was my intention if I had time, but I have not, to suggest 100 amendments to the Liquor Act. The Act says that after a person has been convicted three times for drunkenness the police magistrate may declare him to be an habitual drunkard, but if the section had been made mandatory to say that the police magistrate shall declare him an habitual drunkard, believe me those people would look after themselves. The public can look after themselves and the small minority who abuse the Liquor Act will look after themselves if they are made, and they are the only people we have to legislate for. We have to legislate on common ground and that common ground, so far as I am concerned, would be in keeping with the views of Mr. Jack, the secretary of the temperance organisation, but the only difference between Mr. Jack and me is that I understand and he does not. (Laughter.) He is trying to bring something about by closing the hotels and I am trying to bring about the same thing by keeping them open. (Laughter.) Ultimately our aims are the same. Why should anybody walking down the street, whether a woman or a baby, have to put up with a drunken man falling all over him? That happens because the whole thing is a racket. The whole liquor question is a racket from start to finish, and that is why the Premier resigned for two hours recently, because the hotels were to be opened ahead of schedule. The breweries did not want it now, they wanted it next session. Fortunately, I was able to force public opinion onto the rank and file of caucus and the rank and file were able to have the hotels opened and they did it on a vote of 21 to 20.

The Minister said I hated the Labour Party. On the contrary, I do not hate anybody. I am sorry for their ignorance. I know what is happening to the parliamentary Labour movement—it is going out. I know it and that is why I shall be pleased.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to get back to the question before the Committee.

Mr. BARNES: To-day the means of collecting licence fees is by a calculation of 2½ per cent. on the alcohol purchased. Although it costs 1s. 8d. more for freight to land a kil. of beer at Mackay, the merchants charge £1 2s. 6d. a kil. more than in Brisbane, and the licensed victualler has to pay a fee based on 2½ per cent. of the cost of the liquor. Thus, the hotelkeeper has to pay more for his licence in Mackay than in Brisbane and that applies to other parts of Queensland, except, perhaps, that it is more in some places and less in others. I say that the 2½ per cent. should be based upon the Brisbane price and not the Brisbane price, plus freight and merchants' profit. Why should a hotelkeeper in Bundaberg or in any other town have to pay more for his licence than the hotelkeeper in Brisbane? He has to do it, for no other reason than that the Government cannot think.

Surely some of the publicans are friends of Ministers and hon members opposite; they should get them to do it for them.

The hon. member for West Moreton spoke about shift workers, but why should not a wharfie who starts work at 3 o'clock in the afternoon and finishes at 2 in the morning be able to get a drink as I can when I finish my work? There should be a provision in the Act to enable a bona-fide worker to get a drink after he finishes work at that hour.

The Minister said I had prosecuted a golf club, but I did not want to prosecute it. I wanted to bring the matter up in the hope that the representatives of the people would have the courage to legislate along these lines. I want to open golf clubs, bowling clubs, and hotels on Sunday—hotels for two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon.

I want the hotel, the working man's club, to be open the same as the bowling and golf clubs. If this suggestion is given effect to, then I want the penalties increased tenfold. In addition, a licensed victualler for a second offence should receive a sentence of one month's imprisonment, together with the monetary penalty now being provided for.

If this Liquor Act is not a racket, and I say it is, why has not one report been submitted to the Licensing Commission by the wine and spirit merchants for private sales? The Liquor Acts lays it down that they must submit such a report on private sales of liquor, but they do not do so. Why have they not been made to submit such a report when it is provided for in the Act? Because they are "playing mates" with the big merchants and breweries. I say that all such private sales—some of which are illicit, as they also compete with hotels in selling a single bottle of liquor, when it is specifically set out that not less than 2 gallons shall be sold—should be counteracted by an additional licence fee of 17½ per cent. That will bring the licence fee up to 20 per cent. That will bring their prices for small quantities to a competitive basis with those people who have to pay big licence fees and spend a large amount of money on building and maintaining the hotels in conformity with the Liquor Acts. If that was done, then we should get more revenue for delicensing.

The Minister has made some boast about delicensing hotels, and the payment of compensation with respect thereto. The amount of compensation paid for delicensing of hotels is ridiculous. Any person who is forced out of business because the delicensing of his hotel is an advantage to society should be fully compensated. If the Government encouraged the payment of full compensation in such cases licensed victuallers would willingly submit to any such scheme. To-day I ask the Minister by way of question how many hotels are paying a licence fee under £25 per annum. I suggest that any hotel paying a licence fee under £25 should be delicensed, as it cannot give proper service to the community. I will not suggest that straightout unless any hotel so delicensed is to be fully compensated. In Queensland, we have one

hotel to every 800 persons in the community, while in New South Wales and Victoria there is one hotel to every 1,000 to 1,600 persons, yet the Minister boasts that the administration of the liquor laws in this State is far advanced when compared with those of Tory Governments of other States. If the hon. gentleman would forget the Moore Government and realise what is happening to-day we should obtain practical legislation. If the Moore Government made a mistake—I do not know whether they did—let us forget it, or take advantage of it and improve our legislation accordingly. The Government, on the contrary, are not taking advantage of those mistakes. Why? Because they have forfeited their own platform.

There is another point in the Liquor Act to which I wish to draw attention. If a policeman has a grudge against a publican—and let us suppose for the moment that I am that publican—who had purchased a lease of a hotel for 50 years, which lease was worth £250,000, he could under a gentlemen's agreement come along and "pinch" me for breaches of the Act. I should finally be compelled to forfeit my licence and hand the hotel back to the owner—that is, £250,000. Why should a policeman have power to ruin a man?

(Time expired.)

Mr. RIORDAN (Bowen) (3.9 p.m.): After having listened to the swan song of the Bundaberg bombshell—which turned out to be a complete dud notwithstanding that liquor reform was the chief plank in his election platform—I want to say something about the Bill, particularly as it affects country areas. The introduction of this Bill is long overdue. There are people in the community who say that hotel trading hours should be restricted. I am one of those who contend that the present spread of hours is not in keeping with the wants and requirements of decent people in the community living outside the metropolitan area.

A great deal has been said about the 10-to-10 trading hours being an increase in trading hours. An attempt has been made in certain quarters to make the alteration appear as an extension of hours, whereas it is only a re-arrangement of the spread of hours. I do not see why the people who live in country areas, particularly the workers, should not be able to enjoy the same conveniences and amenities of civilisation as the people who live in the city, but the people in the country areas to-day are suffering a disadvantage as a result of the 8 o'clock closing.

Mr. Barnes: Because they have rotten members representing them.

Mr. RIORDAN: If they get a chance of judging rotten members we know what will happen, possibly before the next election, but we shall know for sure at the next election what will happen at Bundaberg.

The people in the country areas are suffering a distinct disadvantage—canecutters in certain areas I represent work a spread of hours from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.; they take advantage of that spread of hours to avoid the heat

of the day, and in consequence some of those men, who ride as far as 12 and 16 miles to work, are not able to get down to the town after their tea in time to have a drink before 8 o'clock. From the point of view of the temperance people they get no drink. That is a new idea to me as far as temperance is concerned. They have developed more of a prohibition outlook than a temperance outlook. The idea is to give to everyone in the community equal opportunity and rights, and as much freedom as possible; yet they choose to deny certain privileges to the workers in those areas. No-one can reasonably argue that a man who requires a drink should not be allowed to have it. I do not see any more reason why a man should be deprived of a drink of beer if he wants one after 11 o'clock than that he should be deprived of the opportunity of having a cup of tea and scones or a glass of milk at that hour. If, on the other hand, a man abuses that privilege or abuses himself by indulging too freely in the privilege there should be laws to protect him against himself, and when enacted they should be strictly enforced.

As far as I am concerned, the Bill does not go far enough. I do not want anyone to be under a misunderstanding as to where I stand. I favour 11 o'clock closing. I should prefer 11 o'clock to 11 o'clock if it was only a question of a spread of hours, because I think greater opportunities should be given to persons who may be at a picture show of getting a drink after they came out.

The hon. member for West Moreton supported the Bill although he made qualifications because of the troublesome times, and said he would not vote against it. Hon. members forget that during the last war the hours were from 8 a.m. to 11 p.m., and there was no more abuse of those privileges then than there are to-day, when the hours are 8 to 8. The hon. member for West Moreton could not say anything else, but what he said to-day, because I was present at Innisfail during the Herbert by-election—the one that returned Mr. Theodore—and with Mr. Maher on the platform was Mr. Moule, the Country Party candidate, who not only advocated the opening of hotels from 8 to 11, but also advocated the licensing of s.p. shops. Mr. Maher was on that platform and he did not contradict what the candidate said. The Secretary for Public Lands can bear that out. We know it was suggested this morning that their own caucus meeting turned down the Bill by one, but that was deliberately untrue because they never had a meeting and the matter has never been referred to them. Two hon. members of the Opposition stated in effect that they were in favour of the Bill, and others will be found to support it before it goes through.

If they do not speak in favour of it, they will withhold their vote and not vote at all. The hon. member for Aubigny this morning, by way of interjection when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, said that drink—or was it hours?—were restricted in Germany. Is there anything in Germany that has not been restricted? Are there any of the liberties of the people in Germany that

have not been restricted? If not, we have been told untruths. The hon. member for Aubigny, who has travelled extensively and who has world-wide knowledge, said that there are contented people in Germany. That is news to me.

Mr. Sparkes: You have a wonderful imagination.

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. member said that the people are contented. If there are any contented people in Germany to-day we have been "sold a pup."

Mr. Sparkes: I never said that at all.

Mr. RIORDAN: If there is any contentment in Germany it is the contentment of the Gestapo and of the concentration camp.

Mr. SPARKES: I am sorry to have to rise to a point of order. The hon. member said that I said that the people in Germany were contented. I never made any such remark, and I ask that the hon. member accept my denial.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Aubigny denies that he made the statement, and I ask the hon. member for Bowen to accept his denial.

Mr. RIORDAN: I accept the hon. member's denial. There was a little cross-firing at the back when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, and I should not have expected the hon. member to let me proceed without his denying it. However, that is just by the way.

It has been stated that there has been no increase in hours in other parts of the world, but I would point out that canteens have been established on all war-time jobs in England. In England, when there is shift work in armaments or munitions plants or in any works in the nature of a war effort, canteens are provided for the purpose of supplying the workers with refreshment, and supply not only tea and milk but beer, wines, and spirits.

The matter has to be looked at plainly and fairly. There are many people who say that they are not concerned about the publicans, but I am concerned about decent publicans in my electorate who are going slowly broke as a result of having 8 o'clock closing forced upon them. Districts in the country are not only denuded of population as a result of the war but they are affected by the restriction of crops—and particularly does this apply to canegrowing areas. In such areas, crops have been vitally affected, and the district has been denuded of young men who have volunteered for the fighting forces and have gone overseas or perhaps into militia camps. As I have said, there are those who say they are not concerned about the publicans, but I would point out that publicans are carrying on a legitimate business and are entitled to as much protection as any other section of the community.

There is a desire on the part of a number of people to pander to certain interests because there is an outcry against drink. I remember on one occasion reading the story

of the life of a very eminent and well-known prohibitionist advocate in America. The concluding part of the book set out that he had given his life to the work of endeavouring to suppress or prohibit drink and excessive drinking and had died as the result of over-eating. There are other evils that should be tackled in addition to the curse of drink. We know that if drink is abused it can become a curse, that it can cause untold misery and suffering. I was reared in very far northern districts of Queensland, and I remember the time when, as a result of my brother or father's coming home from shift work, I had to go down and "run the cutter." One can see that in practice in mining areas to-day; but such a practice is entirely wrong. My idea of the liquor question is that if public houses are to perform their proper function, they should be open for the sale of liquor to men coming off shifts at particular hours. Why penalise everybody because of the excesses of the few?

If any concessions are to be given, the licensees should reciprocate by strictly observing the liquor laws. At the present time there is a tendency for young girls of tender years to frequent and drink in hotel lounges. I am not a prude, but I think that should be stopped. I think the selling of liquor to very young men—I emphasise the words "very young"—is another thing that should be stopped, but at the same time there are many people who argue that a man under the age of 21 years should not have drink, and I have no hesitation in saying that those same people would be willing to conscript those young men for overseas service. They will deny the young man one thing that a man has the right to enjoy, and, on the other hand, they want to force him to do a man's job.

In my opinion, all this talk about this being an inopportune time for this measure because we are at war is so much flag-flapping. The Bill provides that in event of emergency all the hotels in Queensland shall be closed if necessary. What is wrong with that provision? Do hon. members opposite want the retention of the old conditions, under which you had to run and get a couple of justices of the peace to read what was known as the Riot Act? Do they want a repetition of what happened in Merivale street in 1918, when a certain justice of the peace or police magistrate was called out to read the Riot Act? Do they prefer that to some sound, sensible legislation that helps to control this trade?

Mention has been made of the men working in this industry. If anything is to come out of the liquor interests at all it should be aimed at giving some concession to the people who work in the industry, but the cry that has been put up that these men will have to work until after 10 o'clock at night cannot be justified when we look at the hours worked by members of other unions. I refer to the tramways union, the railway unions, and the unions covering the employees in other services, who have to work over a long spread of hours. The members of those unions have

had to be catered for. The public have to be catered for by way of running trams and trains, ships, and anything else to suit their requirements. The wharf lumper cannot pick his time for going to work. He has to go when he is told. If anyone is asked to go to work at any unusual hour, or if any hardship is imposed upon him, it is a matter for the Industrial Court to alter his conditions.

Another matter that should be brought under the notice of the authorities is the charges made for the supply of liquor in hotel lounges. In some of the city hotels, if one has the smallest glass of lager, one is charged 1s. for it. I think anyone who has had any practical experience of these things—and I am speaking as one who has—knows that it is possible for the publican to get seven glasses of that size out of one bottle of lager, and to charge 1s. for such a small glass is extortionate, and should be looked into immediately by the Commissioner of Prices. It is detrimental to the interests of the people who frequent lounges that these charges should be levied. I am one of those who believe that the time will come in Queensland when the old habit of leaning over the bar to drink will disappear, and we shall drink in hotel lounges, under decent hygienic conditions, and in comfort. The time will come when a man will be able to take his wife, or anyone else who may have some qualms about drinking at a bar, into the lounge to drink in comfort. Possibly, when the war is over and the restriction concerning the expenditure of money on hotel improvements is lifted, hotel lounges will be enlarged and brightened so that people may be encouraged to sit in comfort, and drink what they like at their leisure. Many people will say that if this is done people will be encouraged to drink. I say that it will result in a decrease in drinking and a considerable decrease in hotels.

There are others who argue that hotels should be closed at 6 p.m. or 8 p.m. I say that closing at that hour has given rise to a great curse in this State. I refer to the sly-grog shops. It is no use anyone saying that sly-grog shops do not exist. They do exist. Every day, you see convictions of sly-grog shops in the city.

Opposition Members: Every day?

Mr. RIORDAN: Virtually every day. I read of one in this morning's paper. These convictions occur quite often, and recently there were four or five convictions for sly-grog selling. Would it not be better to have hotels open to a decent hour than have sly-grog shops and dens of iniquity and vice springing up all over the city over which there is no control? Do you not think that would be better than closing hotels at 8 o'clock or at an earlier hour if certain people had their way? I say, Mr. Chairman, that this Bill will to a large extent do away with all those evils.

The traveller's clause should be welcomed by every traveller. Many people say that 40 miles is too far to travel, but the clause is put in the Bill for the purpose of helping

travellers and not for the purpose of opening up a new avenue of drinking on Sundays.

Mr. Massey interjected.

Mr. RIORDAN: The hon. member for Toowong knows that everyone does not have a motor car. If the hon. member is in favour of giving everyone a drink on Sunday I suggest that he get up in his place and say so. He has been making speeches for other people, and if he is in favour of Sunday drinking—and I think there is a tendency that way—let him get up and say so. I am one of those who believe that this Bill will help to a great degree in putting under foot many of the evils that exist to-day.

The hon. member for Bundaberg came into this Assembly with a plank in his platform that he would open hotels altogether. He threw out a challenge that he would debate the question of opening hotels with anybody. His challenge was accepted by the Reverend H. M. Wheller and a date was appointed, but suddenly the hon. member for Bundaberg—the “Bundaberg Bombshell”—suffered from a disease known as temperance ptomaine dysentery. Look up the records, and you will find that that is true, because he rang up and told the reverend gentleman that he could not attend as he was suffering very badly from ptomaine poisoning. However, he appeared in this Chamber on the following morning; it did not have much effect on him. I have pointed this out because he has been loud in his cry this afternoon of the abuses of hotelkeepers, and he said he came here for the special purpose of giving greater benefits to licensed victuallers. He sent out a famous circular asking for donations from the licensed victuallers of Queensland. I believe there are about 1,200 of them, and I also believe that he was disheartened by their response—he only got £18, which did not go far towards paying his expenses. He was not up for much expense, however, because most of the paper the circular was printed on was parliamentary paper, and I suppose he used it to give his appeal some official standing. We can understand the hon. member's seeking a way out when it comes to a vote on this Bill. He said he had 100 amendments to move, but if we were all as irresponsible as the hon. member for Bundaberg, we could move 100 amendments to our own particular liking. I think, Mr. Chairman, that when the time comes for voting, it will be found that the hon. member for Bundaberg is missing, and his excuse will be that he would not vote with the Labour Party. He might be suffering again from ptomaine dysentery. We have all been waiting for the “Bundaberg Bombshell” to explode, but it has turned out to be a decent sort of a squib.

I think that at some future date there will be further amendments to the liquor laws, not by extending the trading hours, but in the direction of providing better conditions and more hygienic surroundings for the sale and consumption of liquor. There should be a reduction in the lounge charges, people should be given proper service, and generally there should be a cleaning up of the whole business.

There is one question that I should like to touch upon in conclusion and it is in relation to the haphazard manner so often raised in this Chamber in having hotels properly policed. I do not think the conditions are any different in any part of the country from those I am about to describe. For instance, if a publican is proceeded against for a breach of the Liquor Act he immediately suggests that the publican at the end of the street has sent him off and that he is in the habit of giving graft to the local policeman. When the Bill is passed I hope it will be strictly administered, not only by the Police Force but also by the publicans themselves in their own interests. If they do not do that it will lead to greater abuse, and the temperance people will see that it is properly answered by a restriction of hours or restrictions in other directions. There is room for a tightening up, and I know that at present merchants and wholesalers and breweries, too, engage in illicit trading by acting as retailers to the detriment of hotelkeepers who have to pay a licence fee calculated on 2½ per cent. of their annual purchases. This illicit trading means a loss of revenue to the State. It is a matter that is well worth looking into and it should be tackled in the interests of all concerned.

Like another hon. member, I am not very much concerned whether the temperance people are allowed exemption from taxation in respect of their profits of the Canberra Hotel. They are entitled to do whatever they like in that respect, but they are expected to be a little tolerant towards other people. According to their little booklet that was read in this Chamber the other day by the hon. member for Hamilton, the temperance organisation proposes to engage in pressure politics by inquiring into the temperance history of a political candidate before it will give him its support. All I can say is that if it inquires into my temperance history it will find that I have always run true to form and just as I am speaking to-day. I think this system of pressure politics does such an organisation more harm than good. There is a loud squeal from it because it alleges that the brewers and the licensed victuallers have combined to build up a defence fund, but if the temperance organisation engages in pressure politics it is only natural that the liquor interests should reply in an appropriate manner.

More consideration should be given to the workers in industry and the people generally than even the Bill proposes to do.

Mr. DART (Wynnum) (3.34 p.m.): I am right behind my leader in opposing the motion and I oppose it just as forcefully as some hon. members have supported it. Last week the newspapers reported that probably the Government would deem it advisable to postpone the introduction of the Bill because of the serious war situation and later, as things became worse, it was said that probably the Bill would not be submitted to the House at all. Since then we know that H.M.A.S. “Sydney” has been reported missing and that quite a number

of good men in Queensland who were in her complement have gone down with the boat.

At a time like this, the least the Government can do is to abandon the Bill or postpone it. I am opposing the Bill, and I combat the reasons given by the Minister for its introduction. Those reasons lead one to believe that he has not given serious consideration as to how this Bill will affect the community—physically, socially, and morally. I cannot support it, particularly after hearing the Minister, for various reasons. Firstly, there is no need to alter the hours of trading. The present hours are satisfactory to the majority of electors. Secondly, the Government have no mandate from the electors to bring about this change.

It would be of some benefit to the Committee if I read what took place at the Labour Convention held at Coolangatta prior to the last general election. A report published in the Press stated—

“Following the strict enforcement of the 8 o'clock closing provisions of the Act, the liquor interests organised a petition campaign praying for the extension of night trading hours till 11 p.m. Your executive accepted this move as a challenge. Machinery was immediately put in motion for a counter petition, expressing approval of the Government's decision to enforce the licensing laws in relation to trade, appreciation of its intention to firmly adhere to this decision, and praying that no alteration or extension in liquor trading hours be made without a referendum of the electors. The petition was issued in association with the Church of England and the Queensland Council of Churches, and, although time was short, owing to the Christmas holidays intervening, the campaign was very successful, about 60,000 signatures being obtained.”

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: But there were 70,000 signatures on a petition asking for an alteration of trading hours.

Mr. DART:—

“The petition was presented to the Premier prior to the sittings of the Labour-in-Politics Convention, at which the Government policy for the elections was decided. The official report of the proceedings at this convention stated that a motion was submitted that the Government should consider altering the liquor trading hours to 8 a.m. to 11 p.m. After the Premier spoke on the question and a debate lasting less than 40 minutes, an amendment was carried unanimously providing for strict enforcement of the present law (8 a.m. to 8 p.m.).”

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: That is not true, and you know it. That is as false as the general part of your speech.

Mr. DART: The “Courier-Mail” gives a very fair report of meetings, and that is what 1941—3 H

the “Courier-Mail” had to say in reporting the convention. It further stated—

“The complete lack of support for extended hours was the most surprising feature of the debate. It was announced officially that the delegates had been unanimous in declaring for strict enforcement of the law and in rejecting any change of trading hours.”

That is what happened before the election.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: That is not true; you know it.

Mr. DART: That is as the “Courier-Mail” reported the proceedings of the convention.

All sections oppose this Bill. Anyone would think, after hearing the speeches delivered by hon. members opposite, that the Opposition came only from temperance people. Allow me to tell them that more people than those who advocate temperance are opposing this Bill, although the temperance people are proceeding along the right lines. I propose to give some of their opinions for opposing it in the hope of convincing the Government that there are others in addition to temperance people who are in opposition to this measure.

The newspapers reported that there were two deputations last week—one to the Premier and the other to the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs—and that both received rebuffs. One deputation was from representatives of the Labour Party and the other from the National Council of Women.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: They received a very courteous hearing.

Mr. DART: They endeavoured to persuade both these hon. gentlemen, the Premier and the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs, to abandon the Liquor Bill, and to hold a referendum before any alteration was made. They failed, and they were told the Bill would go through.

This should not be treated as a party Bill, but considered from the point of view of the maximum benefit to the people of Queensland, and everyone should vote with an open mind. If those hon. members opposite who are opposed to the Bill voted against it it would not go through. The Government Party must have everyone under its wing. What is the use of referring it to Parliament if caucus is going to run the country?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to get back to the principles of the Bill.

Mr. DART: We have not yet had the Bill. It is difficult to know what will be in it, but I will reply to what the Minister said.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister has outlined the principles of the Bill, and it is on that basis that hon. members must debate the motion.

Mr. DART: I oppose the Bill because it will encourage extravagant spending and

luxury while money is required for war purposes. It also includes provision for Sunday trading, which is a retrograde step, and one that will lower the social standing of the people of the State, and have a paralysing effect upon the community, particularly the young people.

Mr. Jesson: Who wrote that speech?

Mr. DART: I prepared these notes this morning. If the coffin-builder would attend to his own business—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member not to indulge in personalities. If he does so, I will deal with him.

Mr. DART: I am sorry I transgressed. If you could keep these people from interjecting—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not have the hon. member reflecting on the Chair. I am quite competent to control this debate.

Mr. DART: The people of Queensland have had no choice in deciding whether this Bill should be introduced or not. There are two ways in which the matter could have been placed before the people: by placing it in the policy speech before the last election or by holding a referendum. Neither course was adopted, yet we claim we are living in a democracy, which is government of the people, by the people, for the people. I think Abraham Lincoln would be ashamed at the passage of a Bill in this manner without democratic rights being exercised in this Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think the hon. member is in order in reflecting on the procedure in this Parliament, and suggesting that it is not based on democratic principles. Every hon. member will have the right to debate the Bill for 25 minutes now, again on the second reading for 40 minutes, and when the Bill is in Committee may discuss each clause for a further 25 minutes.

