

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**FRIDAY, 27 OCTOBER 1961**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**FRIDAY, 27 OCTOBER, 1961**

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. D. E. Nicholson, Murrumba) took the chair at 11 a.m.

**QUESTIONS****ARTICLE IN "TRUTH" NEWSPAPER CONCERNING  
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT**

**Mr. CAMPBELL** (Aspley) asked the Premier—

"(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article on the front page of last Sunday's 'Truth' Newspaper concerning an Honourable Member of this Assembly?"

"(2) If so, can any action be taken by the House to have this matter investigated?"

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough) replied—

"(1) Yes."

"(2) The article concerns a dispute as to legal fees between the Honourable Member for South Brisbane and a client named Honan. I have already rebuked the Honourable Member for South Brisbane for endeavouring to bring this dispute into this House. If his client, Honan, considers himself aggrieved, I would point out that neither this House nor 'Truth' newspaper is an appropriate avenue of redress."

BRISBANE DENTAL CLINIC

**Mr. SHERRINGTON** (Salisbury) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“(1) What is the number of residents in the metropolitan area who received dental treatment at the Brisbane dental clinic during the years 1959 and 1960?”

“(2) What was the number of dentists employed during these years?”

“(3) What is the number of dentists currently employed at the clinic?”

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

“(1) Statistics are not kept showing separately the number of residents within or outside the metropolitan area who receive treatment at the Brisbane Dental Clinics. The following statistics are recorded, however:—(a) the number of new cases; (b) the number of second or subsequent visits; and (c) the total number of attendances. The statistics for 1959-1960 and 1960-1961 in respect of all metropolitan Dental Clinics are as follows:—

—	New Cases	Second and Subsequent Visits	Total Attendances
1959-1960 ..	62,935	240,138	303,073
1960-1961 ..	65,067	236,713	301,780

“(2) Fifty-four.”

“(3) Fifty-four.”

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE AT AYR

**Mr. COBURN** (Burdekin) asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

“Will he kindly give consideration to the establishment of an Agricultural College at Ayr, principally for the purpose of educating students in agriculture as it relates to sugar production?”

**Hon. O. O. MADSEN** (Warwick) replied—

“For some years now, the administration of our State Agricultural College has been under the control of the Education Department. I therefore suggest that the Honourable Member might direct his question to my colleague the Minister for Education.”

GROWING OF COTTON BY BOND'S INDUSTRIES LTD.

**Mr. COBURN** (Burdekin) asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

“(1) Has he read in ‘The Courier-Mail’ of Thursday, October 26, 1961, that Bond's Industries Ltd., one of Australia's biggest textile firms, is investigating the question of growing its own cotton?”

“(2) If so, will he forward immediately to the Chairman of Directors of Bond's Industries Ltd. detailed information setting

out the advantages possessed by the Lower Burdekin Irrigation Area for the production of cotton and invite the Company to send its representatives to Ayr to carry out the necessary investigation?”

**Hon. O. O. MADSEN** (Warwick) replied—

“(1) Yes.”

“(2) The press statement referred to is rather brief on the points bearing on what is obviously in the Honourable Member's mind. The Queensland Government is most anxious to develop those industries suitable to particular areas. Should the Honourable Member care to issue an invitation on behalf of land holders in the Burdekin Irrigation Area, my Department will be happy to co-operate to the fullest possible extent in making technical assistance available to help in any suggested further development of the cotton industry.”

DECLARATION OF STATE FORESTS

**Mr. ARMSTRONG** (Mulgrave), for **Mr. GILMORE** (Tablelands), asked the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry—

“As it is desirable that timber stands be preserved for supplies in perpetuity, particularly in North Queensland, could he indicate what action has been taken towards the declaration of State Forests?”

**Hon. O. O. MADSEN** (Warwick) replied—

“The Government is fully seized of the necessity for setting aside areas of land as State Forests in order to meet the timber requirements of the State. To this end the Government has had the rain forest areas in North Queensland investigated by a Land Classification Committee consisting of officers of the Agriculture and Stock Department, the Department of Public Lands and the Forestry Department. This Committee is required to report on the areas which should be reserved as State Forests. An interim report by the Committee has been received indicating that the needs of the timber industry in North Queensland are being taken fully into consideration. Discussions regarding State Forest reservations in other areas of the State are continuing between the Departments concerned.”

SUPPLY OF TARPULINS BY RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

**Mr. DONALD** (Ipswich East) asked the Minister for Transport—

“Has the Railway Department lost substantial business due to the inability of the Department to supply tarpaulins? If so, what was the reason?”