Mr. DART: As I have already stated, the people of Queensland have not been consulted on this Bill, and many prominent citizens are opposed to the alterations.

Mr. Jesson: Who are they?

Mr. DART: This is an extract from the Press—

“A.L.P. Branch Opposed to Hotel Hours Extension.

“A motion asking the Q.C.E. to stop the Parliamentary Labour Party extending hotel trading hours was agreed to at a meeting of the Wilston-Grange branch of the A.L.P. last night.

“The Parliamentary Party’s plan, the motion said, was contrary to the Southport Convention’s determination on the question.”

The Women’s Christian Temperance Union decided to write to the Premier requesting him not to change the liquor hours without a referendum. I have received several letters from the Ministers’ Fraternal and also from the Order of Rechabites, and, in support of

my objections to this Bill, I will read these letters—

“St. Peter’s Rectory, Wynnum,
“18th November, 1941.

“Dear Mr. Dart,—

“At a meeting of the Wynnum-Manly Ministers’ Fraternal—held last Thursday, 13 November—a resolution was passed with reference to the proposed alteration of the liquor trading hours.

“The enclosure is a copy of the resolution which I have been asked to send to the State Premier, and to you, as member for the district.

“Yours sincerely,

“(Signed.) J. W. NOMMENSEN.

“For the Wynnum-Manly Ministers’
Fraternal.”

“Wynnum,
“13th November, 1941.

“In view of the present national emergency, which calls for the maximum moral and spiritual strength of the nation, this meeting of the Ministers’ Fraternal of the Wynnum-Manly district regrets the announced intention of the Queensland Government to alter the hours of liquor trading from those fixed at present to those from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. without reference to the voice of the people—and resolves with all its power to assist efforts of public protest against such alteration.

“(Signed.) J. W. NOMMENSEN,
Church of England.
W. A. MCKAY,
Baptist Church.
C. T. PALETHORPE,
Methodist Church.
H. R. STILES,
The Salvation Army.”

“Independent Order of
Rechabites, S.U.,
“Harbour Light Tent No. 61,
“Wynnum, near Brisbane.
“2nd October, 1941.

“To Mr. W. L. Dart, M.L.A.

“Dear Sir,—

“At the last meeting of the abovementioned Tent, the members asked that a protest to Parliament against the extension and alteration of the liquor trading hours be sent through you (our representative) and that on their behalf you use your influence against passing legislation to put same through.

“From our personal knowledge of your interest in matters pertaining to the health and morals of the community and our temperance cause, we have confidence in your full support in this matter.

“Thanking you in anticipation and hoping the alteration does not come to pass.

“Believe me ever,

“Your sincere friend,

“(Signed.) ALF. P. ELLEN,
“Secretary.”

In our opposition to this Bill, I expected support from Ministers in the Government. The Treasurer, the Hon. F. A. Cooper, Bremer, addressing a Band of Hope conference on 8 November, is reported to have said—

“We have a great youth in this State. They will be all the finer and better if we train them along temperance lines.”

The hon. gentleman was speaking on alcohol and youth in the realm of profession and business. How will he explain to these people how he voted on this occasion?

There is decent hotel accommodation in Queensland, and there is no need for an amending Bill to make any alteration. There are approximately 1,300 hotels in the State, or one hotel to every 800 people—including women and children. In South Australia and Western Australia, the proportion is one hotel to every 1,000 head of population. In Victoria, there is one hotel to every 1,100 people, whilst in New South Wales the proportion is one to every 1,400. Surely, if that is ample accommodation in those more densely populated States, there should be no need for creating further accommodation here by extending the hours and allowing Sunday trading? In the year 1939-40, liquor sales amounted to £4,104,855—an increase of £474,241 on the previous year's figures—the expenditure per head being £4 0s. 7d. as against £3 12s. 1d. in the previous year, so that returns were quite good in 1939-40.

Many of us who are opposed to this alteration in trading hours believe that the alteration will help the moneyed interests—the people who have invested large sums of money—to obtain greater revenue. It is significant that the day after caucus decided to introduce this measure, brewery shares went up. That, in itself, is ample proof that by introducing this measure, the Government are helping moneylenders and the men interested in the liquor trade to earn greater returns. Why help the moneyed interests in this trade when butchers, bakers, and others are confined to a narrow spread of hours and suffer heavy penalties if they extend them in any way?

Mr. Power: You do not want a pound of steak every day or every hour, but you might want a pot of beer.

At 3.52 p.m.,

Mr. BRASSINGTON (Fortitude Valley), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. DART: It is just as necessary to have meat and bread as it is to have beer. In fact, it is more necessary for most people, because drink is a luxury. At a time such as this, the Government are ill-advised in giving the people greater opportunities to spend money on luxuries. By doing that, they are working against the best interests of the State and against the war effort. Instead of spending spare money on luxuries at a time such as this, we should be using it to replace cruisers like the “Sydney.” We know that the “Sydney” cost £2,100,000 to build, that

to replace her to-day it will cost £3,500,000, and, despite this knowledge, the Government propose making it easy for the community to buy luxuries. Why should the brewery customers be given special attention? Why should they be favoured over other sections of the community? After all, it is not the duty of the Government to legislate for a few. Last week, the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs said in Parliament that the whole of the evil surrounding the liquor trade in Queensland and in Australia is due to the fact that there are not enough customers for the trade to enable the licensees to keep premises in the way that we would have them kept. Despite the fact that the whole of the evil centres round this, the Government are coming to the rescue of the hotelkeepers by providing them with customers.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: We are not providing any more customers. Where are we getting the customers?

Mr. DART: You are now preparing a Bill like this to supply customers for the favoured few.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Wynnum to address the Chair.

Mr. DART: The Government received £100,000 from the people interested in the liquor traffic, and that sum was paid into the consolidated revenue of this State. £75,000 was also received from those licensees who hold hotels.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: How much revenue did you say?

Mr. DART: £100,000 was paid into consolidated revenue and £75,000 was also received by the Government from licensees. The licensees paid over £75,000 through taxes on liquor and here in Queensland the brewers or the owners of hotels go scot-free. In New South Wales the brewer or the owners of hotels have to pay their share, but in Queensland the whole £75,000 was provided by the licensees.

Mr. Barnes: That is because you have a Labour Government.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: I do not think you understand the figures you are trying to use.

Mr. DART: The Minister wants me to use them in a way to suit him. Those figures are correct. I repeat them. The Licensing Commission has a revenue of £100,000, which goes into consolidated revenue, and the 2½ per cent. on purchases returns £78,000.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Pure rubbish! Whoever wrote that for you does not know what he is talking about. (Interruption.)

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DART: I repeat: I prepared these notes myself this morning. I am opposed to the alteration of the hours and the Sunday trading because I say it will drag many men from their homes. It will not encourage home

life, and the alteration of the hours will be strongly resented by many women in Queensland. If the working man can go into an hotel till 8 o'clock, there is time after that hour for him to go home and enjoy the society of his wife and children, but if hotels are kept open till 10 o'clock he will stay there until that time and there will be no home life for him.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MOORHOUSE (Windsor) (3.59 p.m.): I should like to congratulate the Minister on the way he presented this motion. I do not think he could have made out a better case than the one he did. I am concerned, however, because he has merely considered the consumer and has not given consideration to hotel employees. The provision in respect of the sale of liquor at dance halls has been urgently required in this city for years. There are a number of hotel proprietors in Brisbane who do not want the altered hours. (Continuous interruption.)

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I must say that the hon. member for Bundaberg has had a good deal of latitude and I ask him to keep order and respect the Chair.

Mr. MOORHOUSE: There are a number of hotelkeepers in the city who say that they do not want any alterations in the present hours. I was elected to Parliament in accordance with the principle of "government of the people, by the people, for the people." Where has there been any request for a change in the liquor-trading hours? Mr. Charles Arrowsmith Bernays, former clerk of the Queensland Parliament, in his book, "Queensland Politics during Sixty Years," says at page 187—

"The session of 1918 was redeemed from commonplaceness by an incident which is unique in the history of our Parliament. During the progress of the war most, if not all, of the States of Australia took referenda on the question of the early closing of public houses, the result being that throughout Australia, Queensland excepted, the people decided in favour of limiting the hours for public house trade. In Queensland no referendum was taken the reason being that prominent on the Labour platform was 'The Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill.'"

That is the point I want to emphasise, that no referendum was taken in Queensland in those days when there were only three hon. members of the present Parliament in the House. Three times the Lower House passed the Popular Initiative and Referendum Bill and sent it to the Council, and on each occasion it was rejected. What concerns me is: Why have the Labour Government to-day taken the place of the Tory Upper House of 1918? It was a Tory Upper House and it would not give the public the right to a referendum, and to-day the Labour Government will not give the people the right to a referendum, local option, or anything of that kind. What have the Government to

hide? What are they afraid of? Why are they afraid of a referendum? Why have they brought forward a Bill upon which the people have expressed no opinion and when the Government have the approval of the public to introduce legislation to give effect to their policy which is "Produce for use and not for profit?"

Mr. NIMMO (Oxley) (4.2 p.m.): In introducing the Bill the Minister made as good a case for it as possible. There is no doubt that he dealt with a good many subjects, but they really camouflaged the issue. He discussed prohibition in America and in Russia, he told us of its ill-effects, but it was not until the close of his speech that he told us how the Bill was going to affect the people. He made a particularly good speech from his point of view and I want to congratulate him upon it.

The hon. gentleman told us that the Licensing Commission had closed so many hotels throughout Queensland, but he did not tell us that the majority of them were closed because the people who held the licences had asked that they be closed and that they were not worth keeping open.

At this stage I should like to say that the Leader of the Opposition should have been extended the common courtesy of an advance confidential copy of the Bill long before any newspaper or anyone else got a copy of it.

I am pleased to hear that provision is made in the Bill to endeavour to stop the drinking that now goes on at public dance halls. It is long overdue. Is the Minister going so far as to prevent people from having drink in motor cars outside these halls? Can he legislate for that? Can he prevent persons from taking liquor in motor cars to the road-way outside halls and drinking it there?

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: We cannot prevent them, but we can punish them if they do so.

Mr. NIMMO: I am pleased that the hon. gentleman has done something in that regard.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: We are making the wording of the provision very wide—in the vicinity of the hall.

Mr. NIMMO: Another provision in the Bill, that of taking power to close hotels in a state of emergency, is only a bit of eye-wash in order to get the altered spread of trading hours enacted. The Commonwealth National Security Regulations contain full power to enable the Government to take any action they choose in that respect.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: We do not administer Commonwealth regulations.

Mr. NIMMO: I say that the Government do in that respect.

The Premier took the Leader of the Opposition to task for quoting the platform of the Labour Party. I am pleased that he did so on that matter, because there has been a

suspicion, not only in Queensland, but throughout Australia, that the Forgan Smith Government have long departed from the Labour Party's policy as formulated and advocated by the old Labour stalwarts, and that it is practically a dictatorship now.

The hon. member for Bowen said that people keeping hotels in his electorate were going slowly broke, and that he would not stand for that. Does he stand for the fleecing of the public to keep these hotelkeepers from going broke? They are not going broke from the laws governing the trade, but from the stranglehold the breweries have obtained on hotels in Queensland.

I was up at Dirranbandi recently. There are two hotels in that town, one a two-storey building and the other a bungalow. Both hotelkeepers told me that the buildings were owned by the Queensland Brewery Limited, and that they paid £40 a week—£20 being computed as rent and the other £20 being computed as goodwill. How in the name of fortune can these people carry on without fleecing the general public? This is the result of the policy adopted by the Government in giving a monopoly to the brewery interests in this State. The hotelkeepers are slowly going broke.

Mr. Barnes: Hear, hear!

Mr. NIMMO: Recently the liquor trades union made application to the Industrial Court for certain hours governing their employees in the trade. Mr. Hickey, its representative, asked that the servers, the people who serve customers round the hotel with drink, should not be employed until they reach the age of 21 years. Mr. Hickey pointed out that juniors under this age were only employed to take advantage of cheap labour. He further stated that there was no need for these people to serve an apprenticeship. He pertinently asked: why allow these junior servers in the hotel when the law states that juniors should not be allowed to be served with intoxicating drink?

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: That is for the Industrial Court to decide.

Mr. NIMMO: I mention this in reply to some of the arguments that were used this morning. The Premier said he sent a cablegram to the Agent-General making some inquiries about the liquor laws in England. The liquor laws of England may not have been altered, and I am not prepared to say that the information he gave this Committee is not correct, but I will say that the Agent-General did not give him the whole story if what he told this Committee was correct.

The following statement appeared in the "Telegraph" of 24 October:—

"Brewing of Beer Reduced in Britain.

"London, 23 October.—Rev. James Little, in the House of Commons, urged severe rationing of strong drink in order to promote sobriety at the present critical time.

"Major Lloyd George (Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Food) replied that a drastic reduction already had been made. The Government was permitting the production of beer at the level of output for the year ended 30 September, 1938. Distilling was severely restricted and there had been no imports of wine and spirits, except for special purposes, for some months. He said there was no adequate reason for adopting Dr. Little's proposal."

I have quoted that to show that drastic restriction is operating in Great Britain. Is it right that we in Queensland, at this critical stage of the war, should provide for an extension of hours, as the hon. member for Bowen said, to prevent hotelkeepers in his area from going broke. Where is the demand for the Bill coming from?

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: From some of your own members over there.

Mr. NIMMO: I fail to see them. The man in white puts his hand up. (Laughter.)

I have discussed this question with people who are far from being teetotal, and every one of them has said he was absolutely opposed to an extension of hours at the present time. We have the most cherished thing in the community—our young men and our young women who have enlisted for war work—and are we going to encourage them to get the habit of drinking strong drink at a time when they are most susceptible? Talk to the mothers of boys who have enlisted, and you will learn what the position is in regard to these people. Some time ago we had the spectacle of riots in this city, and I believe those riots led up to the stricter enforcement of 8 o'clock closing.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: They took place after the enforcement of the 8 o'clock closing and because of it, and you know it.

Mr. NIMMO: There was a great deal of it going on, and immediately there was a strict enforcement of the law the picture-shows were filled with young soldiers, who took more part in social life, and this Bill will tend to decrease that habit.

We have to look these facts squarely in the face. We have to realise we have a duty to perform. It is all very well to say that no more drinking will be done when the hotels are open till 10 o'clock than was done when they were closed at 8 o'clock. That is far from the truth. No-one would be interested if it was not for the fact that a great deal of liquor is going to be consumed.

Mr. Collins: The consuming public is no concern of yours, evidently.

Mr. NIMMO: I say there was no demand from the public. The employees of the liquor trade are protesting, the Trades and Labour Council is protesting against the extension of hours, and every Protestant church in the community is protesting against the extension of hours. Where is the agitation for the alteration of hours coming from?

I contend it is hard on the people of a British community, who are engaged in a life-and-death struggle, to be asked to extend facilities to buy intoxicating liquors, which represent a luxury, and a very dangerous luxury. More money will be spent than we can possibly afford. All countries in every part of the world have restricted the liquor traffic. The only other place that is talking about altering the liquor laws is the State of New South Wales, where the Labour Party has assumed office. Before Labour came into power there was no talk of extending the hours.

The Premier said here the other day that democracy was a great thing and that it was a wonderful thing in a British community that democracy should be in full operation in this community. One of the statements he made was that no man was expected to obey the law unless he had some say in the making of that law.

The Attorney-General: Democracy seems a stranger to you.

Mr. NIMMO: I am quoting the Premier's statement.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I am hoping that the hon. gentleman will connect his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. NIMMO: The Press gives the voting in the caucus as 21 to 19 and in the Opposition, supposing we say with the Independents, there are four in favour of the alteration and 18 against. That means that if all the 62 hon. members are present to vote, there would be 25 for the Bill and 37 against it. There is no democracy in a system that allows the Bill to be carried in such circumstances. In this Parliament there is a clear majority against any alteration of hours. The caucus sat and decided by a narrow majority that this Bill was to be put through, so that the opinion of the House does not count. There is no democracy in that.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: This Bill was unanimously approved by the party.

Mr. NIMMO: The Bill may have been unanimously approved by the party, Mr. Chairman.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman has been long enough in this Chamber to understand the rules of debate. One rule definitely lays it down that an hon. member must accept the denial of another hon. member of a statement on a particular matter. The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs has clearly told the hon. gentleman that this Bill was accepted unanimously by the party and in fairness to the Minister I ask the hon. gentleman to accept that statement.

Mr. NIMMO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Massey: Read out the names of those for and against it.

Mr. NIMMO: I have the complete list, but I will not do that because the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs might not like

it. At any rate, that is the reason why I said that he made a wonderful speech this morning. I know what his feelings were first on this Bill.

How is it that the sale of foodstuffs, even of bread, is restricted to 5.30 p.m., but with liquor it is almost an "open go"? Under the traveller's clause it would mean that country hotels will be open 24 hours of the day.

Mr. Jesson: That is wrong.

Mr. NIMMO: At any rate, we had an hon. member saying a few moments ago that a wharfie knocking off work at 2 o'clock in the morning would be entitled to go along and have his pot. If a wharfie is entitled to go along and have his pot should he not be entitled to go and buy half-a-pound of steak or a pound of bread if he wants to?

The Treasurer: No, he has his wife to do that for him, but his wife cannot have his pot. (Laughter.)

Mr. NIMMO: As a matter of fact the man who wants his beer could get his wife to take a bottle of beer home for him. The fact of the matter is that it is designed to encourage drinking. The man who is wanting to drink is being considered. He is being given the opportunity of hanging about a bar for long hours and drinking when perhaps he does not intend to drink at all.

Mr. Power: How do you know that?

Mr. NIMMO: Will this Bill improve the health of the community? In this connection I wish to refer to the report of the Industrial Court of the claim before the court asking for shorter hours. Here we are going to have longer hours—

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: There was no application to the court for shorter trading hours.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the point that a matter before the Industrial Court is something entirely removed from the subject under discussion.

Mr. NIMMO: I quite appreciate your ruling, but I will connect my remarks to the point by quoting from the record of the proceedings to show that close confinement in a bar at night is not conducive to the health of the girls and men working there. It is proposed by this legislation to bring them back to work until 10 o'clock at night. Mr. Parker said this before the Industrial Court—

"The majority of bar attendants are females and the future mothers of the race, and any conditions affecting their health should be given consideration by the court. In view of the fact that Sunday, the bar attendants' only rest, follows directly after two exceptionally busy days, the holiday on Sundays is of no value as it scarcely allows the bar attendants time to recover from the strain of the two previous days. There is a great strain on bar attendants during those days. Nerve specialists all over the world are agreed

that excessive noise is a potent factor in breaking down the health of the human race. The noise in hotels on Fridays and Saturdays is enough to cause even the strongest a nervous breakdown. Wireless loud speakers blare, half drunks sing and shout, and everybody yells at the top of their voices."

That proves that if we put these girls and men into the bars for another two hours at night it is going to be very bad for their health.

Another factor is that these girls are protesting very strongly. They have their own union and they are protesting against being robbed of their social life. Girls who work in hotel bars are just as much entitled to stop work at 8 o'clock or as near thereafter as possible and go to a theatre or picture show as is any other member of the community. Why should they be kept back in that bad atmosphere for an extra two hours?

Another point is that it is proposed to keep these men and women at work for another two hours at night, despite the fact that in the Industrial Court theirs was proved to be a dangerous occupation. It is as dangerous as coalmining. It was proved in the Industrial Court that no barman or barmaid could insure his or her life without paying the 50 per cent. loading on the premium.

Mr. Jesson: Tommy rot!

Mr. NIMMO: I think it might be just as well if I quoted the evidence given before the Industrial Court by William John Jones, an officer from the State Insurance office. This was his evidence—

"By the President: What is your full name?—William John Jones.

"We understand if a barman or a barmaid comes to your office for insurance the life policy, if granted at all, is granted subject to loading because of the nature of the occupation?—Not in every case.

"You might explain the position as far as you can?—In the case of life assurance it is necessary to have a medical examination.

"That is necessary in all cases?—Not in all cases, but we do require it with hotel or liquor trade employees.

"Is it not the usual thing?—Not in every case. In smaller policies, up to a certain amount, we do not require it.

"What amount?—£250. On applications over that amount we ask for a medical examination, irrespective of calling.

"What about barmaids and barmen?—The medical examination might be quite satisfactory in every feature and if they sign a total abstainer's declaration invariably we accept the insurance without any loading.

"The loading is based on the assumption that if a barman or barmaid remains long in that occupation, he or she is likely to develop a liking for liquor?—Yes."

He also went on to point out that the reason for the loading was that it was definitely proved that barmaids and barmen through getting a liking for liquor had their lives considerably shortened.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Tommy rot!

Mr. NIMMO: That is the evidence given in the court, and I have Mr. Hickey's evidence also.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think it is relevant.

Mr. NIMMO: I intended connecting it up. Is this Bill brought forward to prevent crime? Analysing the question from that angle, we find that when the Government brought in a stricter enforcement of the 8 o'clock closing there was an improvement in the crime ratio, and the Commissioner of Police pointed out that in the eight months of the stricter 8 o'clock closing there was a reduction of 15 per cent. in crime. That proves that the "open go" that existed before the stricter enforcement of the 8 o'clock closing did not help to prevent crime, and I say that if this Bill becomes law crime will again increase in the State.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Crime had increased before the 8 o'clock closing was enforced.

Mr. NIMMO: When the 1923 Bill was before the House, the one providing for the hours of 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., there was a certain gentlemen's agreement whereby the hotel-keepers and brewers said, "You wipe out the prohibition poll and we will agree to 8 o'clock closing."

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Not at all.

Mr. NIMMO: That is a fact. The agreement was that a poll was to be taken in the following October, and it was agreed that if there was 8 o'clock closing there would be no local-option poll. It is in "Hansard," and I have taken the trouble to read it. I say again that there was a definite agreement that if the 8 o'clock closing was agreed to there would be no more local-option polls. The trade was anxious to get local-option polls knocked out. The whole of Brisbane and South Queensland voted—

(Time expired.)

Mr. PIE (Hamilton) (4.28 p.m.): I listened with a great deal of interest to the Minister's remarks this morning when introducing this Bill, and I have also listened with a great deal of interest to the speeches made by hon. members of the Opposition in an endeavour to arrive at some reason why this alteration of hours should be opposed. I must say that the Leader of the Opposition made a very important point, to my way of thinking, when he said that this was not the time to make the alteration. I think that perhaps most of us in this Committee realise that this is not the time to make an alteration of such a nature.

I tried to get further reasons for the opposition to the Bill, but all I could gather was a

very narrow outlook on the whole subject. It is apparent to me that perhaps hon. members of the Opposition are judging the measure without having had experience of actual life combined with experience of liquor-drinking.

Mr. Jesson: They are secret drinkers. (Laughter.)

Mr. PIE: I therefore feel they are perhaps not in a position to judge of the whys and wherefores of this Bill. The man who is qualified to judge is he who has gone through the mill, as it were, and is willing to have a few drinks, and who gets pleasure out of the company of people who have a few drinks, too.

Such persons perhaps are the best qualified to say whether the Bill is going to have the effect we are led by its opponents to believe. The decision of the Government to alter the trading hours to 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. has encouraged a number of people to level criticism against the proposal without their actually truly analysing the whole basis of the subject.

It has been said by people in authority that Great Britain, Germany, Canada, South Africa, and New Zealand have enforced stricter control of the sale of liquor during the war. I believed that to be so, but to-day that was contradicted by the statement of our Agent-General in London, who says that there has been no restriction of the liquor-trading hours in England. Anyone who knows the freedom amongst the people in England in liquor trading will realise that there must be some reason why there has been no further restriction because of war. Obviously the reason is that the people of England are good beer-drinkers, that they enjoy their beer, and do not drink beer to excess. Therefore, no Government have any right to restrict them, even in a war period.

As most hon. members know, in Germany before the war drink could be had at any time, and the same can be said of France and other European countries. There has never been any restriction regarding hours. In the United States of America hotels and night clubs pay for a licence empowering them to operate at different times of the day. For instance, one man might desire a licence to operate from 11 p.m. to 4 o'clock in the morning, and another from 9 p.m. till 3 o'clock in the morning. They each nominate the times and the licences are granted accordingly. There is less restriction on drinking in America than in most other countries, because of the lesson that was taught them when prohibition was imposed. After the unfortunate experience of prohibition, every broadminded, thinking American realised that it was one of the worst measures ever introduced into that country. During the reign of prohibition some of the people manufactured hootch, as they called it, and I have seen cases myself in which hootch has made people drunk in about five minutes. No-one wants to see that practice or that stuff introduced into this country.