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer) replied—

“No.”

## CASH SHORTAGE AT H.M. PRISON, STUART

**Mr. COBURN** (Burdekin), for **Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South), asked the Minister for Justice—

“What are the circumstances surrounding the cash shortage of £8 6s. 8d. at Stuart Prison as mentioned on page 161 of the Auditor-General’s Report and what action has been or is proposed to be taken against the person or persons responsible?”

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong) replied—

“As stated in the Annual Report of the Auditor-General, there was a cash shortage of £8 6s. 8d. in the accounts of Her Majesty’s Prison, Townsville, as at June 30, 1961. This discrepancy when originally detected was recorded in the Superintendent’s diary and marked in the Cash Book of the Prison. Subsequently checks were made of receipts and expenditure and the Superintendent reported that his investigation failed to show how the deficiency occurred, except that it appeared to have been made up of compensating errors of £10 and £1 13s. 4d. As stated in the report of the Auditor-General, the action in connection with this matter was incomplete at the time of the preparation of his report. Subsequently the Prison Superintendent was advised that the shortage should be adjusted by payment of the amount into the Imprest Account. This was done and on October 24 a cash receipt was issued for the amount of £8 6s. 8d. paid into the account.”

## PURCHASE OF X-RAY PLANT BY MAREEBA HOSPITALS BOARD

**Hon. P. J. R. HILTON** (Carnarvon) for **Mr. ADAIR** (Cook), asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“Owing to the fact that a recent request by the Mareeba Hospitals Board for permission to purchase a higher powered X-ray plant from funds available for the Mareeba Hospital was refused on the recommendation of the Queensland Radium Institute, thus causing undue hardship to those patients who are forced to travel to Cairns at extra expense for necessary X-ray treatment, will he have this matter investigated with a view to granting to the Board permission to purchase the required X-ray plant at an early date?”

**Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga) replied—

“The question of the supply of X-ray equipment to hospitals is decided on the advice of the Queensland Radium Institute. At the request of Mr. T. V. Gilmore, M.L.A., I had another look at the request of the Mareeba Hospitals Board for permission to purchase a higher-powered

X-ray machine for the Mareeba Hospital, and referred the matter to the Queensland Radium Institute for further consideration. The Queensland Radium Institute has now recommended that a higher-powered X-ray plant be purchased for the Mareeba Hospital, and I gave approval to this this morning.”

## STATEMENT BY SENATOR IAN WOOD ON BEEF ROADS IN QUEENSLAND

**Mr. RAE** (Gregory), without notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

“Has the Minister seen the statement by Senator Ian Wood in the Federal Senate, and published in ‘The Courier-Mail’ today, that the restrictions and taxes imposed on road transport by the Queensland Government could have detrimental effects on the success of the proposed beef roads to be constructed in Queensland under the Commonwealth Grant of £5,000,000?”

**Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer) replied—

“My attention has been drawn to the Press report of the remarks made by Senator Wood in the Senate yesterday. I have not had the opportunity of reading the full text of Senator Wood’s speech, but the matter published reveals a lamentable lack of knowledge or complete disregard of the facts involved and, as a result is very damaging to this State. Under the ‘Transport Act of 1960’ there is a complete exemption from fees for all—I repeat all—vehicles carrying goods, including livestock, to and from the nearest railway station, and by Order in Council made under the Act, and designed to assist the beef cattle industry, all movements of livestock in areas generally west of the 146th degree of east longitude are free of restrictions and permit fees.

“The movement of cattle on the roads involved in the Commonwealth Grant of £5 million will come under these categories and, therefore, will be completely exempt under State Transport law.

“I also wish to draw attention to the fact that the fees on the movement of livestock generally, where liability is incurred, are not levied at the rate of 3d. per ton per mile on the load capacity of the vehicle, as stated by Senator Wood, but are levied at the rate of 1½d.

“I have sent a telegram to Senator Wood pointing out the above facts and requesting him publicly to correct the misstatements made by him in the Senate to the detriment of this State.”

## PAPERS

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

Report of the Commissioner for Railways for the year 1960-1961.

Report of the Commissioner of Irrigation and Water Supply, 1960-1961.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamation under the Forestry Act of 1959.

Orders in Council under the Forestry Act of 1959.

PARLIAMENTARY CONTRIBUTORY  
SUPERANNUATION FUND ACTS  
AMENDMENT BILL

## INITIATION

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Fund Acts, 1948 to 1958, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

## LIQUOR ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

## SECOND READING

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.14 a.m.): I move—

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

As the main principles of the Bill were fully explained and discussed by a number of hon. members at the introductory stage, and as I had the opportunity of replying at that stage, my remarks in moving the second reading of the Bill will be quite brief.