Reports from Tasmania, where the liquor-trading hours are from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m.,

fairly prove that drinking is not increased by an extension of hours, but that adequate facilities are available for people to drink at a time they desire.

A factor that I should like to bring before the Committee, one mentioned by the hon. member for Bowen, is the increase in sly-grog selling, which, to my mind, is a very important thing. I want to tell hon. members that if anyone wants a drink he can usually get it. He will go to any lengths to get it, and when he does get it, it seems to taste a long way better, and so he wants more. If he could obtain supplies in accordance with the law it would be ever so much better than the sly-grog methods, and there would not be the excessive drinking that is likely to be produced by sly-grog selling.

I also agree with the hon. member for Bowen that there should be a restriction in the bar trade. If I had my way I should close all the bars at 7 p.m. at the latest, because I think that most of our trouble arises from drinking round the bar. Sometimes there is a row of drinkers along the bar and no-one will leave before he has paid for his drink, and so each has to go ahead and pay for his round.

At 4.34 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. Macdonald: Would you make it illegal?

Mr. PIE: Yes, make it illegal if you like, or insist on a "bob in." If drinks were served in the lounge after a certain hour, that would reduce some of the excessive drinking that has taken place.

It has been clearly proven to my mind that the man who drinks to excess begins to drink very early in the morning, and anyone who has seen a man with delirium tremens realises that the victim's first duty to himself next morning is to rush off for a drink to help to keep him going during that day. Those are things this legislation will correct. I do think that the alteration of hours will have a very good effect on that type of person.

It has been contended by prohibition advocates that for approximately seven years a large section of the community has consistently broken the 8 o'clock closing law. They must have some substantial evidence before making such a drastic statement. That statement alone convinces me that the average law-abiding citizen has given proof that the law should be amended to cater for his personal requirements and habits. We must legislate for the majority. I am speaking of the normal man, who sees no harm in having a drink, not the abnormal man, the total prohibitionist or excessive drinker, who is in the minority.

I have been reliably informed also that since the enforcement of 8-o'clock closing there has been a very great increase in the sale of bottled beer. That clearly proves to me that bottled beer is being bought not to be drunk on the hotel premises but to be taken away to other places. That is proof

also that people will still have their liquor despite 8 o'clock closing. I believe that if a man wants to get a drink he should be able to do so in the right place—namely, the hotels that are licensed for the trade.

The bar trade should be restricted to a greater degree than at present, as I previously said. From observations made overseas, one knows that in the German beer-gardens or the French boulevards one takes quite a long time to drink his liquor. The people there are served with their drink out in the open, and after drinking it, talk and watch the people, or do as they like. They may get more enjoyment from watching the blondes and brunettes than they do from the drinking of their beer. However, they take a longer time to drink it than they would do if they stood at the bar.

I certainly think that the people in the country have an appreciably stronger case to put before this Chamber than any other section of the people. It is obvious to me from my trips to the country that the average country man regards the local pub as his country club, where he can meet people at the end of his day's business or work and become acquainted with the local gossip, which enables him when he goes home to spread the news of happenings in the community. They have not the clubs in the country that we have in town. Therefore, the hotels in those centres serve a double purpose—of enabling a man to have a few drinks, and of giving him the chance of interesting conversation on local happenings, which will probably more than compensate him for the distance he has travelled to get there.

I have endeavoured to prove that this Bill caters for normal people, not abnormal people, and that it caters for the temperate man. Its chief opponents are the total abstainers and the prohibitionists. I feel sorry for them. They do not seem to realise that in life there are other matters than condemning other people's attitudes on what is right or wrong. Surely we are entitled to our own opinions, and if I want to have a drink I should be able to do so. I do not criticise the man who has not that desire. We all have our own lives to live, and we all have to make our own enjoyment. Some people who get drunk pay for it the next day; life seems full of compensations. The only way we can deal with this matter is by legislating for the majority of the people.

It has been suggested—and I take exception to it, and I am surprised at the Leader of the Opposition for suggesting it—that the extension of trading hours would affect the soldiers. I feel that he, as an ex-soldier, is more competent to speak on that subject than I, but at the same time I point out that in the last war no-one could complain of the conduct of the Anzaes, who did a wonderful job and were regarded as the best soldiers in the world.

Mr. Sparkes: He is one of them.

Mr. PIE: Yes.

Mr. Sparkes: And a good one, too.

Mr. PIE: Yes, and one that I have the greatest respect for. I maintain that ability to get a drink and carry it did not affect his powers or the powers of the soldiers who landed at Gallipoli and did such a good job. Even then we had 11 o'clock closing, so why cannot we trust the second A.I.F. in camp now? They will meet with temptation, and is it not better that they should become used to temptation in their own home town rather than in Cairo or Egypt where there will be greater temptations than in Brisbane? In my opinion, lads have to go through these trials to get a thoroughly proper perspective in life. They have to realise that these things go on. They have to get their experience of life and it is better to get it here in Brisbane than abroad before they are fighting battles.

There is nothing much more I have to say other than that I have satisfied myself, after looking at this matter from all angles, that there is nothing wrong with the action of the Government in bringing this legislation before the House at the present time. The only strong point made by the Leader of the Opposition was that this perhaps was not the right time. I think that is perhaps the feeling of every hon. member of this Committee, but the Bill certainly has its compensations and these, in my opinion, far outweigh that fault.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) (4.43 p.m.): The Minister introduced the Bill in such a way that its faults were obscured to the man who was not balanced enough to see through the smokescreen clauses that covered up the clauses that are open to most objection.

Mr. Jesson interjected.

Mr. DECKER: It is drink speaking now.

Mr. JESSON: I rise to a point of order. I take strong objection to those remarks; I am temperate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement and apologise to the hon. member for Kennedy; I consider it most offensive.

Mr. DECKER: I will in deference to yourself, Mr. Chairman, but the interjections have been continuous all the afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chairman will attend to that matter and see that the hon. member is not interrupted when making his speech. I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

Mr. DECKER: I withdraw and apologise and leave the matter in your hands.

Most of us can agree with the clauses in the Bill with the exception of two. What I have the most objection to is the alteration of hours from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. to 10 a.m. to 10 p.m., and the creating of two periods for serving liquor on Sunday.

Hon. members are not called upon to say whether they are teetotallers or whether they believe in the temperance view—we are here to do what we think is the right thing in

the interests of the community. If we studied the interests of the community, particularly the workers—and I stress that point, particularly the workers—then we should not extend the hours in which liquor may be served. I think that is a degrading clause and the other clauses have been introduced to act as a smokescreen to cover up that obnoxious clause.

An Opposition Member: That clause is the weakness in the Bill.

Mr. DECKER: As the hon. member interjects, that clause is the weakness in the Bill—that and the provision for Sunday trading. We know that at present a man travelling by rail has access to the refreshment bar and can obtain all the drink he requires, therefore the traveller's clause can relate only to people travelling in motor-cars. At present petrol-rationing does not permit of very extensive travelling and consequently there is no urgent necessity to have the traveller's clause inserted. We are at war and petrol must be conserved.

We are here to-day to do the best we can in the interests of the war. The Leader of the Opposition made a very strong point this morning. He said that this is no time to bring in a Bill of this kind. He also made a very strong plea that there should be no increase in temptation to our young men in camp by extending the trading hours. He asked that these young men who are serving their country should not have unnecessary temptation forced upon them.

The Attorney-General: A Tory Federal Government created canteens.

Mr. DECKER: I agree with the principle of canteens. Like the Leader of the Opposition and several other hon. members of the Committee, I served with the Australian Imperial Forces in the last war. Drink is no good for soldiers.

Mr. Jesson: Why do they give it them before they go over the top?

Mr. DECKER: All the afternoon I was hoping for that interjection. I say emphatically that when drink was offered to soldiers going over the top approximately only 40 per cent. accepted it. The other 60 per cent. went over with a clear-thinking headpiece. At a time of war and at any other time, for that matter, when a man wants his wits at their keenest, he has to keep away from strong drink. There is no doubt about that. We know very well that our young men going overseas have these temptations thrust upon them, but we must trust them until they return to their own land. We should encourage them and help them, if we can, by not putting temptation in their way that they actually want to resist, and so, perhaps, getting them into a groove they will find it difficult to get out of. If we can fill in their time with other occupations they will not have a desire for drink, but by extending the hours of hotel trading to 10 p.m., we are not doing the right thing by the war effort. If this Committee gives genuine consideration to this Bill it will agree to the clauses

that provide for greater penalties for offences in an attempt to tighten up the Act, but it will reject two clauses, the alteration of the hours of trading and the traveller's clause.

Mr. CLAYTON (Wide Bay) (4.48 p.m.): I should like to say a few words on this very important matter. It has been before the public for a considerable time and it is pleasing to know that at last we have heard something of the matters that have been discussed in caucus from time to time. So far as I am concerned, I will say that the Bill that is being introduced is better than that passed on a previous occasion, and if it is administered as I understand it is provided in the Bill, I am inclined to think that the position will be materially improved.

In the past few years there has been an unwritten law permitting the extension of the liquor-trading hours until the administration was tightened up recently. Liquor could be sold in hotels between 8 p.m. and 11 p.m. In some places the police were not supposed to go into a bar until after 11 p.m. unless there was some disturbance about the precincts of the hotel. I am given to understand from what we have heard so far of this measure that that will be tightened up. I welcome anything that the law can do to see that the Act is strictly observed.

We hear much about the evils of drinking to excess, but I remind the Committee that no-one is forced to have a drink. That is entirely a matter for the individual concerned. I go further, and say that it is very seldom that one sees a drunken man or woman in the streets to-day, which shows that the temperance of the people has improved considerably in this State, and no doubt in other States, too.

Publicans in general are looking forward to some fixation of hours. At present, instead of leaving hotels at the prescribed closing hour of 8 o'clock, people congregate in the bars for a long time after 8, and it is very unjust that attendants should be called upon to work beyond that hour, even until midnight in some cases. Whilst working these late hours their conditions are very unhealthy in that the doors are closed, lights are shaded, and the atmosphere is by no means pure. Of course, when I say that it is most unhealthy I am not speaking from experience. (Laughter).

It has been stated by the Minister that the new trading hours will be from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. I prefer them to the hours of 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., and I say that as a representative of a country electorate. Country dwellers are often prevented from having the opportunity of enjoying some liquid refreshment, not necessarily hard but in a bar, after 8 o'clock. If they attempt to have a drink at a bar after that hour, they render themselves liable to prosecution. Dairymen—here I might say that they are getting a very poor return for their labours at present—often do not finish milking until 7 or half-past 7 on summer days, and it is often after

8 before they can get into town to enjoy a drink.

Mr. Massey: How can they afford to buy it?

Mr. CLAYTON: If the hon. member was there he might buy it for them, but I doubt it. These men go into town keen to have a drink, and I fail to see why they should be prevented from enjoying one. If the trading hours are extended to 10 p.m. more people will come into town at night, because they will have a means of enjoying themselves in a way similar to that in which many of us have enjoyed visiting clubs from time to time.

Another matter to which I should like to refer is the tremendous improvement that has been effected in recent years in the accommodation and general facilities offered by the various country hotels. Travellers and others who go into the country often have to live at a hotel. Some years ago the accommodation and conveniences provided for guests in country hotels was very unsatisfactory, but under the excellent administration of the Licensing Commission these disadvantages have been abolished. The accommodation offered by most country hotels to-day is excellent. In fact, it is a pleasure to stay at them, and that is something that we could not say some years ago. I feel that if the country hotelkeeper cannot get a reasonable living from his bar he cannot give lodgers at his hotel the accommodation they are entitled to.

We have heard much about the young men who have gone and are going overseas to fight for this country. Those young men have left farms and other places to come to Brisbane and other headquarters for training purposes. I am not going to criticise those men, who, after all, have only thoughts of the war ahead of them, if they go into a hotel and have a drink from time to time. They are doing no wrong, and, as a matter of fact, I have thought it a kindness on several occasions to take some of them in and buy them a few drinks, not, mind you, encouraging them to drink to excess. We have heard hon. members in this Committee talking about young men getting beyond control, and I am going to say that it is a rotten state of affairs to circulate about the community so that the news will get overseas and to the ears of our enemies.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. CLAYTON: I say that these young fellows are keen to do everything possible to help us in winning this war, and I was surprised to hear hon. members using that argument in this Committee to-day in connection with the Bill.

The Attorney-General: Shame on them!

Mr. CLAYTON: During the last war our young men did an excellent service, and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that from what I know of them they are giving us an excellent service at present. I trust that we shall hear no more of what some of our

young men might do occasionally in connection with the consumption of liquor.

I know that this is not the time to speak at length on the measure. I look forward to seeing the Bill, and I will vote as I think right on the various clauses when the opportunity permits.

Mr. YEATES (East Toowoomba) (4.58 p.m.): I am sorry the Minister has not extended the courtesy of handing a copy of the Bill to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Brand: The papers gave it all.

Mr. YEATES: Have we to read about it in the newspapers?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. YEATES: Whatever I might feel about this Bill five years hence or 12 months after the declaration of peace, I am not in the humour to support it now. I am not going to take up much time because I shall have an opportunity of speaking on the measure later. I could quote the views expressed by many leading people in this country. John Curtin, our Prime Minister, for instance, has asked us not to spend our money on luxuries, and I say that the extension of the hours of trading for hotels is going to encourage spending on a luxury. I am pleased, however, to see that provision is to be made in the Bill regarding liquor in dance halls. When the Bill is going through, we shall have the opportunity of supporting parts of it, at any rate. For years I have advocated not only preventing liquor from being taken to dance halls, but preventing it from being in the vicinity of them. I do not know whether it is possible to prevent liquor from being contained in motor cars in the vicinity of dance halls, but I should like to prohibit people from having liquor in motor cars in proximity to dance halls.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: They are all governed.

Mr. YEATES: I am glad to hear that. I do not know what radius has been fixed.

Provision has been made to meet the convenience of travellers, I understand, but a man may leave Sydney, travel along the road to Wallangarra, come to Toowoomba, and go into one of the hotels there after hours. He may have travelled a long distance altogether, but he may have camped the night before at the tourist hotel at Greenmount 18 miles away. How would he get on?

The Premier: We want you only to understand the law, but we do not set about telling you how it can be broken. (Laughter.)

Mr. YEATES: I am pleased the Minister has given legislative effect to the suggestion I made during the consideration of the Estimates relating to the Licensing Commission, that the maximum licence fee of £300 should be abolished. I could never see why a hotel with a turnover of between £18,000 and £20,000 a year should pay only that sum.

I am satisfied that persons under 21 years of age have been getting liquor for years.

Mr. Barnes: It should be 18 years.

Mr. YEATES: Something should be done about it; make it 18 years if you like, but see that the law is observed. There are many matters that could be discussed on the measure, but I prefer to leave any further comment on it until the later stages of the Bill. The main purpose of the Bill, to my mind, is to grant an extension of hours—an alteration of hours it was described as by some hon. members, but I prefer to call it an extension—from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. to 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. I should say that the man would be one in a thousand who would want a drink between 8 a.m. and 10 a.m. because no drinking worth talking about is done from 8 a.m. to 10 a.m. I cannot support the extension of hours.

Mr. MACDONALD (Stanley) (5.3 p.m.): Much has been said by the hon. member for Hamilton concerning the qualifications required to enable one to express an opinion on the Bill. I am neither a teetotaler—or a wowser, as the Minister described such people—nor a drunkard. Time after time I have lived in convivial company, and I have never regretted it. I know the conditions in the country as well as those in the town. I have travelled long distances by car, and time and again I have arrived at my destination with the thought that I could benefit considerably by having a good quaff if only the law would allow me to do it.

So far as I know, not one of the hotel-keepers to whom I have spoken has clamoured for this change of hours, not a single one, and, in fact, many of them are much against it. The same applies to the towns—many hotel-keepers that I know are against it, as are also their employees.

The Minister has explained the measure, and there are some provisions in it that will be of great benefit to the people in the country. I have in mind particularly the practice of drinking at dancing halls in the country. That is to be prohibited. It has been a curse in country districts for a very long time.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: It is bad in the city, too.

Mr. MACDONALD: Utilities go out into the bush and young fellows go out to them and drink. Time and again the police in my district have complained that they have no motor cars to stop the practice. They have only horses, and when riding along the roads the people with utilities pass them loaded with grog, on their way out to sell it. The police are unable to stop the practice, because they have no motor vehicles to help them. On that account I made representations to the Commissioner of Police to see that these men got some conveyance so that they would catch these people.

I do not object to any man's having a drink, and he can have it at any time he likes, so far as I am concerned, so long as he does so within the law. What I do object to

is that the Government should introduce this Bill at the present moment. The hours now legalised are 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. People who are in business work under the 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. system. Then, through the laxity of the authorities, there was an unwritten law that extended the hours by approximately three. It was in those additional three hours that the profits were made. On the licensee's book values his business changed hands, and the incoming licensee bought on those inflated figures. When the Government, in their wisdom, saw fit to enforce the law, these men squealed, forgetting that they went into the business with their eyes open, and it was a business risk. That is one thing that should not be condoned. Those men took that risk, and should stand or fall by it.

I do not think that the traveller's clause will benefit many people, certainly not in these days of petrol-rationing.

I listened to the lengthy speech made by the Minister this morning, but he did not advance one reason why there should be an alteration in the spread of hours. He was hard put to it to justify bringing forward this Bill giving an alteration in the spread of trading hours. I cannot see the reason. I have looked backwards and forwards to see why we should give that alteration of hours. All I can think is that outside influences are pulling. I cannot see any other reason for it. Hon. members opposite say they are not altering the trading hours. I am not a sporting man, but I am willing to wager that the trading between 8 p.m. and 10 p.m. will be equivalent to six other trading hours.

Hon. members opposite also say that the altered trading hours will do no harm to the young fellows. There is the old proverb—

“An open door will tempt a saint,
Opportunity makes a thief.”

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: A petition containing 70,000 names came to the Premier asking for an alteration of trading hours. It did not come from the publican.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman knows what petitions are just as well as I do. It is absolute rubbish to bring that forward. I cannot see why there should be an alteration in trading hours. Getting right down to tinctacks, if you want to bring in an alteration in the liquor laws, I can suggest where an alteration may be desirable. With the advent of main roads, some hotels have been cut off from a township. That township followed on the settlement. On account of the Liquor Acts Amendment Act of 1935 no licensee can make application to move his hotel any distance at all. He must first surrender his licence and apply for a new licence on a new site. He gets no compensation or priority.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: He gets compensation if he surrenders his licence.

Mr. MACDONALD: I beg your pardon. He gets compensation, but he does not get

priority. I could give another instance in which roads have cut the township in halves, and as a result the hotel was left right out of the town. That man cannot apply for a transfer of his licence; he must surrender it and apply for a new licence, when he might possibly meet competition.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: There are anomalies of that kind, but to correct them would create a bigger evil and a bigger job.

Mr. MACDONALD: They must be treated on their individual merits or demerits. I cannot for the life of me see why the Government are altering the hours. It seems to me that to commemorate the loss of the H.M.A.S. "Sydney" they are going to sink a lot more schooners between 8 and 10 o'clock.

The Premier: That is very cheap.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is true, though.

Mr. LUCKINS (Maree) (5.10 p.m.): This is a very important matter, affecting as it does most people in the State. It is a measure that could have been left over for consideration until we got through our present-day difficulties. The liquor laws have been the concern of the people for many years.

Mr. Power: You should know, as you were a hotelkeeper for many years.

Mr. LUCKINS: I know it to my sorrow. I am satisfied from my experience in it—I lost all the money I had in the trade—that it is one of many problems. I have had experience that enables me to throw light on the activities of hotelkeepers and the drinking habits of people. I know something about the question, and I did not come here with any prepared speech, which might have been prepared by somebody else; therefore, my opinion should be of assistance to the Government on this matter. This is not a matter of vital importance to the State. No man can tell me that it is essential to alter the liquor laws. What is the reason, then, for the Bill? If there is any reason for the alteration of hours, I have not heard it. We should have some concern for the difficulties that confront us and how we can best advance the interests of the State. My experience has impressed upon me the demoralising effect drinking has on the community generally, and I shall read some of the records of the State dealing with that matter; but, before I do so, I wish to lay a foundation for my argument.

Mr. Power: You would be prepared to sell if you had not gone broke.

Mr. LUCKINS: I was very disturbed with conditions. I speak from experience, and that experience enables me to draw morals from the trade. Any hon. member who has had experience should be able to give some evidence in support of his conviction. I am not blaming any man for his opinion about the liquor trade, I am not asking anybody to support the principles I enunciate, but evidence is required to show why one section support the liquor trade and the other section oppose it. When we get to the kernel of this

question and examine it, what do we find? We find that strong drink has never brought anything of an uplifting nature to the community, and it has not created any ideal that you or I could look up to; on the contrary, it has had the effect of breaking up homes and breaking down men's health, and it has had a demoralising effect on many unfortunate women. If we can legislate to cure those evils, we shall do something for the community. It is our duty to legislate for the benefit of the whole of the community and aim at lifting men and women to a higher standard of civilisation.

Although I may not be a member of a temperance league—nor, on the other hand, a member of the froth-blowers, as Mr. Clem Lack describes them—I have had experiences in the city of Hong Kong that have deeply impressed me. Many young men went to Hong Kong to pioneer the British Colonial Office, and anyone who goes to Hong Kong and visits the Happy Valley cemetery may read the notices on tombstones of the young men who died between the ages of 18 and 28. I know that strong drink and other curses we know of in our civilisation contributed to their early death.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: At Toowong you may see a long line of tombstones of men killed by motor cars. Are you going to prohibit motor cars because of that?

Mr. LUCKINS: There is a greater number of deaths from the causes I have mentioned at Hong Kong in proportion to population than anywhere else.

On a previous occasion I complained in this Chamber of the cost of our Statistical Department, but in order to enforce my argument and fortify my opposition to the alterations in the liquor law, I refer to it again. There has been a great increase in juvenile crime and in considering the social problems confronting us we can trace them to one quarter. Mr. Colin Clark, the Director of the Bureau of Industry, and, therefore, the Government Statistician, has completed a survey of crime. He has stated that the number of children who appeared in the courts during the 12 months ending 30 June last was more than one-third greater than the number in the previous year.

I pass from that to another evil—drunkenness. The Minister endeavoured to convince the Committee that according to the police records there was less crime in the community. Certainly, we are very proud of that fact, but there is the problem of the crimes caused by drinking habits. The report of Mr. Colin Clark sets out that drunkenness accounted for one-third of male offences and 40 per cent. of female offences and that approximately one-quarter of the male offences were either breaches of the traffic or transport laws. As compared with 1931 drunkenness offences were 56 per cent. greater. We have to face these facts. We have to deal with the proposal placed before us in Parliament honestly. It is no crime for a man to advocate what he believes to be correct. If

we are a civilised community, as we claim to be, we should be looking to the bigger and greater things in life rather than to fostering the baser material things. To-day we should be considering a greater effort to prosecute the war in which our young men and women are doing so much for us.

Mr. Brand: At what hour of the day or night did these crimes take place?

Mr. LUCKINS: The hon. member will find that crime will be committed at night and in lonely places. If hotels are to be allowed to remain open for a further two hours what will happen? Is it not reasonable to suppose that those men who commit crimes will lurk and wait for the poor, unfortunate individual who has been addicted to too much liquor and jab him on the back of the neck with a sandbag and rob him?

Brisbane is no different from any other city of Australia, and I do not intend to open up that page of our history and tell hon. members where these crimes have been committed. There is enough in our social life and habits to justify us in hiding it rather than dragging it into the debate. My idea is to endeavour to lift our people to a higher ideal. That is my idea of my working life. I care not whether a man is satisfied or dissatisfied with my ideas, I intend to act in the best interests of all sections of the community. In the interests of everybody we have to endeavour to right the wrongs we see about us. What is more unfortunate than a small girl or mother waiting outside a hotel endeavouring to get the father and husband out? The father, perhaps having a little too much drink, starts an argument in a hotel and he remains there arguing and drinking. Is that not a demoralising sight? Is not such a scene pathetic? That is a social evil that concerns us. Can we justify our existence if we do not contribute towards better conditions in our community? If we can do so by making sacrifices then we shall have accomplished something that is particularly worth while.

Let us get back to the days when we admired each other for our uprightness—let us bring to this community a greater measure of social stability and social joy than we have enjoyed of recent years. If Queensland can do something to uplift her people so that this State may be a shining light to other States of the Commonwealth, then we shall have achieved something. I cannot agree that extending the liquor trading hours into the dark hours of the night will achieve this desirable objective.

Mr. SPARKES (Aubigny) (5.21 p.m.): I feel some diffidence about speaking on this proposed measure after hearing the hon. member for Hamilton suggesting that a person must be a drinker before he can really give any views upon the Bill that it is proposed to bring before this Parliament.

Mr. Brand: He said a temperate drinker.

Mr. Pie: I said a temperate drinker.

Mr. SPARKES: There is no need for the hon. member for Isis to tell me what he

said. He has already made some rash statements this afternoon, and I prefer to rely on my own ears. Although I am not a drinker myself, I do concede to other people the right to drink if they desire to do so.

Mr. Brand: That is doubtful.

Mr. SPARKES: That shows how narrow-minded the hon. member for Isis is. That may be his way of looking at it, but it is not mine.

To my mind, the whole question here centres round moderation. We know that in the past, although 8 o'clock was the closing hour, the law was honoured in the breach rather than in the observance. Later on, however, the law was tightened up and enforced, and I should have liked the Minister to tell us what the effect of that tightening up was. Did it reduce crime or the effects of drinking?

Mr. Barnes: It has never been tightened up.

Mr. SPARKES: I should have liked some enlightenment from the Minister on this matter, but he did not reply to my interjection.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: I do not like making rash statements on these things.

Mr. SPARKES: I always thought the Minister's department checked up on crime from month to month, but apparently I am wrong.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Those statistics have been used to-day to show, first of all, that we are a more sober people.

Mr. SPARKES: So many different statements have been made by hon. members on both sides of the Chamber that it has been rather hard to follow the argument. We find one hon. member saying that he supported the proposed extension from the point of view of the country hotelkeeper.

The hon. member for Isis said that he did not know whether the hon. member for West Moreton was supporting the proposed extension or opposing it. I do not know how he could make that statement. Anyone who listened to the hon. member for West Moreton would have no difficulty in deciding his position. He said that at a time like this, he did not think the proposed legislation was warranted. That statement was plain enough for anyone and should have penetrated the intelligence of even the hon. member for Isis. The hon. member for Isis could not see that an extension of the trading hours to 10 p.m. would not make any difference to the amount of drink consumed. Why not be fair and frank about this? The hon. member for Isis said we should get up and speak fairly and frankly. I want to say quite frankly that any hon. member of this Assembly who gets up and says that the extension of hours to 10 p.m. will not mean the consumption of more drink is either talking with his tongue in his cheek or he is very ignorant. Everyone knows that the extension of trading hours

at night means more drinking. I go so far as to say that in country districts virtually all the liquor sold, or at least 90 per cent. of it, is sold from 7 o'clock onwards. At any rate, more is sold between those hours than during the rest of the day.

The Minister also referred to the clause with respect to the consumption of liquor in dance halls, and in that matter I agree with him. I am right behind the clause, not only in its application to the country, as some hon. members have said, but everywhere. I find it difficult to follow the Secretary for Health and Home Affairs in some of his remarks concerning the clause, however. To quote his own words, he said that we must have that good spirit of dancing without liquor, and then a little later he goes on to say that he is extending the liquor hours. It is hard to follow him; I know that he is a difficult man to follow in many respects.

The clause governing the Government's right at any time to close up hotels or shorten the trading hours is a very important one, and to me it bears the imprint of the Premier. I can visualise the Premier saying to himself, "Now, it might be all right, but I am very dootful." (Laughter.) The Premier will have the right, when this Bill passes through the House, to shorten hours at any time or close hotels up altogether. He made that statement himself.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: It is true.

Mr. SPARKES: To me, Mr. Chairman, it is the weakness of the Bill. In the many Bills the Minister brings before this House, does he include such a provision? The Minister will have ample opportunity of telling us all about that at a later stage, but despite what the hon. member for Hamilton said, that because I am not a drinker I should not have a voice in this matter, I am entitled to my view.

Mr. Pie: I am as temperate as you in many things.

Mr. SPARKES: In some things the hon. member is not as temperate as I am. However, that is by the way. I have no wish to be called to order for getting away from the purposes of the Bill, but I say again that, to my mind, that is the weakness of the measure. I can see the Premier behind it. Something might occur that we do not wish to occur in this country—some act of war, or something unforeseen in some of our coastal cities—and the Premier would be able to invoke the aid of this clause. I hope that such a happening will not come about.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: You are frightened that hours are going to be restricted.

Mr. SPARKES: There are many hotels in my electorate, and I must say that I have realised that the tightening up of hours has made a great deal of difference in the trading of those hotelkeepers. I am sure that every hon. member of this Committee will admit that. The hon. member for Isis said that no more liquor would be consumed by

the alteration of the hours, but that is ridiculous rot.

Mr. Brand: That is your opinion.

Mr. SPARKES: He furnished the reply himself, because he said that workers in the country could not get into town until late at night and they should have the right to get a drink. That is quite sound, I believe they should have that right, but it only goes to show that if they are not given that right less drink will be consumed. The Minister said he would not make any rash statements.

We know the Bill will become law because the Premier has told us that every hon. member opposite will vote for it, but he also asked why anyone should have the right to interfere with the rights of other people. That is a very sound idea, but I want to know if it is extended to a person who is asked to join a union. Has he any right then? No. He is told that he must become a member of a certain union. I should have liked the Premier to say that all hon. members would be given an "open go" on the Bill, to vote according to their own ideas. I have no objection to anyone's having a drink; being a non-drinker I have nothing to worry about. I want to ask the Minister, if hotels are kept open for certain hours, and if there is an increase in crime, will he take action—

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: Decidedly.

Mr. SPARKES: I thank the Minister for that assurance, and I appreciate his frankness. It has a very soothing effect on me.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: You can rest assured that the Government will always take every possible measure to restrict crime.

Mr. SPARKES: It is a crime for anyone to have opium in his possession. Why? Because opium when used to excess can be detrimental to health. The same can be said of morphia. No-one can justifiably level criticism against any man who takes drink in moderation, but, unfortunately, there are some people who do not. The law provides that severe penalties shall be imposed on persons who have morphia, opium, and similar drugs in their possession, and the penalties are heavy because of the detrimental effect such drugs are likely to have when used to excess. If the hon. gentleman can get figures to show that crime is on the increase because of drinking, he will take action to bring back the hours to what they were before. The figures he has submitted show that crime is on the increase because of drinking.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: I said we would take action to restrict crime.

Mr. SPARKES: If one knows the cause of crime then naturally one should take action to remove it. That is sound enough. If, by his own statement, the Minister proves that crime is on the increase he should take action to reduce the selling hours of liquor. The

only way to get rid of crime is to get rid of the cause of it. What is the use of putting a man in gaol or otherwise dealing with him for an offence if we allow the cause of the offence to remain? If cattle are being bogged in a paddock, why keep the bog there? Why not remove the bog or fence round it so that it will not continue to be a cause of trouble?

The Secretary for Public Works: Why do you not do that on your station?

Mr. SPARKES: The hon. gentleman must have got bogged on my station. I do not remember having had the pleasure of having him bogged on my station. I offer him, in all sincerity, an open invitation to come along to my place, for he will find there is no bog there.

No-one can quibble with the clause prohibiting the sale of liquor at dance halls or the taking of liquor to dance halls. No matter what any hon. member may have said, there can be no gainsaying the fact that a habit has grown amongst young girls and boys of drinking at dance halls. If that habit can be curtailed by prohibiting the sale of drink at these halls—and if the Act can be policed to make it practically impossible for this practice to continue—then we shall do a very good deed for the country. I have no doubt that the great thought of many people—not only the people who do not drink, like myself, but people who do take a glass—is how we can correct this evil. I ask any hon. member would he like to see his daughter of 18 or 19 years of age drunk in a dance hall? There have been a number of crude interjections about girls and barmaids, but we must not forget that we all may have a sister or daughter. I think most hon. members, no matter what their views might be on this question, would be very sorry, indeed, to see their sisters or daughters under the influence of liquor in the company of young men also the worse of liquor at a dance hall. Personally, I should prefer to see my boy a gambler than a drinker, because he at least would remain in possession of his wits—and it cannot be said that a drinker has his wits about him.

The hon. member for Bowen made some remarks concerning the trade in Germany. Another hon. member said there had been trade restrictions in Great Britain and Germany. What I say is that if the laws in Germany had been altered, the German people, while they may not be content, are a very efficient race and would accept the fact. Their methods of conducting this war, no matter how we might dislike them as a race, must commend themselves to us, particularly their organisation and the getting of their war machine to work. We have learnt quite a great deal from them in that respect.

Mr. Pie: They will not win.

Mr. SPARKES: I never dreamed that they would, but the hon. member himself knows that in the boxing ring—for instance—we never get anywhere by underrating our opponent.

This debate on the initiatory motion has extended to an unusual length. Had the Minister not gone into such detail it was not my intention to speak until the second reading, when we should have seen the Bill. I regret very much that the Minister has not given the Opposition an opportunity to have a look at the Bill; if he had done so, it might have saved a good deal of debate.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: You will get it directly.

The Treasurer: The sooner you sit down the sooner you will get the Bill.

Mr. SPARKES: Had the hon. gentleman handed us the Bill on Friday—

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: It was not printed then.

Mr. SPARKES: Mr. Chairman, in the next few minutes it will be moved "That the Bill be printed," and the Bill will be immediately circulated. The hon. gentleman knows all about it, and hon. members on this side of the Committee should have been given an opportunity to see the Bill, and understand it.

Mr. Jesson: You would not, anyway.

Mr. SPARKES: We should at least be given the opportunity of showing whether we can.

The whole question seems to me to be whether moderation can be carried out. I admit there are requests from the hotels in the country, who say that the earlier closing has deprived them of their best selling hour. I have not the slightest doubt they are right. I cannot see the need for extending the hours in the city.

Mr. EDWARDS (Nanango) (5.42 p.m.): There is no doubt, as the hon. member who just resumed his seat said, that the introductory stage of the Bill has taken a long time. Extraordinary statements have been made from both sides of the Chamber. In the first place, I wish to refer to a statement by the Premier. The Premier makes some splendid speeches on what he terms "democracy," and I think they have much influence amongst the people. To-day, the hon. gentleman has been advocating something similar. He said that he did not believe in interference with the liberty of the subject.

The Premier: Any more than is necessary to protect the public interest.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes—any more than is necessary to protect the public. If the Premier carried out that principle he would not have agreed to the introduction of this Bill. There is not one hon. member on either side of the House who has not seen families wrecked and ruined through strong drink. There is no denying the fact.

The Premier: You are putting a case for prohibition now.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, I voted for prohibition every time—I never voted anything else in my life. That is, after all, the liberty of the subject. If you put certain temptation in the way of a person who has not the

strength of mind to resist it, well, you are interfering with the liberty of the subject.

The Premier: If a man has no opportunity to sin, can you call him virtuous?

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, Mr. Chairman, what do the courts do? They put him away in gaol for sinning.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: First they give him the opportunity to sin.

Mr. EDWARDS: They do nothing of the sort, and you know that as well as I do. The Premier knows his answer—of course you do not. You try to do everything you possibly can to keep crime away from him. However, that is not the point I was making. I am not altogether a teetotaler. I have taken a drink in my time, but, during my lifetime, I have never been the worse of drink for five minutes.

This is the position as I see it; no hon. member in this Committee will disagree with the proposition that a hotel cannot sell drink between 8 a.m. and 10 a.m. to the same extent as between the hours of 8 p.m. and 10 p.m.—not by a thousand times. Nobody, except one who has been on a spree the night before, wants a drink before 10 o'clock in the morning—therefore, the two extra hours are a gift to the hotelkeepers. At least another third more drink will be consumed as a result of the extension of those two hours.

For the moment I will touch upon the restrictions that the Minister said would be placed on drink in halls. I do not know whether he said, "selling drink in halls." After all, there is not much in it, for the reason that in most country districts the hall is alongside the hotel, with the result that people are going backwards and forwards to the hotel all the time. Whenever a dance, or whatever it may be, is in progress drinking is going on. The Minister made the definite statement that he could control it only after 10 o'clock at night. If this Bill comes into effect it is quite right that he will control it only after 10 o'clock at night; but, in my opinion, the position will be 50 times worse than previously. After 8 o'clock at night at present they dare not go backwards and forwards in numbers because the police can put them out, but now they will be able to go on without any interference until 10 o'clock. The position is made worse than it was previously.

I will leave the remainder of what I have to say to the second-reading stage. It is a shame and no credit to the Government that this legislation should be brought in during such a time as we are passing through. To-day we have had to listen, in my opinion, to stupid talk. It is an insult to the soldiers to say anything about their having liquor to fight well. That has nothing to do with the question inasmuch as 70 or 80 per cent. of the soldiers did not drink. A number of men went to the war and never had a drink there and they are the men who came out of it best. Let there be no mistake about that. I should be very sorry indeed to think I

should have to live again through the conditions I saw after the last war, and that is no condemnation of these men at all. I admired them. I have always admired them. We have in Australia the best fighting men in the world. Some of them came home with their nerves racked. They returned by no means "in the pink of condition," and because the hotels were open they drank until 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock at night, and then were dragged out on the streets.

Mr. Jesson: That is a lie.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is not a lie, I was staying at a hotel and saw it.

I should be very sorry indeed to see that sort of thing take place again. I repeat that it is our job, if we are worth our salt, to do everything possible to stand by those people who have not quite the amount of will power that enables them to keep away from drink. Many good men—in fact, many of my friends, and hon. members opposite must have had this experience—lose their senses when they have two or three drinks and then go on a spree, and once they do that nothing will keep them from the drink; they must be cut off from all access to it. Of course, they go on these sprees perhaps only once in three or six months—

Mr. Power: Why penalise the majority because of the actions of a very small minority?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am penalising nobody. Nobody can tell me that drink is anything but a luxury. We could all well do without drink. We have heard a good deal of nonsense about people going 20, 30, and even 40 miles to get a drink, but no sensible man would walk even a mile for it. Drink has never built up the human race in any way, as has been suggested this afternoon. The human race has been built up by temperance in all things, and hon. members opposite know it.

Even at this late hour I ask the Minister and the Government to consider seriously the wisdom, having regard to Australia's position to-day, of persisting with the proposed measure. If it is passed through this Assembly tremendous expense will be placed upon the community in policing it. A tremendous number of young policemen who might perhaps go to the war or do something else of value in the war effort will be required to police the new hours properly and to see that the law is strictly observed. In fact, I predict that the law will not be observed at all, that gradually we shall revert to the practices that have been indulged in up to the present.

THE SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, Ithaca) (5.53 p.m.): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Brand: There is no need to reply.

THE SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The debate that has taken place this afternoon has left me in doubt whether there is anything to answer. Some hon. members of the Opposition have announced that they are going to support the

proposed Bill while others have approved of it, but were a little doubtful whether this is the correct time to bring it into operation.

The complaint of the Leader of the Opposition that it is being brought in at the tail end of the session leaves me cold. To my mind, to-day is just as important in the affairs of this Parliament as the first day of the session. The last day of the session is just as important as the first day, and any hon. member of this Parliament should be capable, on the last day of the session, of debating anything that is brought before this Assembly. There is no intention to close up the debate on the Bill. Had the Bill been one of those that were going through all stages in one day, as some of the minor Bills will at the end of the session, then by all means it would have been the right thing to send the hon. gentleman an advance copy of the Bill; but this Bill is going through its stages in the normal course, just as other Bills usually do. I think, too, that hon. members opposite thought they knew everything that was in the Bill, judging by the statements that were being made. However, I do not see that there is much need to give early copies of the Bill. It was announced four weeks ago. The Premier promptly announced to the community that it was proposed to introduce such a Bill, and every hon. member of this Assembly has had at least a month in which to turn over in his mind how he would look upon any alteration in the trading hours of hotels.

Surely to goodness, hon. members know how they feel on these matters, and should be prepared to express opinions without having one of the daily newspapers to write speeches for them!

The story that Great Britain is restricting hours is not true. An hon. member of the Committee read some statement or question asked in the House of Commons, and proceeded to give the answer, but the answer given in the House by the Minister was that the restrictions of the liquor traffic in England were already drastic enough; the 1938 standard was being maintained.

Mr. Nimmo: You are misconstruing it.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Those are the words he used—

Mr. Nimmo: He said that they were back to that standard.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It was the year before the war. The hon. member tries to misconstrue the quotation as evidence that Britain had restricted liquor trading since the war to help the war effort. As a matter of fact, the cold fact is that greater facilities have been provided in England for drinking, and canteens have been established at the various munition works so that shift workers can get a drink if they want one.

Here is the cable from the Agent-General for the State of Queensland addressed to the Premier—

“No recent English legislation restricting or extending liquor trade.”

That was the cable received as late as 17 October from the Agent-General in London, and I presume we are entitled to take his word on the matter rather than the doubtful quotation used by the hon. member for Oxley.

The Leader of the Opposition choose an unfortunate approach in his opposition to the Bill. In the first place, he said that a referendum should have been taken on this question before such a Bill was introduced into Parliament.

Mr. Nicklin: I did not say that.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: He said that—

Mr. Nicklin: I did not say that. I said that the present was not the time to bring it in. I said that peace time was the proper time.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The hon. gentleman mentioned referendum, and said that there was no mandate. I took a note as he was speaking. However, other hon. members used the argument that a referendum should have been taken.

Mr. Nicklin: In peace time.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It does not matter when it is taken. The hon. gentleman suggested that a referendum should be taken, and he said that we had no mandate from the people for this amending Bill. That was a very unfortunate word for hon. members opposite to use. I have a keen recollection of their regard for referendums and the decisions obtained in that way. In 1930, when hon. members opposite were in government in this State, they submitted the subject of a railway superannuation scheme to the railway employees by referendum, 95 per cent. of the permanent employees voted, and the result was 5,223 in favour of the scheme and 10,110 against it.

Mr. Maher: What about the referendum that was taken on the question of abolishing the Upper House? The Labour Government totally disregarded the expressed opinion of the people.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I can assure hon. members opposite that we have a thorough understanding of their respect for referendums.

Mr. Maher: And your respect, too; it cuts both ways.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I am pointing out the appreciation of the value of a referendum by hon. members opposite. Although there was a two to one vote against the proposal submitted to the railway men the Government of the day insisted on going forward with the insolvent and unsound scheme, which, to-day, is costing £80,000 per annum, and has cost Governments that amount annually since 1932. That liability was placed on the country because the then Government absolutely disregarded the common-sense judgment of the railway employees concerned.

Hon. members opposite have mentioned the referendum on the subject of abolishing the Upper House, but there is nothing to hide about it. At that time the Labour Government took a referendum, and the result was against the proposal. Subsequently, the Labour Government went to the country and received a mandate from the people to wipe out the Upper House. One of the leading planks of the Labour platform was the abolition of the Upper House, and hon. members opposite made the maintenance of that Chamber the leading platform in their fight against the Labour Party at that time. The Labour Party won the elections, and so the people by their mandate expressed themselves in favour of the abolition of the Upper House. The Upper House was eventually abolished, and at the next elections Labour was again returned to power.

The Leader of the Opposition also said the Government did not have a mandate to alter the liquor-trading hours, and here again he has been unfortunate in the choice of a word, because in 1929 the party opposite received a mandate from the people not to reduce wages and not to increase hours. Hon. members will remember the pledge given by the leader of the party opposite at that time that in no circumstances would the Country-National Party stand for a reduction in wages and in no circumstances would it increase hours. The people gave hon. members opposite a mandate to carry out that pledge, but immediately they were returned they reduced wages and increased hours.

Mr. Brand: That is not so.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: That is quite right. Hon. members opposite must remember the then Premier, Mr. A. E. Moore, standing up here and denying in this Chamber that he had made that pledge while I, from my place in opposition, brought out each newspaper published in every town in Queensland where he had spoken in which that pledge was quoted.

Mr. Brand: He said he would leave it to the Industrial Court.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It is rather unfortunate that they should introduce the question of the referendum and again make mention of a mandate.

Again, hon. members opposite have the temerity to get up and say that they represent public opinion and that public opinion is against this measure. Fancy public opinion being represented by a section of the Opposition, which is only a small part of the hon. members of this Chamber! His statement is that he is public opinion.

Mr. Maher: Supposing everybody in this Parliament was allowed to vote and give his own private view, what would be the result?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: That is the duty of every hon. member in this Chamber. (Opposition laughter.) This story that hon.

members opposite are putting over that this Bill was only carried by a small majority of the members of the Labour Party is not true.

Mr. Barnes: Not this Bill, but the original Bill was.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The hon. member speaks with his usual complete ignorance.

Mr. Barnes: The first one—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: No other Bill has been submitted to Labour caucus than the Bill I have introduced to Parliament to-day.

Mr. Barnes: 21-20.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: There was a difference of opinion, but only as to the provisions, and that was to be expected in a reform measure of this kind. Every member of this party has a right to take part in the framing of the legislation this Government introduces to Parliament and every hon. member can express an opinion as to what should or should not be done, and then the aggregate of the desires of every member of the party is, as far as possible, given effect to. This Bill was submitted to the party on only one occasion—namely, last Wednesday, when it was unanimously adopted by this party.

I want to call hon. members' attention to the fact that the idea that because a man has a glass of beer it is going to interfere with his capacity to work is nothing but humbug.

Mr. Brand: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Does any hon. member suggest that our war effort will be improved by the introduction of total prohibition in Australia? I venture to say that the war effort would be destroyed. To suggest that because a man likes a glass of beer when he is tired after a long day's work it will destroy his capacity to work is a condemnation of the way of living of the British people. In England every effort is made to make it possible for any working man to have a drink when he gets off shift, or at the midday break. During the last war the hotels in Fleet street were open between half-past 12 o'clock midnight and half-past 1 o'clock in the morning in order that the newspaper employees—thousands and thousands work in that area throughout the year—could obtain refreshment if they so desired.

We have an excellent illustration of the value of giving good, pure, clean liquor to men who desire it here in Brisbane. Hon. members opposite will remember the commencement of the construction of the Somerset Dam—which, of course, most of them deemed extravagant. It was found impossible to keep the men in the camp. At night they used to go to town, to Esk, Kilcoy, or any other place where they could get liquor. As it was a long way to return to camp they deferred their return as long as

possible, with the result that the work was interrupted and quite a number did not attend work on Mondays and were dismissed. The Government decided to establish a canteen there. Sly-grog shops had sprung up in the area and the situation became difficult. That was because of the desire of the men to have a drink of beer and their determination to get it. The Government authorised the constructing authority to establish a canteen and bar at Somerset Dam.

Mr. Macdonald: No-one has ever been put in gaol there in consequence.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: That is so, and since the establishment of the canteen no-one has even been sacked for drunkenness. The men are always on the job because there is no need to go away for a drink. Not only that, but the profits of the canteen go towards providing social services for the men at the settlement. The hon. member for Stanley can give any hon. member of the Opposition his views of the success of the experiment at the Somerset Dam.

Another thing that amused me this evening was the queer idea some hon. members opposite have about the weakness of the men who are going overseas to fight for this country. They seem to think it is a sign of mental weakness to join the A.I.F., and if they get near beer they will go to perdition. These poor weaklings who are going to fight for this country against the armed hordes of Hitler would not survive contact with a glass of beer! I never heard such rot talked about real men as hon. members opposite talked. The men of the A.I.F. in the last war did not care a rap—anybody who did not want it did not drink it. Nobody would suggest that the men who had a glass of beer were any worse soldiers than the men who did not. The idea that once a man becomes a soldier somebody has to go and guard his soul from the temptation of imbibing liquor is all rubbish.

Not one hon. member opposite seemed to be a bit concerned about maintaining the sobriety of the higher officers in the Army, Navy, or Air Force, who have the responsibility of leading and organising and who have a dozen times more reason to keep sober than the private soldier. Nobody suggested there should be no liquor for the generals or colonels or captains or lieutenants or sergeants, but because a man is a private soldier and because in many cases he sacrificed a good living to join the A.I.F. at 6s. a day, he is to be deprived of privileges we claim for those who stay at home. I think everything we can do to give any pleasure or any comfort to the fellows going overseas should be done. They are entitled to the best we have and the best we can give them. Everybody knows that when they get into the fighting areas there will not be much pleasure. The Leader of the Opposition knows that by experience—that there is not much comfort or pleasure once he gets into the actual fighting. There are no parades through the streets with cheering multitudes when he gets over the other side.