However, to refresh the memories of hon. members, I will very briefly mention my five-point summary of the basic principles of what might be regarded as the more important and controversial amendments. At that stage I said that the five-point programme might be regarded as one to give effect to—

(1) The basic principle of the establishment and maintenance of respect for law.

(2) The democratic principle of freedom of the responsible individual, commensurate with an adequate degree of responsibility of the individual to the community.

(3) The medical principle of the comparative advantage of the partaking of food with liquor;

(4) The moral principle of the protection and the safeguarding of our young people; and

(5) The social principle of educational and health measures to discourage intemperance and to prevent and cure alcoholism.

I then went on, at that stage to explain at considerable length, how those basic principles had been given practical application in quite a number of the clauses in the Bill. After doing that I gave a short indication of 12 other amendments in the Bill which, although of some importance, were regarded as being less important and less controversial than the others. I concluded by drawing the attention of hon. members to the fact that there was quite a number of administrative amendments not involving basic policy.

Since that time hon. members have had the opportunity of studying the Bill, and I will be most interested to hear, particularly from members of the Opposition, any further expressions and any views that they might have on particular local problems in their electorates. However, I think that by the nature of its general application this is a Bill that can be discussed much more effectively in detail at the Committee stage, because during that stage instead of talking merely in general terms, as must be done in either the introductory or second reading stages, we can discuss—and I hope, usefully and intelligently—the details of the provisions and apply our minds to whether any of those detailed clauses can be improved.

I mention this matter now because obviously, in a Parliament such as this, with a limited time to deal with a very large legislative programme, it follows that the more time we devote to generalisations and to political considerations, the less time we will have for the serious consideration of the clauses of this very important Bill. In the same way, while the Standing Orders are rightly quite generous in the allocation of time, I suggest that in the consideration of this Bill which may involve local problems in far-flung areas of the State, I believe the discussion will be more helpful if we have a number of members participating rather than very few talking at considerable length.

Those remarks apply particularly to members of the Opposition, because members of the Government parties, as is well known, have discussed this matter in very considerable detail and have taken up the major part of three complete Wednesday afternoons. For that reason, it is my desire, and, I believe, the desire generally of the Government, that there shall be a certain amount of restraint on the part of members on the Government side so that members of the Opposition parties will have the greatest opportunity to express their views.

I have already indicated that, while we regard it as extremely unlikely that there will be any departure from any of the main principles of the Bill, the Government approach the subject, as they approach all other subjects, with the realisation that any

Bill we introduce may not be perfect. This one has been very carefully examined and very carefully considered but I look forward to the debate today, and possibly to a subsequent debate when we are dealing with the measure in Committee, and I can assure hon. members that I will listen very attentively. If any hon. member can point out anything in the Bill that is wrong, if he can show that we have not given effect to what has been more or less publicly stated as the principal objectives, I will be very interested to hear those comments.

On those general lines I may say again, without in any way departing from any of the principles of the Bill, during the last fortnight we have had a very close look at some of the points in Country Party circles and I have had printed, and I think they have been circulated—if they have not been they will be in a few moments—copies of notice of four amendments that I propose to move in the Committee stage.

**Mr. Duggan:** We have not got them.

**Mr. MUNRO:** I have asked that they be circulated and they will be in a few moments. Only one of those amendments is of any importance and even that is for the purpose of removing an anomaly that the Bill as originally introduced would have brought about in relation to dancing by diners in the course of partaking of a meal at a licensed restaurant. It is a simple amendment and its import will be readily grasped by anyone who reads it. The other three are very minor amendments. I would regard them as being more in the nature of corrections than anything else.

Of course, those four amendments can be fully discussed at the appropriate stage, that is, when we are considering the Bill in Committee.

In that spirit I commend the Bill to hon. members and I will listen with great interest to all the views expressed.

**Mr. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.24 a.m.): This morning we have had a very interesting example of the reason why there should be some explanation of the Opposition's general role in the introductory stages and the second-reading stage of a Bill. In the introductory stage the Minister very properly spent a good deal of time in outlining to the Chamber what he considered to be the important principles in the Bill and he elaborated in some detail on some minor matters that were not matters of principle at all. Nevertheless he occupied a good deal of time in attempting to justify the Government's action in the hope that it might placate some interests outside who have very strong and definite views about the consumption of liquor. It will be recalled that, during the introductory stages, the Government indicated that it was proposed to facilitate the printing of the Bill to enable us to examine its provisions in detail and I regret that, although subsequently a few minutes

were spent in explaining the Opposition's role in these matters, it did not stop Government members, by interjection and indeed in some of their speeches, from accusing us of supporting the measure providing for the imposition of increased licence fees, the Sunday trading provisions and the other principles of the Bill because we voted for the printing of the measure.