Some hon. members opposite endeavoured to convey the idea that the Government are introducing this Bill because they are in the hands of the liquor interests—that the liquor interests control this Government. Hon. members opposite have given a very emphatic denial themselves to their own innuendo. In the first place, let us just see how much under the control of the liquor interests this Government were when six months before the last election sufficient police were brought in for the strict policing of the 8 o'clock closing, and it was enforced immediately. Does that give any indication that the Government were in the hands of the liquor interests? Does that give any indication that the Government had to leave the hotels open because they were in the hands of the liquor interests? Six months before the election the hotels were more rigidly or more efficiently policed than ever before in the history of Queensland. That did not seem as if the liquor interests controlled this Government. On that question I call as a witness the hon. member for Stanley, who stated this afternoon that the hotelkeepers in his electorate did not want an alteration of hours. I know the hotelkeepers in Brisbane do not want an alteration of hours. I know a hotelkeeper out my way who has built a cottage at Redcliffe, and at 8 o'clock every Saturday evening his wife has everything ready and the car is loaded up and at half-past 8 on Saturday night they get off to Redcliffe and come back on the Monday morning. He complains that the alteration in hours is going to deny him that pleasure because it will be too late to leave at half-past 10. Most of the hotelkeepers in Brisbane do not want this change.

A number of the hotelkeepers in the cities and towns on the coast of Queensland were satisfied with 8 o'clock closing. As the hon. member for Stanley has just said, it is not at the suggestion of the hotelkeepers that the alteration is being made. It is being made in an endeavour to give the best convenience we can to the great majority of the people of Queensland, and, at the same time, to bring about the highest state of reform that is possible.

The hon. member for Bowen this afternoon touched on one phase of liquor reform that the Government are keeping in mind. That is the provision of a decent cafe in hotels where people can sit in comfort and take alcoholic or other refreshments. The greatest evil in the hotels here is the secrecy in which drinking is done. People slip into a hotel, through a dark doorway, as if they were ashamed of anybody's seeing them going for a drink. They then line up at a small bar, several deep. As soon as they have had their drink they have no excuse for standing there unless they order another drink. In a bar there is nothing else to do but to keep on ordering drinks. Moreover, the majority of bars are small and hot and stuffy, and there is neither comfort nor hygiene in the bars in which so many of our people drink. The only way to meet that situation in Queensland is to provide for the continental method of drinking—that is, a cafe supplied

with tables and chairs, to which anybody can come, sit down, and get not only beer, whisky, or wine, but a cup of tea or coffee, a sandwich, or anything else he needs. Hon. members must not forget this—that it is drinking under these conditions that will do much to get rid of drunkenness, because no hotel proprietor will allow a drunken person to wander round amongst his patrons sitting at tables in a proper cafe. One never sees drunks wandering round the cafes of Paris or any other of the larger French cities. That would not be tolerated for two minutes. The drunks would interfere too much with the comfort of the patrons. There, you can see a man sitting at a table with his wife and children. If they want beer or wine they have it. If they want coffee or tea they have coffee or tea, and something to eat. What the patrons at the next table are doing has nothing to do with them, but you will not see any person drunk there, Mr. Chairman, because the proprietor would not tolerate that for one moment. Anybody who was drunk would interfere with his patrons. It is in that direction that in this tropical climate of Queensland provision will have to be made. Of course, there is not much opportunity of doing anything in that direction in these times when money is not available. It would take much alteration to make the average hotel fit for such a trade, but undoubtedly the Commission will, in future, have to give consideration to encouraging the provision of at least accommodation in which people can drink, not in secrecy and in dark corners but in the open light of day where everybody can see them, and where there will be no drunkenness.

The hon. member for Bowen also mentioned the escape by breweries of taxation on their sales to private customers. It might have been inferred from his remarks that Queensland breweries can sell to private customers and escape taxation. That is not so. What the hon. member was referring to, if I understood him correctly, was direct sales by Southern breweries to customers in Queensland. Unfortunately, that does escape taxation. Local breweries have to pay the 2½ per cent.

Mr. Brand: He said they should pay another 17½ per cent.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: That is a matter of opinion. The escape of breweries from paying the 2½ per cent. taxation was mentioned by the hon. member for Bowen, and that is the point I want to clear up. Any brewery in Queensland that sells to a person who has not a licence to sell liquor must pay the same fees as a licensed victualler pays, 2½ per cent. on the price of the sales. On sales made direct by Southern breweries to private customers in Queensland, the Constitution prevents us from levying anything because it is made in a Southern State.

Mr. Sparkes: It would have to pay taxation in New South Wales.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It probably would.

The hon. member for Wynnum and the hon. member for Oxley both seemed to think we

are encouraging the sale of luxuries by this measure and that there is something harmful to the war effort in encouraging the sale of luxuries. Does either of those hon. members suggest that we should prohibit the sale of motor cars, which are luxuries to most of the private citizens?

Mr. Nimmo: Have you heard of petrol rationing?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Yes, I have, but they still sell motor cars to people who can afford them, and, do not forget that people who can afford them can have two or three motor cars and get a ration for each of them. That is done, too. I have not heard any hon. members opposite suggest that we should abolish picture shows and other theatres. They are luxuries. Why pick on one luxury that only one section of the people enjoy?

Mr. Nimmo: But they will spend more money on it now.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: But look at the immense amount of money that is spent on pictures! Do hon. members suggest that we should abolish picture theatres for the duration of the war? The Press of Brisbane gave greater space to a cricket match that took place here in the last couple of days than they have given to the Battle of Libya. Are hon. members suggesting that the luxury of a cricket match should be denied to the people during the war period? There are just as big crowds as ever at the races. Are hon. members advocating the closing down of horse and dog racing for the duration of the war?

Mr. Nimmo: But that is all heavily taxed.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Nothing is more heavily taxed than liquor and tobacco—two of the rather harmless vices of 99 per cent. of the people who indulge in a glass of alcoholic liquor or a smoke. Those two commodities are taxed far in excess of any other commodity in the country, and hon. members know it.

Mr. Maher: What about the amusement tax for pictures, races, or the stadium?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The hon. member can make a case on that as soon as he likes. He has not made it yet in this Assembly.

It is suggested that this Bill encourages the sale of a luxury. I venture to say that the keeping of racehorses and indulging in horse-racing is a greater luxury than the tired worker's having a pot of beer to refresh him after, perhaps, a 12-hour shift—four hours' overtime. If there is any sincerity in this cry about cutting out luxuries, I ask hon. members: why not cut out some of your own luxuries? Why try to deny to the man who works hard and sweats for every bit of bread he gets the luxury of a pint of beer?

Mr. Massey: Is he the only man who drinks?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: No, but he is the man who can least afford to keep a store at home. Hon. members opposite are quite satisfied that somebody else's little comfort in life should be cut out, but they cry, "Lord, do not interfere with ours."

I put another question to the hon. member for Oxley. Ice-cream is a luxury. Does he suggest that ice-cream should be cut out and that Peters ice-cream factory be closed down for the duration?

Mr. Nimmo: That is not a drug.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I am not talking of drugs; I am talking of luxuries.

Mr. Nimmo: Drink is a drug.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The hon. gentleman is not going to suggest that ice-cream be cut out for the duration of the war. What a lot of humbug we have heard to-day from people who are suggesting that somebody else's luxury be cut out but that theirs be not interfered with!

Mr. Sparkes: You would not call keeping a slow racehorse a luxury?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I cannot say that because I have never had the experience of keeping one. I look at them occasionally.

Mr. Sparkes: You have had the experience of backing one.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: I rarely have the experience of picking the right one. (Laughter.) Notwithstanding the statement made by the Premier this afternoon, after the Leader of the Opposition had spoken, several hon. members repeated the falsehood that the convention of the Australian Labour Party decided that the policy of this party was to maintain the 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. hours. The hon. member for Wynnum stated it this afternoon.

Mr. Dart: I read the report.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Nothing of the kind happened, and the hon. member probably read some lying statement published by some journal. I suppose it was regarded as near enough to the truth for the hon. member for Wynnum, but it was not near enough to the truth for most decent people. There is no need for telling a falsehood in a debate of this kind. I was the mover of the amendment at the convention, and there was nothing to suggest that there was any intention of maintaining the 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. trading hours. I want to give that a denial.

The hon. member for Wynnum got badly bogged in his arithmetic this afternoon. I do not know what he was reading, nor do I know where he got his figures, but I am afraid he was not quoting from any journal when he said that the income the Govern-

ment received from the licensing operations was £100,000, plus £75,000 from licensees.

Mr. Dart: £78,000.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: He was not quoting from any journal at all, because no journal would be stupid enough to publish such a story even if the hon. member for Wynnum is stupid enough to repeat it. No journal would publish anything like that, and even the most bigoted anti-Labour journal keeps reasonably close to the truth. I repeat that there is no journal in the State that would publish that information. If the hon. member was reading from any statement in a newspaper, then I say to him that he could not understand the figures put before him. The total revenue of the Licensing Commission from all sources is £100,000, and included in that amount is the £78,000 that licensees pay.

Mr. Dart interjected.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The hon. member is beyond redemption. There is a sum of £20,000-odd that the Commission gets in fees for building licences, application fees, registration fees, and for various other little things for which a few shillings are lodged. I repeat that the total revenue of the Commission is just under £100,000. There is no merit in the argument of the hon. member for Wynnum when he is only £75,000 wrong in his arithmetic.

A further statement was made by the hon. member for Wynnum—he excelled himself this afternoon—that the deputation that waited upon me from the women's organisations in Brisbane met with a rebuff. They were received courteously; I listened to their statements, and their representations were noted, and I assured them that the matter would be considered by Cabinet. I made my report to Cabinet, and Cabinet instructed me as to the answer to send to these ladies. That answer was sent yesterday, and it was a courteous answer. **Mr. Chairman,** I suggest that the hon. member for Wynnum take a leaf out of the book of these good ladies, because although they made as strong a case as they could against an alteration in the hours, they quite frankly and honestly and without necessity to do so told me that the Country Women's Association would not take part in the deputation because that organisation representing country people had to have regard for country requirements. There was no need for them to tell me that, but they were very honest, well-meaning, and sincere ladies, and consequently they told me everything they thought I ought to know. They set a good example for the hon. member for Wynnum to follow.

Mr. Dart: And then you turned them down.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: No, I sent them Cabinet's decision that contrary to their fears Cabinet was of the opinion that the Bill would bring about a moral improvement in the people.

The hon. member for Oxley again comes into the picture. He put up a good performance this afternoon in misrepresenting matters concerning the Bill. For instance, he said that the liquor trades union was violently opposed to it.

Mr. Nimmo: That is right.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Very well, we shall see what the liquor trades union had to say on the matter. The hon. gentleman has told the Committee and the people through the Press and "Hansard" that the liquor trades union was opposed to any extension of hours. I have here a copy of a letter signed by the Secretary of the liquor trades union, dated 13 December, 1940. The letter is addressed to the Secretary, Brewers' Association, Castlemaine Brewery, Adelaide street, Brisbane, and is as follows:—

"Dear Sir,

"I have been directed by the above union to request you to meet representatives of the union with the view to considering the following demands:—

1. That a minimum wage of £5 be paid to all male employees and a pro rata increase for females and junior employees.

2. That all hours be worked on a eight within nine spread, except with permission of the union executive."

Then it goes on to mention a request for the improvement of a number of conditions, and finishes up by saying—

"When these additions to present awards are complied with, we, the Federated Liquor and Allied Trades Union undertake to instruct"

I should like hon. members opposite to mark the word "instruct"—

"our members to support the trading hours of 8 p.m. to 11 p.m. in hotels. We also undertake to pursue this policy in the industrial and political Labour movement, realising that the only real solution for the employees in the industry and the working class generally, is the people's control of the industry."

Mr. Dart: That was a year ago.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Yes, a year ago. This proposal was sent by the secretary of the liquor trades union to the liquor interests in this State offering in return for benefit to themselves to undertake to instruct their members to support 8 a.m. to 11 p.m. trading, and to undertake to pursue that policy in the industrial and political Labour movement.

Mr. Nimmo: That was from the brewery employees, not the barmen and barmaids.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: From the liquor trades union.

An Opposition Member: Who signed it?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It is signed "D. J. Skehan, Secretary Liquor Trades Union." The letter paper is headed "Federated Liquor and Allied Trades Employees' Union of Australia, No. 33 Trades Hall, Brisbane, 13 December, 1940." That shows that the secretary of the liquor trades union is not dealing honestly with the people when he says the union is opposed to the extension of hours when all that he wants to get is a price for his support, for an extension of hours. We cannot be concerned with that.

The hon. member for Oxley also stained his shirt front with tears when talking about the terrible conditions under which barmaids work, and about the effect the so-called longer hours would have on their health.

Mr. Nimmo: That is right.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: Really, there was a sob in the hon. gentleman's voice that brought a tear to every eye in the Chamber when he was speaking about the terrible effects the longer hours are going to have on the health of the girls in the bars.

Mr. Nimmo: It must have.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: The Bill deals with the licensing law and with the trading hours, but it does not in any way affect the working hours or the working conditions as prescribed in the award covering the industry.

The employees in the liquor trade will still have their 44-hour week. They will not work a minute longer than at present. The hotels will not be open a minute longer. How these alterations in the trading hours can adversely affect their health I do not know. The hon. gentleman will probably come out of a picture show or theatre one night in the next week or so when he is doing his usual visit to an entertainment, and go into a cafe where the girls are kept working until half-past eleven o'clock at night. These girls have not such good wages or short hours as the girls in hotels, but the hon. gentleman has not shed a tear for those girls who are under-paid or who work longer hours in a cafe. This merely shows that the hon. gentleman is not a bit concerned about the girls working in hotels. He is only concerned about having something to say against this Bill.

He and other hon. members sitting in opposition, when I mentioned that the operations of the Licensing Commission had resulted in the cancellation of 71 licences, suggested that this was not due to the operations of the Commission and that most of these people voluntarily closed their hotels up. That is not true at all. Why did the owners or licensees of these hotels not close them up before the Licensing Commission operated when trade was worse? The Commission started operations in 1936. Trade was beginning to improve then. It had been bad in 1931 and 1932 and 1933, in the depths of the depression. Why were these hotels not closed then? In the first place, there was no provision in the Act for the payment of compensation if they were closed. When

the Government established the Licensing Commission provision was made to compensate the holder of a licence and compensate the owner of any hotel that was closed. Quite a number offered to surrender their licences. Why? Because the conditions imposed by the Commission were such as to be beyond their capacity to meet. These hotels were in such an unhygienic condition that the Commission decided they should not be allowed to sell liquor unless considerable improvement was made. These alterations necessitated the spending of much money to make them conform with the requirements of the Commission, the alternative being to go out of business. They decided to go out of business, that it was better for them to accept compensation by being closed down than finding additional money to put the premises into a state of repair when they could not get sufficient return on the expenditure. When you come to look carefully into these things you will find an entirely different reason put forward by hon. members opposite. They should inquire the reason for these things. Members of the Licensing Commission will be only too happy to explain any of these things to them should they take the trouble to give them a ring, or go along and interview them.

Mr. Nimmo: I know some hotel licensees surrendered their licences because they were glad to get out of the business.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: They all wanted their compensation before they went out of business. The plain fact is that they could not spend the money required for the improvements and carry on.

For some reason or other, the alleged increase in juvenile crime has been introduced into the debate. I do not know what the liquor-trade hours have to do with any alleged increase in juvenile crime. I do not know that many children under 16 years of age indulge in the over-consumption of alcoholic liquor.

Mr. Nicklin: I noticed one case.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: It is remarkable that the increase in juvenile crime last year occurred when hotels were strictly closed. Juvenile crime has nothing to do with our licensing laws or trading hours of hotels. Hon. members must realise that the tables issued by the Government Statistician have to be understood to glean the lesson that can be learned from them.

This year the number of juvenile offenders was 521, and last year the number was 365. That looks like a tremendous increase, but in 1931 there were 653. Last year juvenile offences reached a low point. They have come down from 653 in 1931 to 450 in 1932, 264 in 1933, 463 in 1936, and so on; 521 looks like a big increase compared with last year, but most of these were trivial offences. Surely hon. members do not think that in that year 521 more young criminals were turned out? In one case there were 20 charges against a boy, and that would count as 20 in this list. This boy committed

20 two-penny-halfpenny robberies amongst his neighbours, and that put 20 on this year's number of offences. During last year there was an epidemic of bicycle stealing; they stole them not to sell but to ride away, and these kiddies are brought before the court. That epidemic of juvenile bicycle-stealing coincides with an epidemic of motor-car stealing by adults. These figures have to be looked at over a period of years in order to get a true picture of the amount of crime. Certain juvenile crimes have nothing whatever to do with the liquor-trading hours.

Mr. Nimmo: How do you account for the drop of 15 per cent. in crime over the eight months during which there was the enforcement of 8 o'clock closing?

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: That figure is not for eight months; there was a drop over 12 months, and if the hon. gentleman takes the trouble, he will find that over the years since 1932 there has been a drop in the amount of crime—it has been steadily going downhill. We have a lesser number in prison to-day than in 1932. People have reached a better standard of living. We have only 60 prisoners in North Queensland and half the gaol in Brisbane is empty. We closed St. Helena, and we closed Rockhampton's gaol and we have only the watch-house there. We have not many prisoners at all. There has been a continuous decrease. You must take a period of years to get the real picture.

It is the same with infant mortality statistics. You cannot get an idea of the number by comparing two years. An epidemic will throw the figures out of proportion. You have to take a period of years to see the true trend; and the same thing applies to crime statistics—you must take a period of years to see whether there has been a gradual rise or fall.

I do not think there is anything else that needs explanation. I have covered every objection made. I took careful notes of every objection made to the measure by hon. members opposite, and I think there is no real objection by hon. members opposite to its introduction.

Mr. CLAYTON (Wide Bay) (7.58 p.m.): I should like to ask the Minister in charge of the Bill if he and his Government intend strictly to enforce the law generally in regard to the measure he is introducing.

The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs: That is the policy of the Government.

Mr. MOORHOUSE (Windsor) (7.59 p.m.): I heard the Minister read a letter that was supposed to come from the liquor union in 1940. I happen to have here a little pamphlet which reads as follows:—

“Convict Slavery 1841.

“Back to Slavery 1941.

“Booze Racket Exposed by the Federated Liquor Trade Union.”

It contains the following:—

“This is the liquor trade union calling the people of Queensland to rise and support progress and liberty (defeat any alteration of hours). A bigger sale of draught beer and less bottled beer means increased profits and less labour.”

Obviously the Minister's information is out of date, as this is issued in 1941, and it is a matter of a fortnight ago only.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, Ithaca) (8 p.m.): When 8 o'clock closing came in the liquor trades union lost half of its employees by their being thrown out of work owing to the policing of hotels, according to the officers of the union. Now the idea is that with an alteration to 10 o'clock closing the other half will be thrown out of employment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Stanley) (8.1 p.m.): I should like to ask the Minister if he proposes doing anything on the lines I mentioned this afternoon, when the construction of a new main road puts a hotel away from the line of settlement.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS (Hon. E. M. Hanlon, Ithaca) (8.2 p.m.): The matter was very seriously considered by myself, the officers of the department, and Cabinet, to which I brought the matter for final decision, and we could not see our way to meet the very rare case that crops up, as suggested by the hon. member for Stanley, without opening the door to other abuses. The 1935 Act did away with all the provisions that enabled a police magistrate or a court in any district to allow a hotel to be moved from place to place. Hon. members will remember that wherever a hotel was moved, naturally the licensee always wanted to shift it to a better site, and there were all sorts of imputations of somebody being paid for the favour being given. The present law eliminates that possibility.

Mr. Macdonald: A hardship exists.

The SECRETARY FOR HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS: A very minor one.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Hanlon) be agreed to—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Barnes	Mr. Mann
„ Brand	„ Moore
„ Brown	„ O'Keefe
„ Bruce	„ O'Shea
„ Clark	„ Pie
„ Clayton	„ Power
„ Collins	„ Riordan
„ Conroy	„ Slessar
„ Cooper	„ Smith, W. Forgan
„ Devries	„ Theodore
„ Dunstan	„ Turner
„ Farrell	„ Walsh
„ Foley	„ Williams
„ Gledson	
„ Hanlon	„ Tellers:
„ Healy	„ Brasington
„ Jesson	„ Hilton
„ Larcombe	

NOES, 13.

Mr. Dart	Mr. Sparkes
„ Edwards	„ Walker
„ Luckins	„ Yeates
„ Macdonald	
„ Maher	„ Tellers:
„ Moorhouse	„ Decker
„ Nicklin	„ Massey
„ Nimmo	

PAIR.

AYE.	No.
Mr. Bulcock	Mr. Müller

Resolved in the affirmative.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Hanlon, read a first time.

CO-ORDINATION OF EMPLOYMENT FACILITIES BILL.

SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. T. A. Foley, Normanby) (8.9 p.m.): I move—

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

I do not intend covering all the ground that I traversed on the initiation stage, when I outlined in detail the powers, duties, and obligations of the various boards and councils that will be set up under this measure.

I attempted, in the initiation stage, to give in detail the principles of the measure we are discussing, and I intimated that I did not intend to cover the same ground, as hon. members have had an opportunity of reading the Bill and should, naturally, have a fair knowledge of it both from my remarks and the Bill itself.

The introduction of this measure is in furtherance of the logical and evolutionary policy for the planned co-operation of State facilities which is being carried out year by year. The presentation of this, another co-ordination Bill, might be described as another milestone in the journey towards the objective of economic security that is part and parcel of Labour's platform. In retrospect, one can see other milestones on the road to Labour's goal—laws that it has placed on the statute-books of this State since 1915. I refer, first of all, to the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916. The system laid down in that measure has proved itself in actual practice over a number of years and has been a very powerful source of uplift to the social conditions of the people of this State. Their gains have been tremendous when compared with the conditions obtaining prior to 1915. We can say that we are practically living in what may be termed an industrial paradise when we look at the conditions that existed prior to 1915. I can look back to the time when I started work, a time when there was no arbitration or wages-board system in operation, and I can trace the development that has taken place since that time. It almost appears as if one were reading a story of fairyland or a bedtime story. The progress has been phenomenal.

I now pass on to another measure—I intend to link this up with the Bill—in the Workers' Compensation Act of 1916. In the olden days, the dependants of a worker who met with a fatal accident were virtually thrown to the wolves. I have recollections in my early days of helping to carry a breadwinner out of the stopes and up to the surface and handing him over to an ambulance. He was dead, and beyond any human aid. The only form of compensation that existed in those days was for the hat to be passed round on pay day into which the workers threw their mite for the widow and kiddies of the deceased. Later on, a series of socials and dances were organised to raise funds for the unfortunate widow and children.

I do not intend to deal with each stage of our progress, but now refer to the Inspection of Machinery and Scaffolding Acts and to the protection given to the workers working in various occupations. At one time there was no regulation of gear, machinery, and other things, but, on our building projects of to-day, everything must be up to prescribed standards and the gear and machinery must be regularly inspected before the men are allowed to start work.

We then go on to an attempt made by the Labour Government to help those engaged in the mining industry. The Mines Regulation Act was passed to give some measure of protection to the miners, whereas previously the mine manager or one of the managing directors determined the conditions.

We pass from that field to the sugar industry. The Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act was passed to stabilise the industry and to clip the wings of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and its inspectors who were virtually kings in the industry prior to the introduction of that measure. That Act also enabled the farmers to pay award rates to those engaged in harvesting their crops and to give them reasonable working hours—say, from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m.—whereas when I took part in harvesting back in 1909 the rule was to work from “can” to “can’t,” an American phrase, that meant from when it was hardly light until sundown.

The State Insurance Act is another milestone on Labour's road of progress which gave an opportunity of a cheap service of insurance and thus another form of protection to those who desired it.

Then in 1920, after 60 years of anti-Labour administration, the Main Roads Act was passed by the Government to provide a planned organisation of roadmaking, and create road facilities throughout Queensland, which has resulted in a network of thousands of miles of roads already constructed, and many thousands more gazetted and under the control of the Main Roads Commission to-day.

We then pass to the facilities granted by the State Advances Corporation in the Workers' Dwellings Act and the Workers' Homes Act, which, over a period of years, have enabled 70 per cent. of the workers in this State to own their own homes, the highest percentage in any State in the Commonwealth.

I am mentioning the various Acts to indicate the various milestones that have been laid down by Labour Governments since 1915 with the one definite trend towards a greater measure of security to the great mass of the people in this State, whereas previously they enjoyed very little.

We come then to the Fair Rents Act of 1920, which checked the exploiting landlord because it gave the tenant an opportunity of approaching a court if he thought he was being unduly exploited. Now the position is that if the landlord wishes to raise the rent, he must (if challenged) obtain the permission of a court before he can do so.

Then there is the Public Curator's department, virtually a State legal bureau, which gives a cheaper legal service to the people than previously existed.

Then we come to the Contractors' and Workmen's Lien Act Amendment Act of 1921 and the Wages Act of 1918, which gave protection to the great mass of workers in this State from the unscrupulous employers by giving them a first say with regard to wages in the event of any smash or financial instability on the part of their employers. These and other measures passed by early Labour Governments laid the foundation upon which successive Labour leaders have faithfully built.

It is within easy recollection of the youngest hon. member of this House that the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act was introduced into this Parliament by the present Premier. It was a very successful measure, and it is now being copied by other States and other countries.

When it was introduced in this House it was scoffed at and dubbed the Loafers' Paradise Bill. Notwithstanding all the opposition that showed itself at that time, the measure was placed on the statute-book, and the Unemployment Insurance Fund is now in a solvent state with a big reserve, enabling a fairly big rush to be met with safety. It has given, over a period of years, a measure of relief, protection, and security to those who could not be catered for in work by the employers.

The reason why I am going through these measures, Mr. Speaker, is to point out that the trend of legislation from 1915 had but one goal—a greater security for the great mass of the people. This legislation has led up to the co-ordinating measures that have been introduced recently. The Apprenticeship Act of 1924 gave greater protection to the youth of the State on starting out to learn a trade. Instead of being a message boy for a couple of years under the old system, and finishing his time with very little knowledge of the trade he desired to learn, he now completes his apprenticeship in a trade or calling under a defined system of education and examinations in the employer's time.

We find that notwithstanding all that has been said about farmers' representatives and squatters' representatives, and their love for the selector and primary producer, we had

60-odd years of legislation prior to Labour's taking over control of this State from an anti-Labour Administration, and yet during the whole of that period no form of organisation was laid down that would give the stability and protection to primary producers that were urgently required. We come, therefore, to the Primary Producers' Organisation Act of 1922, which enabled the primary producers to be organised into a completely unified organisation that gave the farmers a direct voice in the solution of their agricultural and marketing problems based on the principle of co-operation. This is all linked up with the Bill before the House, and points to the trend of legislation from 1915 to the present day. Since this measure I referred to was passed, we have had 17 different marketing boards operating in this State, which have handled millions on millions of pounds' worth of primary products and given the full benefit of that service and the best price that was obtainable to the farmers. That was followed later by what is known as the Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act, which also gave a great measure of benefit and protection as well as security to the farmers.

In due time a Health Act was enacted. This Act is supreme over any other State law dealing with public health. It includes industrial hygiene and confers on the Director-General of Health and Medical Services power to investigate the accommodation of employees and such matters. That Bill is also linked up with the Bill under discussion. We pass from that Act to the Hospitals Act of 1936, providing for hospital management, by means of hospital boards, and the giving of better service generally to the people throughout the State than was rendered under the old hospital system. Then we come to the Dental Act, which governs the training of students in dentistry. This was handed over to the Queensland University, which has now established a faculty of dentistry. The Medical Act of 1939 was designed to give better protection to the people's health.

The Bureau of Industry Act of 1932 was the first step in this State towards a planned development scheme. Later this organisation was made a constructing authority and it carried out some very fine works.

Now we come to 1938. Individual measures were passed by the House, but as the State departments and the work of the Government grew it was found necessary to co-ordinate many of the services that had been established, and in 1938 the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act was passed, having for its object the improvement of the general and economic welfare of the State, an orderly system of planned public works, co-ordination of Government departments, and the elimination of overlapping and waste by those departments resulting from the individual efforts that were being practised prior to the introduction of that measure. As a result of that co-ordinating Bill a splendid programme of work has been carried out by the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works.

Throughout the State all manner of works have given employment to thousands and thousands of workers and have resulted in the establishment of millions of pounds worth of assets to this State that will be of value for many years to come.

We now come to the Rural Development Transfer and Co-ordination of Powers Act of 1938, which resulted in the establishment of what is known as the Bureau of Rural Development. Instead of a number of independent departments making advances to various primary producers they were all brought under one co-ordinating board that has operated ever since with great advantage to the State and a great saving generally has been effected. It shows the trend of to-day towards the greater co-ordination of State facilities.

Now we come to the latest measure passed by this House—the National Education Co-ordination and the University of Queensland Acts Amendment Bill. That Bill dealt with the co-ordination of educational facilities in this State with the object of giving a better service by way of education to the people and the youth of Queensland.

Hon. members can see the trend of Labour towards the objective laid down in Labour's platform. Right from 1916—when no protection or security existed for the workers of this State—starting off with industrial measures that gave better working conditions and then safety measures protecting the men in industry, we have measure after measure, as I outlined, until we have reached the position to-day when we are co-ordinating every State service under different headings—one dovetailing in with the other, so that the maximum amount of benefit will result from the administration under the new system that has been developed over the last few years.

And so we come to the present Bill. This is a measure that dovetails in with other Government legislation and provides for greater co-operation and co-ordination between school and employment and between employer or the constructing authority and the man offering his labour. Hon. members will realise that the Bill itself would not be fully effective if it were not a link in the co-ordinated chain of Government facilities that I have referred to. By the principle of co-ordination and the planned programme of work and the recommendations of the State Employment Council, the State employment exchange boards, and the committees I outlined on the initiation stage, recommendations of the main council will be given effect to by constructing authorities such as the Co-ordinator-General and the Government departments. Where no recommendation is subject to the Bureau of Industry they will be given consideration to by country and city councils, Government bodies, and private employers, and this will extend even to the special recommendations through the Chief Secretary to the national Government in connection with national projects that could with advantage be

established to provide employment in periods when it is necessary.

There is also power in connection with various other matters that are not exactly in the nature of employment, under which the State Employment Council can make recommendations to the Governor in Council, who, in his wisdom, can decide whether such recommendations will be accepted.

In connection with the advantages to be gained by a system of co-ordination, I would refer hon. members to an article appearing in to-night's issue of the Brisbane "Telegraph." It is headed, "Men and Machinery in Queensland Not Aiding War Production." If ever there was an illustration of what lack of co-ordination means to a Government it can be obtained from this article. Notwithstanding that, the Commonwealth Government, with a tremendous organisation it would be virtually impossible for the average business man to have, and with a tremendous volume of business and transactions to be undertaken, have been trying to establish a war organisation over a period of years, we find the same thing going on: Separate departments and separate committees all functioning separately and with no co-ordination. The article states—

"After two years of war, Australia still has hundreds of skilled engineers and huge quantities of valuable machinery not doing a tap to help war production.

"This situation is disclosed in the third report which the Commonwealth Man-Power Committee has presented for consideration by Cabinet."

For the benefit of hon. members I will read these other extracts—

"The report deals mainly with Queensland, which is described as a State with greater potentialities than any other State of the Commonwealth, even South Australia, if any attempt was made to organise those potentialities.

"The committee found that north of Mackay alone there were 1,000 skilled engineers and more than £500,000 worth of machinery contributing nothing to war production.

"During the remainder of the year it is suggested this could be turned over to munitions production or other war work in the slack periods.

"The report also mentions bungling in the ordering of the timber for rifle furnishings.

"In a number of cases, either incorrect quantities were bought or the orders were placed just before the start of the rainy season in North Queensland, where the timber is obtained. Outcome of this was that the timber could neither be cut nor got into the mills.

"Another recommendation is that the building of wooden boats and military pontoons be transferred to Queensland, instead of sending timber on to Sydney

for treatment, and then to South Australia for construction as is now done.

"The report expresses the opinion that no real attempt has ever been made to organise man power and machinery north of Bundaberg.

"A programme intended for South Australia required 60,000 workers when the only labour available comprised about 2,000 registered unemployed and another 8,000 people employed in other industries who wanted to take up war work."

Those are small extracts from the article, but from them hon. members can obtain some idea of the chaos that can result from the system in operation in the Commonwealth to-day. My Government very early realised the value of co-ordination and have worked on those lines in the realms of education and public works. Now they are doing it in regard to employment facilities in an endeavour to bring together all the facilities and interests that have to do with employment so that they can be properly organised to make a maximum effort to obtain the results we require of them.

It may be said that the scheme is an ambitious one. I have intimated that our aim is to establish a principle that has exercised the minds of almost every person in the Commonwealth, a principle that has been on Labour's platform for a number of years—the right to work and social security. I think it can be said that almost every one of us is striving for that from day to day. The measure is ambitious, but the way has been paved already by the legislation that I have mentioned. The measure of success destined for this Bill would not have been forthcoming in earlier years, and I repeat that it is due to the orderly planning and co-ordination that have resulted from the Government's wise lead that such a measure as this can be launched now with the knowledge that under capable administration it will have every chance of achieving its object.

The problems that are likely to confront the Government at the end of the war have been studied carefully by their advisers, and in this proposal will be found the translation of the combined recommendations and decisions of the Government in their resolve to be prepared for the post-war problems with which they will be confronted.

It will be noticed that the scheme calls for greater co-operation of all sections of the community. I stated earlier, and quoted two authorities for my statement, that a Government alone cannot solve the problems with which we shall have to deal. No Government can do that. They must have the co-operation of all sections of the community if it is desired to realise anything worth while in the solution of those problems.

I think it can be said that the people of this State are educated enough and have a broad, tolerant outlook up to this point. Twenty-five years of development under Labour administration have proved the fact that at least Labour can govern wisely. As evidence of this I refer to the standard of

living now existing as compared with that obtaining when Labour first took office. The improvement is almost incredible. The elevation in the standard of education under Labour administration is outstanding. Our educational system is the envy of the rest of the Commonwealth and of other countries of the world. Since we were asked by the people in 1932 to take charge of the affairs of the State again, the business index has shown a continual upward trend from the lowest figure known in the history of Queensland to record heights at present. Reference to the Queensland Year Book shows a tremendous increase in both primary and secondary industries under Labour administration. In fact, no matter what sphere of activity hon. members may wish to mention, there has been a steady upward trend in it since 1932. In addition to that, we have been able to accomplish something that our opponents said could be done only by them. I refer to the fact that we have balanced our Budget. In 1929 our opponents told the people that if anti-Labour forces were given the opportunity they would put the State on an even keel and balance its Budget as well as bring about employment never known in the previous history of Queensland, yet despite this boast the exact opposite happened.

The longer they governed and administered the affairs of this State, the further they drifted from Budget equilibrium. Labour, as I pointed out, improved the business conditions of Queensland, stimulated primary and secondary production, uplifted education, and raised the standards of living; and we have been able to balance the Budget year after year for the last few years.

So it is with confidence that my Government invite the full and ready support of the people of this State, and it is only by obtaining that support that the full measure of benefit from this Bill will be extended to the people of the State. An outstanding lesson of this war has been the success attending the co-operation of effort. We have only to see what is happening in Great Britain and to note that our system of industrial regulation has proved that, by co-operation and wise administration, we can achieve wonderful results.

Continuity of employment is something that is very desirable in view of the seasonal fluctuations in many of our industries, quite apart from the problem of unemployment itself. If we can bring about a solution of this problem—and this Bill is endeavouring to do it by conceding to the various boards of workers and employers, and also to the State Employment Council, certain powers enabling them to investigate this problem and recommend methods of bringing about greater continuity of employment—we shall, at least, give greater social security to many thousands of our workers.

Some idea of the principle we are trying to establish can be obtained from a very fine statement I read recently made by Mr. Winch, in one of the debates in the Canadian Parliament. It is reported in the *Journal of the*

Parliaments of the Empire, Vol. XXII., No. 1, January, 1941. He declared—

“The next peace must be economically planned, so as to give a guarantee to the world that there would be no further holocaust. Hard-won rights and standards of living must be maintained. Men in uniform must be given the right to work, even though in times of peace the country was unable to solve the problem of unemployment.

“In England to-day it is share and share alike. Already the old discrimination between the classes was disappearing because of the need for unity of purpose. Never again would the people tolerate want in the midst of plenty. There would never be a return to the old system, either in England or Canada, which was a revolution that would bring unexpected results.”

The same trend is developing in this country of ours in a unified war effort throughout the Commonwealth by all sections of the community. Workers in factories are giving of their best and are toiling and sweating, paying taxes, working overtime in an endeavour to provide the sinews of war. On the other hand, the young men who have left Australian shores are doing their share overseas. It is to be hoped that, at the end of the war, we shall not say to those who have helped so wonderfully that we cannot find them employment; if such a thing took place, it would be a reflection upon the abilities of every statesman in the Commonwealth.

The object of the Bill is to make a survey of the resources of the State so that we can develop them in such a way as to guarantee, as far as it is humanly possible, that every man and every boy and girl leaving school shall have an opportunity to work. I sincerely hope that the Bill will have the full support and co-operation of hon. members opposite.

On the subject of the right to work, I propose to refer to the reminder by the Premier to hon. members in this Chamber some time ago, when he said—

“The basic principle in society is the candid recognition of individual work and service, and I emphasise that this Government seeks to evolve methods whereby the children of this era shall be enabled to live better and fuller lives than their parents.”

If we can do that by dovetailing the Bill in with the other co-ordinating measures that have been passed, we can at least say that we have done our bit in our lifetime.

In conclusion, I should like to quote these words by Edwin Markham—

“And the right of a man to labour,
And his right to labour in joy—
Not all your laws can strangle that
right;
Nor the gates of hell destroy;
For it came with the making of man,
And was kneaded into his bones,
And it will stand at the last of things,
On the dust of crumbled thrones.”

That principle is embodied in the measure, and we hope that by co-operation all sections of the community will eventually obtain and enjoy it.

Mr. NICKLIN (Murrumba) (8.47 p.m.): I must congratulate the Minister on the hard work and enthusiasm he has put into the preparation of the Bill, but, unfortunately, I cannot join him in his enthusiasm for it. After examining it, and comparing it with other legislation, it seems to be virtually a rehash of the legislation already on the statute-book, legislation that was designed with a view to collaborating, co-ordinating, organising, amalgamating, and harmonising various functions, an object that up to the present has not been achieved. I hope the Bill will do what the Minister says it sets out to do. To my way of thinking, instead of being a milestone in the progress of evolutionary planned facilities, it seems to be another milestone in the production of words, words, words, and no action.

The Bill is supposed to provide a plan to deal with employment during the war and the post-war period. It will if it is put into operation, but we already have all the other Acts on the statute-book, embodying the powers contained in the Bill. It seems to me that the Bill is a duplication of all the other Acts that have been passed, and when the Bill is passed there will be, not co-ordination and co-operation, but duplication. I do not know whether the Bill supersedes all the Acts from which large slabs have been taken to compile it.

Let us look at the trend of Government legislation in recent years, and the attempts the Government have made to get unnecessarily elaborate titles for the various Bills they have introduced from time to time with great noise.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: You must make those titles elaborate, in order to understand them.

Mr. NICKLIN: To my way of thinking, the title given to this Bill almost condemns it, for instead of tending to an understanding of what it is really designed to do, it has the opposite tendency.

Just let us have a look at some of the titles that have been given to Bills in recent years. We had the Rural Development Transfer and Co-ordination of Powers Act of 1938, an Act—

“to provide for the co-ordination of the administration of provisions regarding State advances to co-operative companies, associations, and primary producers, and advances generally in aid of primary production by the creation of the corporation of the Bureau of Rural Development; and for other incidental purposes.”

Previously, all this work was done by the common garden Agricultural Bank, which managed to struggle along for a number of years very successfully without all that surplus verbiage which has now been tacked onto it.

Then we had the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act of 1938, an Act—

“to provide for improving the general economic welfare of the State and for the encouragement of employment generally by providing for an orderly planned system of public works and constructional utilities by means of the marshalling and co-ordinated organisation and control thereof, and for other purposes.”

Now, after that collection of Acts, we have the crowning effort, a Bill—

“to constitute the Department of Labour and Employment; to make provision, having in view war and post-war requirements, conducive to placing workers in employment by a planned co-ordinated system of employment facilities; to amend the Labour Exchanges Act of 1915; to establish a juvenile employment bureau; and for other incidental purposes.”

All words, words!

Mr. Collins: That is a laudable objective.

Mr. NICKLIN: It would be a laudable objective, but it is all words, and, as the hon. member for Stanley reminds me, what we want is action. I hope we shall get action instead of words. We have the words in the Acts I have quoted, all of which up to date have been mainly words, not action. If the objective the Minister outlined in his very full introductory remarks and second-reading speech is going to be any good, then we do not want from the Government high-falutin titles such as are given to this Bill, but action. The Opposition will then give all co-operation in bringing about anything that will make for the provision of better employment facilities and the better development of this State. We should certainly be able to give it heartier co-operation if we had some simpler measure, something without so many words attached to it.

Mr. Williams: A coloured label does not spoil the contents of a tin of jam.

Mr. NICKLIN: A highly coloured label does not make a tin of jam any better jam, neither does a very elaborate title make a Bill a good Bill. It is what the Bill contains that matters. Let us examine this Bill.

The Minister stated that the object is to set up various committees to investigate the possibilities of public works, co-ordinate the activities of various constructing authorities, to help to provide employment, and develop this State in the post-war period.

That is a very worthy objective and one that we can support; but we have to remember, Mr. Speaker, that similar high-sounding measures have been introduced with similar objectives, but they were placed on the statute-book and no action was taken.

The Minister gave us a review of legislation over a number of years. I am going to give him a review of legislation over a number of years, but the legislation I shall

quote is legislation we can connect up with this Bill, whereas much of the legislation he quoted had nothing whatever to do with the Bill. Take the Labour Exchanges Act of 1915, which we can link up with the present Bill. That Act provided for Government employment exchanges and for the licensing of private employment exchanges. This was just a plain piece of legislation without embroideries. It was prior to the new system the Government have adopted of putting plenty of frills on Bills they introduce.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: Give credit to the labour exchanges for the work they carried out.

Mr. NICKLIN: I am not detracting from the work the labour exchanges have done; they did very efficient work, but I contend they were able to do that excellent work under an Act with a plain title, and I do not think they will be able to do more efficient work under a Bill that it takes 10 lines to describe.

Then we have the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act of 1922. This is the first Act in which we can see the painting of word pictures solely for propaganda purposes. Section 4 of that Act provided for the appointment of an Unemployment Council with the following duties:—

“(a) Inquire into the causes and extent of unemployment within the State or any part thereof;

“(b) Inquire into and consider what are the most effective measures to be taken for temporarily or permanently reducing or eliminating unemployment within the State or any part thereof.”

Those are objectives that are more or less contained in the present Bill.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: They have done very useful work and they have given good advice to the Government.

Mr. NICKLIN: Another duty of the Unemployment Council was—

“Obtain and disseminate information on all matters connected with industrial occupations and the callings of workers with a view to improving the industrial relationship between workers and employers and lessening the evils of unemployment.”

It will be seen that the provisions of the Bill under consideration to-night are not new, that they were contained in the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act of 1922, but they have been dressed up and paraded in this Bill.

We pass over another 10 years and come to the Bureau of Industry Act of 1932. This Act continued the propaganda work. The Bureau of Industry was required to report on—

“Reproductive works that would provide employment and increase the wealth production of the State;

“The organisation, capitalisation, and labour conditions of particular industries;

“The trade of Queensland, both overseas and interstate;

“Stock of commodities, both primary and manufactured.”

The Bureau of Industry was also required under the Act—

“To review the statistics of employment and unemployment throughout the State;

“To inquire into the causes and extent of unemployment within the State or any part thereof;

“To inquire into and consider the most effective measures to be taken for temporarily or permanently reducing or eliminating unemployment within the State or any part thereof;

“To investigate and consider proposals for the productive development of the lands of the State;

“To investigate and consider proposals for the productive development of the mineral resources of the State.”

Those are more or less the same provisions that appear in the Bill before us. What is to happen to the Bureau of Industry? What is to happen to the committees set up under that Act and their duties? This Act provided for the following committees and their duties:—

The Rural Development Committee, whose duties shall be to advise the Bureau on matters concerning the productive development of the lands of the State other than road construction;

The roads, mining, and general works committee, whose duties shall be to advise the Bureau on matters concerning the productive development of the mineral resources of the State, new public works, including road construction, manufacturing, building, and general trade activities and expansion.

Is not the rural development committee established under the Bureau of Industry Act of 1932 in existence?

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: My word it is, and doing very fine work, too.

Mr. NICKLIN: What is to happen to this committee under the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Bill—to give it its short title? Is that committee to operate? Is it to continue its activities with the committee set up under this Bill or is it to be scrapped? We are entitled to know these things. We are entitled to know what is to happen to the roads, mining, and general works committee, whose duties were to advise the Bureau on matters concerning the productive development of the mineral resources of the State. Is this committee in existence to-day? Is there to be a duplication of committees?

The administrative, finance, and industrial committee had its various duties. Most of the powers provided under this Bill are already on the statute-book. So far as I can see, there will be a considerable amount of duplication unless the intention is to scrap all

existing legislation and committees in favour of the committees to be appointed under the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Bill.

We now move to the next big noise in the legislation introduced by the present Government—the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act of 1938. This Act, also, was notable for the employment miracles it was to perform. Actually, it has done nothing except provide for the supervision of works carried out by the Government and local bodies, which cover about 5 per cent. of total employment. Its provisions include—

“The creating of additional means or methods of employment generally;

“The progressive restoration of persons in part-time employment to the status of full-time employment on full-time wages;

“The maintaining of persons in full-time employment on full-time wages;

“The evolving of schemes for providing employment and/or improving the general economic welfare of the State.”

That is the third Bill, and the Bill before us is the fourth measure—with exactly the same objective. Why the necessity for all this duplication of legislation? As I have said previously, we have this legislation on the statute-book, and to-night we are putting on the book legislation that provides for exactly the same thing as previous Acts have provided for. In addition to the co-ordination and the co-operation and all the other -ations, are we now to have duplication? The Committee is entitled to know, and I hope the Minister will be able to explain it satisfactorily to hon. members.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: If you look up a dictionary you will see the difference between duplication and co-ordination.

Mr. NICKLIN: There is no need for me to look up a dictionary to ascertain that; I am well aware of the difference. I am endeavouring to ascertain if there is to be any duplication by reason of the operations of this Bill. Is it superfluous legislation to do the job already provided for by previous Acts?

A comparison of the Bill with the measures I have quoted will disclose that great slabs of those Acts have been taken out and inserted in this Bill with very little alteration. The only alterations are in the numbers on the proposed committees, but the duties attaching to those bodies are more or less the same. There is a considerable amount of repetition of previous legislation in this Bill.

The point I wish to emphasise is that Bills of this nature, under which all these boards and committees are constituted, will not do one iota of good unless the boards operate effectively along the lines upon which they were designed to operate. We have committees under the Bureau of Industry Act and other Acts, all carrying out virtually the same work as that proposed for the committees to be appointed under the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Bill. We are all

entitled to know whether these other committees are to go out of existence and the whole of the work of the co-ordination of employment, the investigation of the avenues of employment, and consideration of post-war problems that this legislation is designed to attack is going to be carried out by these proposed new committees.

It is only wise and good business to co-ordinate the activities of the various constructional departments, but it would seem that the Government have overlooked the fact that the State provides only about 5 per cent. of the total employment in this State, the other 95 per cent. being provided by private enterprise. If we are to achieve maximum employment in Queensland, we shall have to encourage private enterprise and public companies to establish here industries that will provide the employment which is desirable. Up to the present, the Government have given no great consideration or encouragement to private industry in this State, and it is high time they considered whether, instead of introducing duplicate legislation such as the Bill we are now discussing, it would not be better to revise existing legislation with a view to giving encouragement to the establishment of some solid secondary industries that will provide that employment that is essential.

When introducing the Bill, the Minister made repeated references to the provision of employment for those members of the Commonwealth Military, Naval, and Air Forces who will return to this State after the war. I notice brief mention of these forces in the preamble of the Bill, but the Bill contains nothing to indicate that the Government will give any measure of preference to those members of our Military, Naval, and Air Forces when they return and are available to take up civil positions in this State again. I do not know whether it is a matter that the Minister has overlooked, but to me it is particularly important.

Mr. Collins: It is very important that everybody should be found a job.

Mr. NICKLIN: It is important that everybody should be found a job, but I think it is more important that some measure of preference should be given to returned soldiers.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: The State Employment Council will determine that matter and recommend accordingly.

Mr. NICKLIN: I do not think it should be a function of the council, and I think it should be stated definitely in this Bill so that there will be no argument about it. All things being equal, returned soldiers or returned men of our fighting forces are entitled to a measure of preference. I think that such a provision should be included in the measure when it is passing through the House.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: Would you suggest some consideration for the thousands of munition workers? Would you let them starve?

Mr. NICKLIN: No, they could take their chances.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: They are just as essential as those who go overseas.

Mr. NICKLIN: The Minister says that munition workers should have the same right of preference.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: I did not say that. I asked you if you would not give a measure of preference to munition and other war workers?

Mr. NICKLIN: A measure of preference, but not the same preference as to returned soldiers. I would give absolute preference to men of the fighting forces.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: But the other men are just as essential?