**Mr. Nicklin:** You voted for the introduction of the Bill.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes, but what is involved in that? The moment the introduction of the Bill is approved the printing becomes a formal matter. Consequently, the appeal of the Minister for Justice now falls on deaf ears as far as members of the Opposition are concerned, because he has given us abundant reasons why that course should be followed. He should not encourage hon. members on the Government benches to twit us about this after hearing the explanation he has given.

What is his explanation? Firstly, he said that the Bill had been under consideration by the Government parties for three or four years, more particularly following the 1958 Convention, and with greater particularity still following the establishment of Government committees to go into the matter and after detailed and searching examination by himself, members of his committee, and officers of his department. Following that, the Bill was introduced into Caucus, and he indicated a few moments ago that the new provisions were discussed in Caucus for three weeks before the Government parties came to a conclusion about what the Bill should contain. He has indicated now that, despite the effluxion of a further two weeks, he has seen fit to circularise four amendments to the Bill. I accept the Minister's assurance that that prolonged examination was made, and he gave a painstaking outline of the examination in his introductory speech. I do not wish to mention all the points, but I have them marked—the examination of international reports, interstate reports, systems in other States, and so on. All the facilities available to the Government make it much easier for them to decide what attitude they will take than it is for the Opposition to decide its attitude to the measure. However, as I said, even at this stage it has been found necessary to amend the Bill. In all conscience, therefore, how can members of the Government parties twit us for wanting to read and examine the Bill and see what it contained before deciding what our attitude would be? Because we did that, we were accused of having two bob each way.

We have abundant evidence of the need for care in these particular matters. All hon. members will recall the Bill of Rights. An election was fought mainly on the introduction of that Bill. It figured in the policy speech of the Premier, and he went to considerable trouble to bring it down. I have

said before that I am sorry that a man who enjoys the reputation that the Premier does—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member is discussing the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill, not the Bill of Rights.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes, but I am referring to the principle of the introduction of the Bill. I want to work very closely with you, Mr. Speaker, but the Minister indicated this morning the need for care and the opportunity that is given to us to examine it. I am mentioning the mechanics of the introduction of the Bill.

As I said, the Government were elected to office after winning an election that was fought very largely upon the question of the introduction of a Bill of Rights. The Government retained the services of the most eminent Queen's Counsel in Australia to advise them. Having received that advice, they proceeded to introduce a Bill into the Assembly. Would it be right to commit ourselves till we had seen this Bill when, with all that background information, the Bill of Rights was withdrawn after being presented?

The same thing applies to the Companies Bill that was introduced last year. I saw officers and interstate officers in conference for the best part of 10 days in the Legislative Council chamber. Those officers went interstate for long periods and met the most highly-trained officers in other States. After 12 months, as a result of the advice of those specialists, the Government introduced a Bill and then deferred it because they wanted to clarify certain points in it.

**Mr. Munro:** That all indicates the considerable degree of care and responsibility that the Government devote to these matters.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Despite that, the Minister has found it necessary to amend the Liquor Bill before it has been canvassed or discussed in any detail. With the Bill of Rights there was a very long delay and a subsequent withdrawal. The Bill of Rights was withdrawn entirely. The Minister now gives the excuse that great care is taken by the Government parties. Yet, without any prior information of what is contained in the Liquor Bill they expect me to take down in longhand the remarks of the Minister and then to get up and say what are the considered views of the Opposition. I very properly said, "Let us have a look at the Bill and then we will declare our views." I am criticised even by the Treasurer, a front bench Minister with a great deal of experience, and several back benchers by interjection, for supporting the Bill. They are trying to make cheap political capital out of it to try to put us into what they think is a politically disadvantageous position. Before committing the Opposition to supporting the Bill I needed to have a look at it.

When the Minister for Labour and Industry introduced the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill, a very long Bill, he said that there were certain principles in it, which we, by way of interjection, asked him to amplify, but we were ignored. He either inadvertently or otherwise misled the House. What position would we be in if we said that we would accept the proposal without having an opportunity to examine it? What silly logic! I welcome interjections because what I am saying is an indisputably logical case from the Opposition point of view.

**Mr. Tooth:** You are adopting a different attitude towards this Bill from the one you adopted on the arbitration Bill. At that time you twitted us because we did not discuss the matter at the introductory stage.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member did not do very much more on this occasion. He, more than any other hon. member on his side, tries to make smart interjections from time to time, but he was conspicuously silent on that occasion.

**Mr. Tooth:** I spoke at the first reading.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I am talking about the Liquor Bill.

On the subject of the degree of co-operation from the Opposition, I want to indicate that we accepted the invitation of the Minister that we should not unnecessarily prolong discussion at the initiation stage. I was the only person who made a contribution from this side of the Chamber, except for about a two-minutes or shorter contribution by my Deputy Leader. It indicated our desire not to take advantage of the abundant opportunities to make political capital out of the measure by speaking at the introductory stage. I accepted the invitation of the Minister to restrict discussion. At the second reading stage we reserve the right to speak because we have had an opportunity to look at the Bill.

I am grateful to the Premier for the assurance he gave me, and I give him my assurance at this stage. Although many speakers on this side want to speak, indeed, almost all of them wish to speak today on this matter, many of them have commitments with high school speech nights. I have two in Toowoomba tonight. It is not a very great sacrifice, but in order to attend one of them I am prepared to go without dinner if the House adjourns at a reasonably normal time. Other hon. members on this side, and no doubt some Government members, have commitments in their electorates tonight. With the possible exception of those who have already made plane bookings, we are prepared to discuss the matter as long as it is necessary. But the Premier has been good enough to indicate to me that as long as I give an undertaking on behalf of the A.L.P., which I give now, that although we are prepared to speak and wish to speak, as long as he discharges his

undertaking to me—which I am sure he gave me in good faith—if we restrict our last speaker to a-quarter to 5, the Minister will commence his reply and thus be enabled to complete his speech on the first day the Premier allots. We accept that arrangement.

I now come to the second reason why we should facilitate the introduction of Bills unless there are one or two clear principles involved that should be further looked at. This is where there is an important difference. The hon. member for Ashgrove may say that the other day we opposed the introduction of the Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant Acts. There were only one or two principles involved. It was a very short Bill but it indicated a gross violation of matters of political policy and we very properly opposed its introduction. The Minister said that it contained only one or two principles. He indicated that too in relation to this Bill yet he said that the Bill contained 55 pages. Having committed ourselves to a certain attitude on the Landlord and Tenant Bill, is it to be expected that we should adopt a similar attitude on every occasion, particularly with a Bill containing 55 pages of very involved matter? Some of the clauses require a good deal of examination.

I pointed out before that, whilst in no way expressing any criticism of the parliamentary drafting staff, who are men of great ability, I regretted very much indeed that in this State, and in others, it seems to be difficult to clothe the intentions of the Government in language that is readily understood by lay members of the community. I regretted that it was not possible to do that and at the same time protect the legislation from possible challenge. I suppose we must accept the situation but one has to examine Bills with very great care.

Another reason why it was necessary to examine the Bill at the initiatory stages was that, like all other political parties, our general policy is determined at a convention which, in our case is a triennial convention. In the case of other political parties, it is mainly an annual one.

At the triennial convention held in 1956 the question of liquor reform was discussed and several general principles were put forward for examination. The principal one, of course, was that saner drinking conditions were necessary.

We would not know whether the Bill provided for saner drinking conditions until we had had an opportunity of reading it. If we voted against the introduction of the Bill, would not our supporters outside properly construe that it was a violation of our obligation to implement the policy at convention, which was to provide for saner drinking conditions?

Therefore, a very elementary thing in these matters is to say, "Let us have a look at

it to see if the alleged saner drinking conditions that the Government tell us will result from the introduction and acceptance of the Bill, coincide with our views on the matter." If they do, well and good; if they do not, where and in what way should they be amended?

I indicate to the Minister now that it is our intention to oppose the second reading of this Bill but we have a number of amendments to move in Committee. They will be given to the Minister in due course. The reason that we oppose it will become apparent when I mention some of the statements made by the Minister and refer to the effect of the provisions in the Bill. The Minister stated that one of the principal reasons for its introduction was to give effect to the principle of respect for the law. He also said that there must be some recognition of the principle—these may not be his exact words but this is the sense of them—that whilst we must respect the individual liberty of the subject, it must be taken jointly with his responsibilities to society as a whole. Those two aspects must be taken into consideration—the rights of the individual and his duties as a member of responsible society.