Mr. NICKLIN: Yes, but they are not taking the same risks. Let us compare the returned man with the munition worker. In the first place, the risk of life cannot be compared, as the munition worker takes comparatively no risk at all, but the soldier, who is getting 6s. a day, risks his life every second of the time he is on active service. No, I say emphatically that returned soldiers are entitled to preference, and I am rather surprised that the Minister has not made some provision in this regard in the Bill. I think that it has been an oversight, and before the Bill completes its course through this House I hope he will accept an amendment to be moved by the Opposition, giving returned members of the fighting forces the preference to which they are justly entitled as a result of their services.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: If you study the Bill you will find that the necessary powers are there to allow the council to do that.

Mr. NICKLIN: The necessary powers may be there, but I wish to make absolutely certain—

Mr. Mann: Making political capital out of the returned soldiers?

Mr. NICKLIN: I am not making political capital. Preference to returned soldiers was recognised by the Australian nation after the last war, and if it was good enough for the soldiers of that war it is good enough for those of this.

A Government Member: Did you give it to them?

Mr. NICKLIN: Yes, we did.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to address the Chair.

The Secretary for Public Lands: What about the man who is prevented from enlisting, who is working in the munition works?

Mr. NICKLIN: Has he not got a flying start?

The Secretary for Public Lands: He might have desired to enlist.

1941—3 I

Mr. NICKLIN: But he is not in the same position as the man who is actually serving overseas. The men in industry here are trained men, whereas those fighting abroad may have sacrificed their careers, and by reason of their service overseas have to start life all over again when they come back.

In view of that fact alone he is entitled to a measure of preference, and I hope the Government will do what they did for the soldiers in the last war—that is, to extend some measure of preference to the fighting forces on this occasion.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: That is your main concern, that they should get jobs.

Mr. NICKLIN: I am very emphatic about it, and we in Opposition shall be happy to help the Government all we can in this respect.

In conclusion, I want to say that the Bill is a rehash of existing legislation and that the various bodies to be set up under the Bill either exist now or may be created with similar powers under existing legislation. I have already said that the Bill consists of sections of existing Acts almost word for word, and that those sections were designed with the same objective as this. What we want is action and not words, and I hope the Bill is not put forward for political propaganda purposes, that it will be put into operation, and that a practical attempt will be made to tackle the problem it was designed to solve.

Mr. THEODORE (Herbert) (9.17 p.m.): I desire to compliment the Minister upon the tremendous effort and deep thought he has given to the Bill and his thorough explanation of it. It must be realised by all that in the very near future we shall be called upon to place in work the men who return from the fighting fronts. Already we know of men who have returned and have had to wait a considerable time before they were placed in civil employment again, and that drives home very forcibly an idea of the position that will be created when men return in greater numbers, and of the position that will be created upon the conclusion of hostilities when a tremendous number of people will suddenly be thrown out of work by the closing down of munition factories and a large number of soldiers and other people engaged in war work are clamouring for peacetime jobs again. The Bill is an honest attempt to cope with the problem that must be faced. As the Minister has explained, the Bill provides machinery that may be improved as circumstances warrant, but for the time being it will be capable of doing an efficient service in placing a large number of men in employment, which would not be feasible without the measure.

One of the fundamental principles of the Australian Labour Party is the right to work, and the Labour Party has always voiced its determination that any man who is willing to work should have the opportunity to do so. It is introduced with that object in view. The long experience this and

other Labour Governments have had throughout the length and breadth of Australia is causing them to go further than they have ever attempted before in order to take what will result in a wonderful step in the progress of the Labour movement in this State. Someone must be held responsible if men are denied the right to work. We must not evade our responsibility. We recognise we have that responsibility. Therefore, no-one can condemn the Government for attempting, as far as is humanly possible, to set up machinery—particularly in circumstances as we are faced with to-day—in order that every possible avenue will be examined to place men in employment.

I, as well as all other hon. members, recognise the tremendous difficulty of establishing works to place men in continuous employment. In common with other hon. members, I have had representations made to me that I approach the Government for loan money to carry out public works in my electorate. We have been unable to get that money because it is earmarked for war purposes. For the moment, money for any other purpose than that connected with the war effort must be set aside. There is work for us to do in this State, but the trouble is that we cannot get the money. It is with the object of investigating all those possibilities and avenues associated with public works that this Bill has been drafted. At the present time it is all-important that everything that can be done in order to see that the greatest possible impetus is given to our war effort to make the result of the war satisfactory so that democracy will prevail must be done. There is nothing wrong, however, in the steps being taken as outlined by the provisions of the Bill and the Minister himself—that is, in making provision to anticipate the time when we shall be able to cope with the position that must arise. If we do not do so disaster will result. We cannot evade our post-war responsibilities. If we do we must face a disaster almost as great as we are facing to-day. We must set up machinery now to overcome all the difficulties post-war problems will bring in their train. It is a tremendous task and the Government are desirous of using whatever money is available to establish governmental works that will at some future time achieve the object of this Bill, and at the same time not result in waste of money.

The Leader of the Opposition's main objection to the Bill was its title, which indicates that he had no serious objection to its contents.

As to the point made by the Leader of the Opposition that the Bill does not make provision for returned soldiers, I maintain that the Bill visualises that the Government will be able to provide all the people with employment. The Government recognise their duty, not only to returned soldiers, but to all our people. I do not want to see the conditions prevail at the conclusion of this war that prevailed after the last war. I remember how the youth of this country were situated after the last war, and I do not wish to see again some spectacles I saw

after the last war. In thickly-populated parts of Melbourne large numbers of young boys whose ages ranged from 15 to 21 congregated every night in different parts of the streets and were a menace to the people. They never knew what work was and when they were presented with an opportunity for work they did not want it—they did not realise they were intended for anything more useful than idling their time away on street corners. The Bill provides for the prevention of that state of affairs after this war. If it is impossible to find employment for our youths immediately they leave school the boys will be taken charge of and taught some useful occupation.

In spite of the criticism of this Bill by the Leader of the Opposition I contend it is a very laudable one and the Minister is to be highly commended for it.

Over the years the Labour Party has been confronted with many problems that it has satisfactorily overcome. As recently as 30 years ago miners were working under dangerous conditions, and where a man got killed or so badly injured that he was unable to work any longer as breadwinner for the family his widow or wife had to fight the insurance company for compensation. Labour Governments have altered all that; they have laid it down that it is the right of the worker to be protected from the conditions that existed in those days. Just as a Labour Government have been able to improve the conditions to the extent that we see in so many instances, and altered the hours and general conditions under which workers live, so we say it is possible that we shall be able to set up conditions that will eventually, at any rate, provide the employment to which the workers are entitled.

One of the great problems confronting the Government in carrying out their aims and objects as contained in this Bill is the necessity of co-operation of the Federal Government in order to finance the undertakings that may be recommended by the State Employment Council and its committees. Certain people opposed to the principles and ideals of the Labour Party will, naturally, oppose any attempt to raise large sums of money for the purpose of placing men in our State in peace-time employment. We expect that, but notwithstanding any antagonism shown by the Opposition to the obtaining of the money, the determination of the Government, in co-operation with the Federal Labour Government, will ensure the success of the scheme outlined by the Minister.

The hon. gentleman is to be commended, too, in that although in the first place the Bill visualises the co-operation and co-ordination of the different bodies it is capable of greater expansion and possibilities than the hon. gentleman has outlined. I have very much pleasure in commending the Bill.

Mr. MOORHOUSE (Windsor) (9.33 p.m.): I really believe that the Minister is sincere in his belief that this Bill will solve the unemployment problem. I have searched through the Bill and failed to see anything

that indicates where these jobs are to come from. I expected the Bill to tell the people of Queensland where the jobs are to come from that will be necessary at the conclusion of the war when all those engaged in war work and on active service are released from those occupations. We should plan to-day, as this Bill is supposed to do, and not wait until the war is over.

Mr. Collins: That is the reason for bringing it down.

Mr. MOORHOUSE: If hon. members will listen they will hear something to their advantage. I should like to have seen women on these committees. They are capable.

The Premier: There is no reason why they should not be.

Mr. MOORHOUSE: Hear, hear! I am glad to hear that.

The Premier: A woman is not excluded. When the Bill says "man" it means "woman" also. One is the counterpart of the other.

Mr. MOORHOUSE: There has been evidence that women are capable of taking their places alongside men and I expected that in this Bill there would have been some provision under which after this war women who go into industry would be paid the same wages as the men employed in that industry if they do the same class of work. I sincerely hope that that principle will be applied under the Bill.

I heard the Minister say that the Government alone could not solve the problem of unemployment. I am not quite sure whether he is sincere in that, because I did expect to find in this Bill a provision that production should be for use and not for profit. If production is for use and not for profit, then there is employment for all, and it will solve all the unemployment problems of the whole of Queensland. What is more, I noticed in the "Telegraph" of 29 November that the Queensland Employers' Federation would co-operate to the full in any scheme that aims at solving the unemployment problem. The president made that statement when commenting on the Co-ordination of Employment Facilities Bill.

We have heard it stated that private enterprise provides something like 95 per cent. of the employment in Queensland. That being so, if the Government introduce legislation that will cause production to be for use and not for profit, they must receive the support of the Queensland Employers' Federation, and I shall support any genuine effort by the Government to introduce legislation of that nature. In the meantime, I support the Bill in the hope that the Government will introduce legislation along the lines suggested by me.

Mr. DECKER (Sandgate) (9.38 p.m.): I support the remarks of our leader, and I go further and say that this Bill is the beginning of a change to Socialism. If this Bill is put into operation in the way in which it is intended, then we have reached the much-talked-about New Order already,

without knowing what the outcome of the war will mean to us.

Mr. Devries: You will be opposed to that.

Mr. DECKER: I am not opposed to the Bill as a Bill.

Mr. Devries: But you would be opposed to the socialisation of industry?

Mr. DECKER: If the hon. member will listen, I should like to say that if the Bill is carried out as it is designed, then the boards that it is proposed to set up are going to solve a problem that the world has not been able to solve—the problem of unemployment.

Mr. Collins: You say that it is impossible of solution, do you?

Mr. DECKER: Yes, and with reason. I go further, and say that if the intention outlined by the Minister when introducing this Bill is really to force all owners of businesses to co-operate with the Government under threat of having their businesses taken over by the Government if they do not co-operate, and power to do this is given to the boards and committees, then the Minister has lost sight of the fact that we are a separate State in the Commonwealth. I venture the opinion that if the Government attack private enterprise in any way, in an endeavour to force this scheme on the people, private enterprise still has the right to move its capital and business to other States, and it will do it.

Mr. Collins: Where did you find that in the Bill?

Mr. DECKER: The Minister said it himself in his speech. There are several points we must not overlook. One is that no State can embark on post-war planning on its own.

Mr. Turner: We have led in other things.

Mr. DECKER: It does not matter how we try to lead, the fact remains that we are bound by what the Commonwealth will do and what other nations of the world want us and allow us to do. This is a world-wide problem. Post-war planning can be carried out to a certain extent. We already have the machinery by which that can be done, if it is used sensibly. I say that the State would be taking the wrong attitude to endeavour to take the lead and not to recognise the problem as a national one. We should undoubtedly come to the point when we should make such a success of the Bill we have before us that it will become our ruin. That ruin would come about in this way: If this State persists in its post-war planning scheme and puts it into operation without the co-operation of the other States and the Commonwealth, and we progress and prosper, then we shall attract the unemployed from the other States of the Commonwealth by the better conditions that exist here; it is only natural to suppose that they would come under those conditions. We might make a success of our scheme, but unless we have the co-operation of the other States, we shall

have the unemployed of the Commonwealth coming here to enjoy the benefits of this Bill, a state of affairs that would wreck the system.

Mr. Riordan: If you could give them work it would be a good thing.

Mr. DECKER: If this does create an influx of people to Queensland—

The Premier: This country can carry a very large population.

Mr. DECKER: Granted, and it is on those lines I wish to argue. Supposing we did have a very successful planning so as to attract others, we have then another problem to face. Supposing our plans were made well ahead to provide for the absorption of the increased numbers of unemployed, what are we going to produce? If we produce to the extent of the employment we have given, are we to get rid of the things produced? We cannot hope with a big increase in population to employ every man in our land in profitable employment unless we have the opportunities of exporting some of the things we produce. We depend on export to other countries. There must be exports. It is in this direction that we should work and plan ahead. Do not let us allow ourselves to be put in a groove by doing a wonderful thing in bringing down this Bill—a Bill which gives the lead and enables us to do our own planning—which is the first of its kind to be introduced. I think it is a measure that is ahead of itself. I know that it really means co-ordination, but the powers granted to the boards established under it are excessive. Under careful management we should have no fear of overstepping the mark, but I am afraid that we are reaching the stage at which we might not be guided as carefully as we should be. If this measure was put into the hands of somebody possessing socialistic or communistic ideas, we should be in a dangerous position indeed. The position has to be handled skilfully and carefully. Russia could operate a measure of this kind because its people would not be allowed to leave the country and others would not be permitted to come in. I say again that we must remember we are a State and we cannot preclude people from stepping over State boundaries.

I think we have adopted the wrong idea, not so much in the Bill as by the way the Bill was introduced to the House by the Minister. I say that it is extreme in its way of production and in its way of building up a certain Utopia.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: What is extreme?

Mr. DECKER: The way in which the Bill has been delivered to the Chamber by the Minister.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: You are suggesting that the right to work for our people is extreme?

Mr. DECKER: No, that principle is sound and we have no objection to its inclusion in the Bill. What we are anxious about is to see that we do not destroy our

State and that we do not force the resources of this State into the other States where the Governments have given more careful consideration to planning in co-operation with the rest of Australia and in accordance with a general scheme. We are too hasty in thinking that we can cure this evil merely by bringing in a Bill. With this machinery we can do a certain amount of planning under the guidance of the Commonwealth, acting in co-operation with all the States, and co-operating with Great Britain and the other nations of the world. Then we are in order and can do some planning, but, in my opinion, the Bill is only propaganda. It is unworkable in one unit of the Commonwealth, such as the State of Queensland, and nothing can be achieved unless the scheme embraces the whole of the Commonwealth and is carried out by co-ordinating the services of the other parts of the Empire.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, Mackay) (9.47 p.m.): I listened very carefully to the hon. member for Sandgate, as I did to all other hon. members who have spoken, and it would appear to me that before the problem of re-employment is ever really dealt with it is necessary to get the right outlook upon society. What is employment? What function does man perform in modern society and what are to be his aims and objects in life? The problem of unemployment, or re-employment as I prefer to term it, cannot be dealt with by the Bill alone, nor can it be dealt with by the multiplication of boards that may or may not be established. In the building of any edifice it is necessary to have plant and material and in the case of the Bill we must have the committees—that is, the plant—in order to do the work it is proposed to do; but transcending all that there must be a complete national urge to do things. The Government will fail if they act without the co-operation of the people. Government is by consent and the incentive of leadership can be given by the Government if the people are willing to take that lead and hold it as an object in life.

The hon. member for Sandgate appears to be considerably worried about private enterprise and its future, but there is nothing in the nature of a Divine revelation in the term "private enterprise." To the extent that there is unemployment and to the extent that there is undeserved poverty, the system of private enterprise has failed. I am referring to conditions in which men, capable of working and willing to work, cannot find work. First of all there is the responsibility of the individual; there is always a danger of overlooking that. Every creature, biologically, has to seek his own livelihood. Nature is there with her vast storehouse and vast array of raw material, which can be converted by mankind to his own use.

It is the law of nature that man must earn his living. Therefore, he must show enterprise, he must show fortitude, he must show that he is willing to work and strive towards an individual and collective objective. If we are going to fight this war—and the world is full of horror to-day—

and it is going to mean merely a continuation of all the things that existed in the past, I ask quite candidly: is it worth while? If we are going to have poverty again in the world such as I have seen in many countries, and if that problem is not going to be tackled resolutely, then hundreds of thousands of heroic souls will have perished in vain. We must be prepared to test and examine. We must test and examine many principles we have espoused, which sometimes have turned out to be mere shibboleths. An institution is not obsolete because it has existed for a number of years. Age is not necessarily the test, either. Any institution is capable of being changed when confronted with new demands and new needs by the populace, and the standards of a nation at any given time must be established for the people who live during that time, and they must be established to meet their genius and general needs; otherwise there is no progress. Simply to talk about private enterprise or anything of that kind as being unchangeable, like the law of gravity, is merely begging the question. We must face the problem of man's place in the universe, what we must do to save man, what we must do to establish a virile progressive nation in which the right to work will be recognised, and in which those who work will have security and the means of earning their livelihood. Just as when you go into virgin scrub you have to do very hard work to clear and stump it and till the soil before the fruits of the earth can be obtained, so in the economic fabric of society you cannot look for dividends, either in private enterprise or in the nations striving for a new objective, unless you are willing to endure. You must be prepared to make sacrifices for an objective.

As a matter of fact, one of the greatest characteristics of a man is his capacity for sacrifice for an ideal that is worth while. He must test out his objective, work for it, strive for it, and make all the sacrifices that are necessary to win it by an unrelenting pursuit of that objective, through good or bad, through dull or bright days. If any hon. member thinks that the world, as it is to-day, is going to be satisfied after the war with mere economic patchwork, as existed in the past, then the country will have less and mankind will have less in the future. I believe mankind has a place in this universe and that it is a high place.

I believe that men have a destiny to work out, but they must work out their own salvation; they cannot sit down and expect it to be accomplished by leaning on other people or expect other people to do for them what it is their duty to do for themselves. But, just as in nature, the individual must strive to survive; so there is the principle of mutual aid in nature. You see how people build hospitals and are compassionate and helpful to the sick or injured. All those things are the development of mutual aid—co-operation with the forces of nature. And men can co-operate together to achieve that objective. If you can get millions to work together in an army for the purpose of fighting a battle—

calling forth all the terrorism that such a battle means, calling forth all the sacrifice, the organising ability, and skill that the winning of such a battle means—surely, if that can be done in times of war, is it going to be argued that the principle of collective security is going to be abandoned at the end of the war? As individuals, are we to start going back on our tracks, each seeking his own gain, everybody for himself and the devil take the hindmost? Is that going to be the principle?

I say that this Bill is an endeavour to lay down a basis or a structure which will be useful in building up a new edifice—a new order of society. The old order of society has failed; the old system of seeking private profit has failed. Man, in his highest aspirations, does not seek private property; he merely seeks security, and he also seeks to take part with his fellows in the things in life that matter. And I believe the future of civilisation depends entirely on the extent to which the nation seeks collective security, works together for a national objective, that chief objective being the abolition of undeserved poverty and everything that that means. The problem is moral as well as economic.

It has been asked, "Am I my brother's keeper?" What is the answer to that? The answer is that in organised society we must help one another. Man cannot live in isolation nowadays; he can only live as part of organised society, otherwise he becomes a hermit, a beachcomber, a recluse—whatever title you prefer. The days of splendid isolation have gone, and society can only be built up and improved to the extent that we are prepared to work with one another. Just as an army is organised into various units—infantry, artillery, mechanised cavalry—and a navy into battleships, cruiser squadrons, destroyer flotillas, and so on, all with directing brains behind them, so must we look at the problems of society.

Mr. Macdonald: There will always be Ishmaelites.

The PREMIER: Is the future of society to be determined by Ishmaelites? That is the problem. There will always be good and evil. As a matter of fact, good and evil are always rampant in the world. There are natural good and natural evil, and there are acquired good and acquired evil.

We all know that in regard to habits, which are acquired. We all know, if we study the forces of nature, the problem of weeds, and the other things that grow much easier than good, useful, and beautiful plants. Then we have the problem of the individual living in a bad environment. If his environment can be improved, so can his character. Just as the muscles of the body can be strengthened and improved by proper exercises, so can the character of a man be improved by mental processes, by doing good and working in harmony with modern society.

This Bill is no cheapjack measure. There is no propaganda in it, but there is an earnest endeavour to assemble the plant that will be

necessary in any decent new order that comes to us after the war. There will have to be a reorientation of the ideas of us all. There will have to be reorientation of the forms of government. The place of the Commonwealth, the Constitution, and all other things of like nature have to be considered. In this Bill, within the powers we have, we are making an effort and a beginning. A beginning must be made somewhere. The beginning may be humble, but if there is sincerity of resolution and courage behind the beginning, it has a chance to succeed. If one simply wrings one's hands and says that nothing can be done, nothing will be done.

I believe that anything that a well-balanced mind can conceive as being possible is possible, and that is the attitude towards life that we must cultivate in this Parliament and with the people that we represent. We must have resolution equal to that which we demand from our soldiers. The problems of peace are greater than the problems of war, and civilisation has no future unless we win the peace. Let us resolve together to win the peace as well as the war.

Mr. NIMMO (Oxley) (10.3 p.m.): I listened very carefully to the Minister when introducing the Bill. He made a marathon effort. It was really a propaganda speech, and running through my mind was the thought that Germany had adopted the policy of propaganda, and I could not get out of my mind that element when the speech was being put over. This evening the hon. gentleman made another lengthy speech, enumerating all that Labour had done. He spoke of the milestones leading to better conditions, but it was purely words.

I found missing from the hon. gentleman's list workers' compensation. He did not say that Labour was responsible for that, nor did he mention workers' dwellings, old-age pensions, or the introduction of industrial courts and wages boards. He could not include these things in his list because Labour had not done these things, and they are the important things to the workers.

The Secretary for Public Lands: Labour forced their introduction.

Mr. NIMMO: The Bill under discussion is merely a sop to all classes of workers, a suggestion that it will do something for them, for the unemployed men, the soldiers and sailors and their dependents, munition workers, women, and, last but not least, juveniles. But how are all these people to be put to work? How can anything be done in regard to positions for the youths? How can there be co-operation if one week there are prosecutions for certain breaches of awards, and the next the Government approach and ask them for co-operation? There has been no, shall I say, cultivation of the workers and employers in an endeavour to create additional employment.

I have gone very carefully through the Bill, and I find that a great number of committees are being formed. The thought that struck me was, "Who is going to pay these

committees and what wages are they going to be paid?" The Bill makes no mention of the remuneration. I find that the Governor in Council is going to establish a council to which will be appointed the Minister, the Director of Employment, the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, the Director of the Bureau of Industry, the Director of Education, two workers' representatives, two employers' representatives, a representative of the Brisbane City Council (not an alderman), and a representative of the military forces, and as many associate members as the Government desire.

In addition to that free employment exchanges are to be appointed immediately in all districts. They will comprise an employment officer, two workers' representatives, one employers' representative, and one local authority representative. Twenty of these boards will be appointed throughout Queensland, and the Government can appoint as many associate members as they like. Who is going to pay for all this?

Mr. Turner: What does it matter so long as they achieve their objective?

Mr. NIMMO: Can they achieve their objective? The Premier came along here with a great scheme under the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works by which work was going to be provided for everyone. Is all the machinery under that scheme to be scrapped, or is it to be incorporated in this?

The Secretary for Public Lands: It has been a very useful organisation in the war effort.

Mr. NIMMO: But why have such a multiplicity of boards and councils?

The Secretary for Public Lands: It is strange that the Commonwealth has to adopt the co-ordination policy and follow this Government.

Mr. NIMMO: What we really require instead of all this co-ordination and work that is going on is something for the good of the country, something that will really create employment, something that will get industries to work in this State. Industry is not working in this State and never has done so since the advent of the Labour Government.

Mr. Devries: What about the woollen mills?

Mr. NIMMO: There have been isolated instances, but they have been very isolated. We have not made the progress in secondary industries in this State that they have made in other States. The Premier has told us that Queensland is too far from the centre of population for the establishment of secondary industries, that in other States they have the population at their door, but I have pointed out that that makes no difference, and if we can produce the goods there is always a market for them. At present we have the spectacle of household requirements and little gadgets being made in the South and brought up here for sale.

There are some wonderful suggestions in the Bill. The ideas contained in it are good, but one can hear words until one is sick of them. The Premier comes along with wonderful ideas. We listen to him and feel satisfied that he is on the right track, but after all they have been only words; nothing ever comes of them. We never tackle the basis of the thing.

Mr. Devries: Who are "we"?

Mr. NIMMO: Parliament. All industries in Queensland should be placed on the same footing as industries operating in all the other States. If that was done we might get somewhere.

Mr. Collins: Why not go back to the worst wages in the world? Then you would get somewhere.

Mr. NIMMO: No-one is talking about going back to the worst wages in the world. I contend that no industry will be established in this State so long as the taxation to be levied from it is greater than that paid by any industry in any other State of the Commonwealth. By placing industry here on the same basis as industries operating in the other States, the Government will do more good than they can hope to do by any co-ordinating Bill they bring forward. For instance, the total number of workers on their own account and employees in this State is 382,000, according to the latest figures available.