The Minister gave other reasons as well. He did not say so, but he inferred it, that the law was not being enforced at the present time. We did not make those allegations. The hon. member for Rockhampton South said that the present arrangements in some parts of the State concerning the enforcement or non-enforcement of the existing law, permitted graft to operate. He was asked by way of interjection—not initially by an hon. member on this side of the Chamber—whether it would be the decision of the Minister or the police. He said it was not the Minister, and therefore the only obvious inference was that it must be the police. But the point is, if the Minister thinks that one of the present reasons for a change of law is the non-enforcement of it, we have to decide whether the proposed changes will permit of the enforcement of the amended law.

What are the reasons why the law has not been enforced, either by Government direction or by direction of the Commissioner of Police through his inspectors in the various districts or by individual police officers in the various localities? I am not going to say that I am unaware of the fact that drinking sessions do take place in various parts of the State and have been recognised, whether they are desirable or not, as part of the social pattern of people in various districts for a long period, but the existing law does not provide for drinking sessions, and, if with all the resources of the Government available to him the Minister is not able to enforce the law, what guarantee have we that the legislation will permit of the enforcement of the amended law? What guarantee is there that it can be enforced or will be enforced?



**Mr. Munro:** I answered that point at the introductory stage, when I said the first thing to do was to make the law one which was capable of enforcement.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Then we come to the next point. If it is a reasonable law, why does not the Minister apply it to the whole of the State. Is he going to say there is to be one law for this section, one law for the Liberal Party, one for the Country Party, one for the Labour Party, one for the temperance people, one for the drinkers, one for the golf-players, one for the bowlers, one for the tennis people, one for the hockey people, one for the cricket people, and so on? The Minister is in direct collision with his own logical presentation of this matter in raising by interjection the question of its being a reasonable law. Either Sunday drinking is desirable or it is not, and, if it is not, it should not be permitted. If it is desirable, it should be applied uniformly throughout the State. I should not mind so much if this was a matter of a small minority of people being affected. I think we must respect the rights of minorities on all occasions. They have a perfect right in a democracy to be heard. Some members of the Government, of course, do not want to offend the temperance interests outside, and, because of the fear of political repercussions, they sugarcoat the pill.

I do not know the opinion held of them by Government members, but I repeat the tribute I paid them on the last occasion. I think they are worthy people engaged in a very worthy cause—temperate drinking and temperate habits generally. They put out a great deal of literature which must cause serious-minded people to pause and consider the great damage that is done through excessive use of alcohol. Abundant evidence is accumulating everywhere of the great economic loss to the community, human unhappiness and human tragedies and all of the attendant social evils that occur through excessive use of alcohol. That fact is abundantly clear and does not need stressing here. The people who feel very strongly on this matter wish to educate others, in an inoffensive way, and they have done that, surely. They act in a courteous way. Under the cushion, the Government say, "We do not want to offend you." The only criticism I have to make of any temperance speaker is that at their meeting in the City Hall, to which they urged hundreds of people to come to express opposition to this measure, one speaker, with the obvious object of trying to protect the Government, said that the Minister for Labour and Industry had received them most courteously.

**Mr. Ramsden:** What is wrong with that?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** There is nothing wrong with being received courteously. I have never said otherwise of the Minister. He has received me most courteously, but, if I felt strongly on an issue, I should not care

how courteous the reception was; it would be the result of the interview that would determine whether I felt the Government, or the person giving the decision, should be supported or not. Where a fundamental and social principle is involved, I do not think that courtesy should be an influencing factor in the minds of people who feel strongly about this very grave social problem.

**Mr. Coburn:** Was it an influencing factor?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Unfortunately the Press conveyed the idea that the people had been very nicely received and had been given a courteous reception. I can recall a previous Minister—and I am going back very many years before I was a member of this Assembly—saying that he would prefer to have a request refused by one Minister than have it granted by another Minister because when the first Minister declined the request he was most gracious in his refusal and the other Minister was rude when he granted a request. Hon. members who used to sit on the back benches years ago may remember that every time this Minister declined a request he rounded it off with kind regards. He believed it would soften the blow if he put that at the end.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Are you suggesting that the Minister is a hypocrite?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Fancy the hon. member for Merthyr, a political neophyte in these things, suggesting that I might be saying the Minister concerned is a hypocrite. I do not think he is, but I think the hon. member for Merthyr is.

One of the first things that struck me was the admission about the non-enforcibility of the existing law. It follows therefore, that at present, if a person is found on licensed premises at any time during Sunday, that person is breaking the law. Under the Bill, providing he is there at the prescribed times, between 12 and 2, and 5 and 7, he is complying with the law if he lives more than 40 miles from the Brisbane G.P.O. However, this means that instead of the policeman coming in once a day at any time that suited his administrative responsibilities, he is now obliged to see that no drinking is taking place after the prescribed periods. He will now have to go at least twice a day, at 10 or 20 minutes past 2, to see if there is any violation of the 12 to 2 session. Then, he will have to go back some time after 7 o'clock to see if there is any violation then. The responsibility of the policeman is being doubled, at least.

The Minister advanced the specious argument that it is easier to police the requirements of the new legislation beyond the 40-mile limit. Can he tell me why cities such as Townsville, Rockhampton or Toowoomba with comparable populations and which are not greatly different in size of boundary limits from Ipswich are allowed to drink under this new legislation, yet the people of Ipswich are excluded? Ipswich

has a population of 45,000 but they are not allowed to drink, but in Toowoomba, which is only another 50 or 60 miles further on, the residents can drink during the prescribed periods. Can the Minister tell me why the law cannot be enforced in Ipswich but it can be enforced in Toowoomba? What utter nonsense! What insincerity! How illogical! If it is not a question of discrimination, is the Minister implying that police officers in Ipswich are susceptible to some arrangements with U.L.V.A. personnel or someone else?

I do not know the views of the hon. member for Redcliffe on this matter. However, I should say that the last census figures have disclosed very clearly that there has been a great increase in population at the bayside resorts near Brisbane, and that many people have their homes there. People go for a dip at these resorts just as they do at the South Coast on Sunday, but at Redcliffe and in the Peninsula area they are not permitted to do what they will be able to do on the South Coast, the North Coast and in other places. What is the excuse offered by the Government for these proposals? We are going to allocate a sum not exceeding £30,000 to the various schools for a temperance campaign to influence the children against the evils of drink. I have already indicated that we are conscious of the fact that there is already in existence a very strong and concerted and sustained campaign of temperance organisations and the various churches on the subject of temperance. I suggest very respectfully that they are doing a far better job—

**Mr. Diplock:** And schools, too.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes, and they are doing an excellent job. We are going to test the Government's sincerity by asking them to include in the Bill exactly what they propose to make available. Instead of saying that it shall be a sum not exceeding so-and-so, let them say what minimum sum shall be provided. They have given us no inkling of how the scheme will be carried out. That will be the responsibility of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs and the Minister for Education and Migration. Surely on an important matter such as this, in which they are seeking the goodwill of people outside of temperate habits, especially as the Bill has been in preparation for three or four years and as every other liquor reform measure in Australia and overseas has been examined by the Government and by the officers available to the Government—surely to goodness we could have some outline by the Minister of the precise form this temperance agitation and campaign will take.

**Mr. Munro:** You realise, of course, that in voting against the Bill you are voting against that particular provision?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** No, I am not, because we have an amendment that we propose to move, as the Minister will see in due course.

**Mr. Munro:** If your move to defeat the second reading of the Bill succeeds, that provision must fail.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Does the Minister think it will succeed?

**Mr. Munro:** No. I think your opposition to the Bill is so much hot air.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I could be quite nasty on this if I wanted to. When replying to my speech in the introductory stage the Minister paid me the compliment of saying I was fairly well versed in the use of words and that I was a capable debater. Indeed, he paid me some other compliments. I did not say anything other than that I had the greatest personal respect for the integrity and honesty of the Minister.

**Mr. MUNRO:** If I might rise to a point of order, I want to make it quite clear that by the use of the expression "hot air" I did not intend anything personal. What I wanted to make clear when I answered the question directed to me by the Leader of the Opposition was that all this talk about voting against the Bill is quite ineffective as the Leader of the Opposition well knows. If he wishes to improve the Bill, the proper way to do it is to move or suggest amendments in the Committee stage.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** There we have an admission from the Minister that we are wasting our time in speaking against the Bill because even if we suggested anything worthwhile at this stage, the Government would not take any notice of it.

The Minister talks about hot air. Could there be anything more suggestive of hot air than his coming in here and saying he is trying to prevent the spread of drinking in the State when he covers up what he is doing to provide those facilities by saying that he is going to prescribe that the licensee must have some fruit juices, some packets of peanuts and some packets of biscuits in the bar? If anyone is to be accused of hot air or of trying to obscure the position with a political smoke screen, it is the Minister who is the real culprit. He is the man who should be indicted for giving out hot air and for trying to mislead the people. Indeed, according to the political grapevine he is not very happy about the Bill. Without breaching any confidence, I can disclose that one hon. member on his side—I will not give his name—said to me, "This Bill stinks but I will still vote for it." So we could talk here until Kingdom come and we would not be able to alter these matters by any action we might take.