The estimate of the number of construction workers depending upon expenditure from Government loans, Commonwealth, State, and local bodies, main roads, and State development tax is 20,000, and the percentage is 5 per cent. Hon. members can see the gap, and they can see that 95 per cent. of employment has to be found by private enterprise. Unless that is found we shall not get anywhere by this Bill. We shall not get anywhere unless, as the hon. member for Windsor suggested, we go in for a communistic system of government straightaway. This Bill, when read carefully, would be an ideal measure under the communistic system of government. You could provide work for everybody under that system, but, as the Premier pointed out in this House, we have only one money pool in the Commonwealth, and it is from that pool that we can employ our people.

Mr. Theodore: Your idea is to employ some of the people and let the others starve?

Mr. NIMMO: I say that we should develop the country and encourage secondary industries to come to Queensland. We should be manufacturing many of the things we are importing to-day.

There is no question that the Labour Party has obtained power in this State by always preaching the pernicious doctrine of class hatred, and if we go in for that policy how can we expect to get the co-operation sought under this Bill? I tell the Premier to-night that he must tackle the problem immediately in the right way.

A commission is inquiring into the rate of company taxation operating in this State, a commission that drew £1,000 last year, and for which £250 is provided in this year's Estimates. We have seen no report yet, although the commission has been sitting for quite a long time. Surely to goodness it is time something was said as to the lines along which we can employ our people and encourage businesses to come here. We have a wonderful State in Queensland; we possess a wonderful climate for the manufacture of goods. In fact, everything is right, but we do not get the manufactures.

Mr. Moore: Not enough profit?

Mr. NIMMO: Profit does not count. If the hon. member for Merthyr proposed starting in industry he would start in Victoria where he would pay less taxation, notwithstanding what he represents here.

Mr. Moore interjected.

Mr. NIMMO: That does not come into the picture. We should work on the basis that we do not handicap our industries by having higher taxation imposed upon companies than the rate in Southern States. That matter is linked with the Bill. It is all very well to have wonderful ideas and ask companies to co-operate with each other and with the Government in the finding of jobs. When all is said and done, how futile the whole thing is! The Government cannot employ every man in the State, and, as a matter of fact, I have always contended that the more the Government employ the harder they make it for ordinary industry to find employment for people. You can impose heavy taxation and get a large number of men employed by the Government, but secondary industry has to carry the baby. That is what it amounts to, and we have to face that position as quickly as we can.

The Juvenile Employment Bureau is a wonderful idea, but how far did we get with the old Juvenile Employment Bureau?

The Government published figures to show that they have found so many jobs for boys, whereas the majority of the boys had to find the jobs themselves. On many occasions I rang Mr. Hall and asked him if he could find employment for a boy whose parents had waited on me in my electorate and Mr. Hall told me that the only way to do it was for the boy to locate the job himself and then come along.

Mr. Turner: That is a long time ago.

Mr. NIMMO: It is operating to-day.

Mr. Turner: It is not operating to-day because you cannot get boys now.

Mr. NIMMO: The hon. member is speaking of the war situation, which has created a shortage, whereas I am speaking of normal times. Mr. Hall said that the boy would have to get the job for himself and then he would have to be registered through the apprenticeship committee. The Government took credit in their own figures for every one of those boys who were thus provided with employment. Then we had an

apprenticeship scheme that widened the other scheme and it is true that it did get a certain number of jobs for boys and girls, but how many good boys were debarred from getting jobs because they were not on the Government's list? There were only a certain number of jobs available and if the Government made a drive to get jobs for a number of the boys it meant that a number of other boys were deprived of that opportunity.

This Bill is a bundle of pious hopes. There is to be a committee for each group or calling in industry or groups of trades or callings. Each committee is to consist of a chairman of the Juvenile Employment Bureau with equal representatives from employers and industrial unions or employees. The Minister is to decide how many from each. They can do nothing but advise and make suggestions.

The Secretary for Labour and Industry: What do you suggest?

Mr. NIMMO: I suggest that the State Employment Council should be allowed to carry out the suggestions. Why have the duplication? Why have a State Employment Council and then have a Juvenile Employment Bureau consisting of one person appointed by the Government as chairman, four others appointed by the Government, one representative of the Department of Public Instruction, two workers' representatives, and two employers' representatives? The Juvenile Employment Bureau is supposed to do the job, but then the Government appoint other committees, although all the committees can do is to make suggestions and send them to the bureau. It is all duplication and purely propaganda. I hope the Bill will be a success, but anyone who reads it calmly and dispassionately must recognise that there is no possible hope of achieving the objective set out by the Minister. I should like to see a great deal less propaganda and more action. Unless we can have more action and encouragement for private enterprise, we cannot go ahead with the job.

Mr. PIE (Hamilton) (10.19 p.m.): I do not intend to delay the House longer than is necessary but I feel very keenly the attitude of certain hon. members on this side of the House who apparently do not know what they are talking about. I do not know anything about existing legislation on the subject, but I know that if the Bill is put into operation and administered sincerely it will be a step in the right direction and if co-operation is freely offered to the Government by both employer and employee nothing but success will result from the measure.

The Minister said in the course of his speech that it was the desire of the Government to co-operate with the Federal Government. To this statement the hon. member for Oxley said "Hooey!" That statement is a disgrace to any manufacturer in Queensland. He is a director of a Queensland woollen mill here.

Mr. Nimmo: What is the statement?

Mr. PIE: "Hooey"! You made that statement in this House in reply to an intelligent speech on this Bill.

Mr. Nimmo: You have your opinion and I have mine. You talk about your own business. You are only out for propaganda.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PIE: Any hon. member who makes such an interjection on an intelligent speech has no right to be in this House.

Mr. Nimmo: You will go out at the next election.

Mr. PIE: I am not worried about the next election, as you are. I came into this House to do a job, and I am doing my best.

Mr. Nimmo: You are certainly doing your best.

Mr. PIE: It has been said that this Bill entailed a good deal of work. I can subscribe to that statement, as I spent the week-end studying it. There is a lot of good in the Bill, and after it is put into operation it must redound to the good of all concerned. It does want action to implement it, and I hope the Minister will implement it with the action that is necessary, and that the Government will co-operate fully.

The Minister mentioned that there has been an improved trend in employment. I agree that there has been an improvement, but I am not satisfied with that improvement in comparison with other States. No-one who is sincere can say that improvement is sufficient for this State. We must have a greater upward trend in that improvement. That upward trend can be obtained by a Bill of this nature which will bring about co-operation between all parties. The Minister mentioned a report that appeared in the "Telegraph." I was pleased to see it. It is the first time the Commonwealth Government have realised that Queensland is to be an important factor in the future development of Australia. It stated—

"The report deals mainly with Queensland, which is described as a State with greater potentialities than any other State in the Commonwealth, even South Australia, if any attempt was made to organise those potentialities."

Does not that prove we have a State of great possibilities? The Commonwealth has realised that for the first time. In my opinion, with that vision, this Bill is ideal. If that is done, this State can be made the greatest State in the Commonwealth, both from a primary and industrial point of view, because we have all the natural facilities available.

I was very impressed by the mention of the question of returned soldiers. No-one in this House will disagree with returned soldiers getting preference after this war on an equal basis. Any returned soldier must accept preference on an equal basis with anyone else.

Mr. Massey: Preference on an equal basis?

Mr. PIE: Preference on an equal basis with what he can do. There is no use in putting a carpenter into a plumber's job, or vice versa. If two men, a returned soldier and a non-soldier, possessing equal ability apply for a job, then the returned soldier must get the preference every time. The Minister should issue a list for the benefit of all hon. members of the order of preference that will prevail after this war. That would give us some idea of the preference every man serving our great Commonwealth will receive on his return from the war.

The hon. member for Sandgate said that we were leading the way industrially with the introduction of this Bill; that we were doing too much, and that we are getting too far ahead of the other States. That is wrong. Practically every State in the Commonwealth, including South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania, and New South Wales—I have the reports of what each is doing—is doing everything possible to develop secondary industries. Is it not right that Queensland with her vast potentialities should do the same.

The sincerity of the Minister in bringing forward the Bill was marked. The speech of the Premier was an inspiration to me if it was not to anyone else, and I make the suggestion that speeches of this quality should be printed and distributed among the community.

Now, we come to the question of the notes I made over the week-end, and, for the information of the hon. member for Maree, every note I make is my own.

It was stated by Mr. Duff-Cooper, the British Minister who was out here, that the Australians are an exceptionally adaptable people, and that if the progress made here in munition production was better known, it would astonish the world. In my opinion, that is a truly remarkable statement, coming from an Englishman, and one of which we, as Australians, may be justly proud. Surely, we are entitled to ask, "Why is that progress not broadcast throughout the world and in Australia in particular?" Why are we not kept in touch with and intelligently informed regarding the amazing progress, development, and adaptability of the people that has taken place throughout Australia in secondary industry?

Our Federal Government must be made to realise that these important factors must be publicised so as to cheer and inspire our Australian people—particularly when we have had disasters such as we have had in the last few days—and they must be publicised to inspire the men overseas and make them realise that Australian factories and workshops are producing for them the weapons and equipment that we all know they desperately need and are necessary for ultimate victory.

We might ask, and rightly so: what are these outstanding achievements? As far as munitions are concerned, the first is undoubtedly the production of air-craft and air-engines on mass-production lines, and within a brief period of two years we shall,

this year, manufacture £20,000,000 worth of planes. There has also been great development in the machine-tool industry, in the manufacture of the Bren gun, range-finders, fuse-setting machines, mechanical transport, bridging pontoons, portable bridges, rifles, equipment, parachutes, radio equipment, Vickers guns, explosives, anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns, mortars, armoured fighting vehicles, and prismatic compasses. All these are entirely new to Australian manufacture, and all must agree that it has been a magnificent achievement.

Our textile industries must be acknowledged as making a remarkable effort, also. There is really nothing that, with proper machinery and properly trained labour, Australia cannot make. It is unfortunate that we find the British people are now shipping goods out to Australia. We, as textile manufacturers, in Australia are supplying a large percentage of the clothing needs of the troops in the Middle East, to the detriment of our civil production. It is wrong that British manufacturers should be in a position to supply our market as they do. We had a case in point recently where British blankets were retailed in Brisbane. I am sure the hon. member for Oxley, if he were here, would have been very upset to know that an English firm was taking away some of his civilian customers while his factory was engaged on military production. In my opinion, this must stop, for under no circumstances must Australian textile industries be robbed of their own Australian market. I have tried to bring clearly before all hon. members, on many occasions, the wonderful developments in Australia; but I have also stressed that Queensland is not sharing in this development.

Therefore, I welcome this Bill. It gives us the opportunity of getting a driving force, as the Premier has stated on more than one occasion, the putting into operation of something that we as employers, also the employees and all people, can look to for the development of our industries. I feel that the Bill will provide for and rectify all the past failures of not only the Government, but of employers.

I hope the special committees to be appointed will give some consideration to taxation. The hon. member for Oxley made it quite clear that taxation was a factor in development. I agree that it is. We ask also that we in Queensland should be on the same basis as Australia in regard to wages; for if we are to compete with the remainder of Australia it can be done only if we are virtually on the same basis, and therefore I again remind the Minister that we should take a long view, plan ahead, and give advantages to secondary industries whereby profits over an equitable return to shareholders, left in the business for proved development and increased employment, would be free from taxation.

The Premier: We are willing to do that.

Mr. PIE: What could be fairer than that? If that principle is put into operation, inasmuch as an employer does not wish to rob

his business of profits, development in this State will never look back, as secondary industries will be developed. I know employers generally here, and they want to co-operate with this Government and not retard it, as the hon. member for Oxley would make us believe. I also feel that many Southern people could be influenced to come here if these suggestions were put into effect. I do not want the House to think I am labouring this question: it is very important. As I have said previously, it has been exaggerated by a number of people, but once you take that objection from them there is no excuse for industries in this State not to develop.

The complete success or otherwise of this Bill will depend on the personnel selected for the various committees. The Minister has grave responsibilities and for the sake of Queensland I say he must not fail in his administration. I willingly offer my services and the services of half-a-dozen others to him to co-operate in any way from the employers' point of view to make a complete success of this Bill. In the interests of the State it must be made a success so that industry will be developed to such a degree as to be able to absorb in employment our soldiers and the large influx of industrial population that will surely come to this country after the war.

I fully realise that it will be impossible to begin immediately with the whole of this Bill and I do not think it wise to do so. I am pleased that provision has been made so that it will not be necessary to proclaim the whole of the Act on the same date. A beginning should be made on a small scale. We should profit from our mistakes and develop gradually.

The constitution of the council is excellent. It gives an all-round coverage. Taxation will be an important factor in the development of industry, and I suggest a responsible officer of the taxation department or a public accountant with taxation knowledge be co-opted for the purpose of advising when taxation matters are being considered.

I was very pleased to find that the workers' and employers' representatives were to be appointed for three years. This scheme cannot be brought to complete success in one or two years.

I was very interested also in the question of employment-placing agencies and the statement that the principle of the right to work should be put into effect as far as possible. It is interesting to note that there has come into being in England a policy called the national minimum, which contends that every citizen is entitled to all that is necessary to provide the essentials of a decent life. It must be stressed, however, that the right to work carries a responsibility and that the State has no inexhaustible treasury to guarantee security to all, and therefore employment and other rights must be worked for and earned. The State, to my mind, commences the programme outlined in the Bill, but should and must always remain the medium of co-operation between capital and labour.

Improved industrial relationship is important. I have stressed the fact many times in this Chamber and the time is opportune for repeating David Swing's statement that capital is condensed labour. It is nothing until labour takes hold of it. The living labour sets free the condensed labour and makes it assume some form of utility and beauty. Capital and labour are one and they will draw nearer to each other as the world advances in intellect and goodness. I firmly believe in the truth of this statement, and if this war does nothing else it will draw all classes of people closer together, giving each a broader outlook of one another's problems. War-time offers to me and others considerable opportunity for developing this relationship where the profit motive can be largely submerged in the patriotic.

I make the following suggestions for consideration by the Government in implementing this Bill:—

1. That during war periods the State Government, acting for the Federal Government, temporarily take over manufacturing businesses engaged in war production.

2. That the State Government immediately get in touch with the Federal Government and ascertain what important new industries can be commenced in this State. This information could be gained by an analysis of the present war production throughout Australia.

The Premier: Those proposals were all put up to the Commonwealth at the outbreak of war by the Premiers' Conference, and the Commonwealth Government, as then constituted, agreed to them, but that is the last we heard of them.

Mr. PIE: They were not put into operation. I want to see them put into operation. My third suggestion is—

3. That the State Government, in co-operation with the Federal Government, be prepared to finance such new industries.

This is being done on a large scale in Southern States. I have proof of cases in which the Federal Government have put in plant and machinery for Victorian and New South Wales industries. My next suggestion is—

4. That the managers and active directors in companies engaged in war industries be retained as Government war managers.

5. That labour in the form of employees give an assurance not to strike during the war period.

6. That all disputes arising between the Government, employer, and employee be at all times submitted to arbitration.

To my way of thinking the next is most important—

7. All excess profits not necessarily due to increased prices but to increased turnover due to war production over a normal return to shareholders be divided by the company on the following basis:—

A quarter share to the employer.

A quarter share to the employee, both to be invested in war loans.

A half share to the Government in direct taxation, not repayable.

It must be obvious—it is to my mind—that this would give enormous increased production and encouragement to both employer and employee, and as a result of this increased production there would be consequent savings in the form of economical manufacturing in which the Government would share and the employer and employee would then make a direct contribution of their shares to war loans.

The Bill deals with efficiency, a subject that is very important. Unless we are to become efficient we cannot hope to survive. Mr. Wendell Willkie said—

“Only the strong can survive and only the productive can be strong.”

It is my opinion that when the war ends this country, by increased population, can be made more prosperous, but there must be no limitation of production in the change from war to civil production. The Government, in my opinion, must combine with private individuals in financing and finding new money. It is incumbent on both Government and employers that every factory engaged in war work have a research staff—similar to that in the Department of Agriculture and Stock—to endeavour to work out plans for the most successful changeover when the war is over. In my opinion, if industry is developed in this State we shall not be so badly off as the other States, for we shall have our own domestic market and we shall be able to manufacture the goods previously catered for by Southern manufacturers. Modern development in industry must eventually be greater in this State than in any other and efficiency of the individual and plant will be a dominating factor, and the Government must take a very active interest in co-operation with both employer and employee.

I was interested to note the comments made on the sweating of labour, because if this State is to compete with others it is essential that the State and Federal awards be brought nearer one another. It is agreed that no industry can have a foundation and compete unless it is on an equal basis with all competitors throughout Australia. The question of the sweating of employees is a very important matter, to my mind, and it is unfortunate that employers of juveniles are beginning to show a tendency in this direction. There was a case in Melbourne the other day in which an Austrian wanted to work three juniors to one adult in the Modern Handweaving Proprietary Limited, instead of a two-to-one proportion as prescribed. The presiding judge quickly summed-up the case and the Austrian in question realised that he could not employ his European methods in Australia.

Another factor I should like to bring before the House is that outdoor labour has developed in Victoria, and this is a thing that no factory can stand up against. I have been

reliably informed by the Department of Supply in Melbourne that some Queensland manufacturers have not been able to get orders because certain manufacturers in Melbourne have, with the permission of the union, been handing out the finishing of goods to women to take home at night, and complete during the nights and week-ends. This type of unfair competition must stop if industry is to survive in Australia.

I was pleased to see in the Bill that the Director of the Bureau of Industry is to be co-opted. We should not overlook the fact that we have an Industries Assistance Act in operation in Queensland second to none in Australia.

Much publicity has been given to the South Australian Act in this regard, but an examination shows that it cannot be compared to the Queensland provision. Our Act, however, has not been utilised to any great extent, and with the possibility that new factories will develop, the Act is ideal.

I think the provision made to give short-course training courses in certain callings is excellent, for I know that a large amount of unskilled labour is available at the present time which could be effectively used in war industries. This particularly applies not to youths, but to adults.

The suggestion for the employment of workers advanced in years is quite a good one, for many men who had retired are now brought back into harness and are doing a great job during the war period.

I notice that many districts are designated throughout Queensland, and I cannot emphasise the fact too much that we should develop slowly, get our experience in Brisbane, and not endeavour to do too much at once.

The Juvenile Employment Bureau is a very important subject, and I feel the provisions of the Bill, working in conjunction with similar provisions in the National Education Co-ordination and University of Queensland Act Amendment Bill, must meet with excellent results. There is no question that at the present time there is what might be termed a brains shortage. This particularly applies in Southern States, where manufacturers are virtually pirating each other's technologists. It is important that we should get people adapted for industry, and it must be admitted that it is wrong, in peace particularly, to have youths unemployed whilst they themselves need goods and services. The future of our youth is a very serious problem, and I again stress the fact that secondary industry is the only means whereby we can attain a successful solution. Therefore, it is necessary to provide a technical training for students, supplementing the general education they have had at schools, and I feel that a condition of juvenile employment should be that technical education must be continued by them two to three nights a week or, if necessary, during the day, and I notice that some provision has been made for this in clause 34 of the Bill.

Generally speaking, the only fault I can find with the Bill is that no provision has

been made for the question of taxation, and until this is done, in my opinion, we cannot expect the development that this State warrants.

In conclusion, I should like to bring before the House the question of the managerial revolution that is being considered by many authorities throughout the world. Roughly condensed, the theory expressed is that World War 2 is a social revolution, but not of the kind most people believe. It is reliably stated, and with this I agree, that when it is finished, capitalism and socialism will both be finished, and that the solution to post-war problems will clearly depend upon the co-operation of capital and labour. It has been stated, and I am inclined to agree, that the future ruling classes will be known as managers, and that this class in society will be indispensable in making modern industry productive.

It is interesting to note that in the controlled European countries this managerial revolution has been in operation for many years, but, of course, has been combined with a system of government that no-one in the British Empire or the democracies of the world would tolerate or desire to be brought about. I believe, however, that we can all learn something from the experience of others, and if we can combine the best in a system such as this with our present system of democracy, which I think we all agree has to be altered to meet post-war problems, we should be able to work out a satisfactory workable basis for their solution.

It must be agreed that this so-called managerial system has been up to a point successful. I am interested from a personal point of view, because I visited the industrial centres of Europe about eight years ago and fully realised the many difficulties young business men were faced with in obtaining world trade expansion. I could give an example of one firm well known to me that had been appointed by its Government managers for the export trade of certain products to the Pacific isles, and was supported very considerably by the Government in all its activities. Expenses of trips abroad were paid, and in a very short period a very good export trade was developed with the Pacific isles, as a result of this Government interest and subsidy.

Under this managerial system profits were limited, but bonuses were paid on the results achieved. This was the basis on which many young European business men established an export market, even although there was considerable disruption at that time in the business world of Europe. The position of manager under this scheme could be defined as that of a man who was to organise and co-ordinate the various elements of production, for it must be realised that in obtaining production many things are dependent on one another. This means that different materials—such as tools, machines, plants, workers—must be all available at the proper place and moment and in the proper numbers. This scheme is at present being operated in the munitions section of the Commonwealth

Government, where many people have been appointed as actual managers, some of them without any salary whatever, to bring into being this co-ordinated scheme in the national interests.

The position, role, and function of these managers are in no way dependent on the maintenance of machinery, plant, and the economic basis of the worker. This is the responsibility of the foreman. Their job is to get the greatest production from the industries they are controlling.

No-one can deny, after he analyses this statement, that the system can be worked with great success. As a matter of fact, many successful businesses are being run at the present time on this basis—that is, the sections of the business are divided so that each man working on a share-profit basis can run that section of the business as though it were his own, and then get some reward on a division of profit. This means that the whole of the business will be run efficiently and can be co-ordinated by one directing force that has an all-round knowledge of the different sections in the business.

I have endeavoured to make some contribution to this debate in order to give the Minister some encouragement. I can assure him that so far as the main employers in this State are concerned, they will give every consideration in their endeavour to co-operate in making this Bill an entire success.

The SECRETARY FOR LABOUR AND INDUSTRY (Hon. T. A. Foley, Normanby) (10.53 p.m.), in reply: After listening to the debate, I believe that only one hon. member sitting in opposition has really studied the measure, and he is the hon. member for Hamilton. He made a very fine contribution to the debate. It was clear of all spleen and meanness, and was an endeavour to offer constructive suggestions to at least help and encourage others in the community to co-operate with the Government in carrying into effect the principles we aim at in this measure.

The charge made by most hon. members opposite that this is really a propaganda measure is only one way of cloaking their fear that the Bill will bring the results that are actually desired. As a matter of fact, hon. members opposite do not know their own case, and have not even presented a case for the Opposition. They have attempted to belittle the measure by describing it as propaganda. They are, as I said, adopting these tactics because they fear the Bill will eventually produce the results they do not desire.

The Premier made a very fine contribution to the debate and outlined very neatly the position of society as we see it to-day. In other words, he has pointed out that if society cannot deliver the goods—if it cannot provide employment for the great army of men who will be returning when the war is over and for the great mass of workers who will be thrown on the industrial scrapheap when our munition work ceases, and for the great army of men who are at present helping

to provide for the needs and wherewithal of that great army—these people will ask why and demand in no uncertain terms that the Government of the day take steps to see that these men are fed, clothed, and sheltered. I contend that any society that can, as we are doing at the present time, raise millions of pounds to produce wealth in enormous quantities for destructive purposes—much of which will be blown into thin air, as a result of the war activities—can at least find the lesser amount that will be required in peace-time to provide employment for our men, if we have the necessary co-ordination between all the factors regarding employment, and if we have the necessary will to achieve that objective.

The Bill will receive the earnest consideration of myself and the departmental officers, and whoever will be appointed as Director of Employment to see to the administration of the Bill. I honestly feel that the fullest co-operation will be given by the unions and the employers of this State on the various boards and committees, and as a result of organisation and the proper survey of every employment facility throughout the State we shall achieve a result that will be of marked advantage not only to the State Employment Council, but to the Government also.

I can assure hon. members that if we do not achieve our full objective it will not be for the want of trying on the part of the Government to administer the measure properly. Many men have helped in preparing this Bill, and I wish to take the opportunity of offering my thanks to them. Mr. Story, the ex-Public Service Commissioner, has made no small contribution to the formation of many of the principles contained in the Bill. The Premier has been always ready to give the greatest assistance to me in framing it, and my colleagues in the Cabinet have also helped materially, and members of the party have offered valuable suggestions when the Bill was before them. With all those forces willing and eager to see that a proper organisation is set up and that results are achieved, I can see nothing but success ahead.

Motion (Mr. Foley) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.1 p.m.