**Mr. Munro:** Could I ask you one question?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes.

**Mr. Munro:** This is an honest question and I should like an honest answer. Do you

think the existing law is better than the law as it will be when amended in terms of this Bill?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I indicated quite clearly, I think, that the decision of our convention was that the party should subscribe to saner drinking conditions, and in this regard I will say quite frankly that I am at variance with the temperance people outside the House. I think the licensing of cafes is a sensible innovation, but the Government have spoiled it by arbitrarily limiting the number of cafe licences that will be granted. Either it is a good thing or it is a bad thing to have licensed cafes. I think more evil will be created if the number of licences is fixed arbitrarily. The Premier had this to say when he was Leader of the Opposition—

“The number of club licences to be issued has been arbitrarily fixed at 102.”

The Government are now limiting the number of licences to 32.

**Mr. Ramsden:** You think it should be more?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** If the hon. member will be quiet for a moment, I will tell him. As a former Premier said, “A loud voice generally bespeaks a vacant mind,” and that is generally true of the hon. member for Merthyr.

Dealing with the arbitrary fixing of the number of club licences at 102—more than three times the number laid down in the Bill—in legislation introduced by a Labour Government, the Premier said—

“I would not advocate an unlimited number of club licences but in fixing an arbitrary number, whatever it may be, we might possibly exclude some very desirable clubs.”

That is precisely what the Government are doing in regard to restaurants under this measure.

**Mr. Munro:** I am still not clear in my mind and I am very anxious to know—I wonder whether you will tell me—what is the objective of the Opposition in proposing to vote against the second reading?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Because we do not think that the Government have the guts—I will put it in plain language because the Minister does not seem to understand my parliamentary language—to say that Sunday drinking is a desirable amenity and should be enforced throughout the State or to say that it is not. The second reason is that, on the Premier's own statement, made when he was in Opposition, if the Government are going to widen the provisions and increase the facilities, they should not do so at the expense of the poor old working man. There was no intention of increasing the fees on that occasion. It was only a figment of the Premier's imagination, introduced in the hope that it would become a debating

point. If I might put it on record for the second time, the Premier, who was then Leader of the Opposition said—

“ . . . it would have been most surprising if the Attorney-General had not taken this opportunity to increase the licence fees.”

As I said, such a provision was not contained in the Bill, but, in order to make a debating point of it, the Premier expressed some regret that it was not there. He went on to say—

“Surely the Premier does not think that the breweries and the hotel people pay these licence fees. They do not; it is the poor old chap who drinks the glass of beer at the counter.”

The Minister has had something to say about hot air, and he has made all sorts of other excuses, but he has taken from ordinary persons in the community protection against people endeavouring to exploit them. He has taken away price control; he has made it possible for rents to increase to high levels; yet he gets up in the House and talks about trying to protect the ordinary people in the community. Under this legislation there will be an increase that will have to be paid by the man about whom the Premier was so concerned some years ago—the poor old working man outside. He will have to pay additional charges as a result of the Government's decision to increase licence fees from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent.

**Mr. Munro:** As I understand it, you think that many of the amendments are desirable but you have a strong objection to the increase in the licence fees?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes.

**Mr. Hanlon:** We are not prepared to give our blessing to the Bill as it is.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** No. In our most optimistic moments we thought we might be able to give it our blessing, but I must confess that in the light of reality we dismissed the idea fairly quickly. The Minister seems greatly concerned about the person who might go into a hotel to drink fruit juice or buy a packet of peanuts. That person should not be in there, anyway. If the Minister is so concerned about temperance, why entice him into a bar? The Government are providing that beer gardens must be of a high standard, and persons will be enticed into them to buy a packet of peanuts or a packet of Sao biscuits.

**Mr. Ramsden** interjected.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member can make his own speech.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. DUGGAN:** We did think that if the Minister was so genuinely concerned about the person outside he might impose some measure of price control, but he has not. Members of the Licensed Victuallers' Association say that they cannot bear the impost

of this charge in addition to all the other charges that have occurred in the operation of their business. What does it amount to? Near enough to 9d. a gallon. I understand that there are about 23 glasses to the gallon. The charge cannot be put up by less than half a penny so it means the public are going to be charged 3d. over what it is going to cost the licensee unless the Minister in his Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde role says, "As long as you order six glasses you will get it at a cut rate. You will be charged only an additional 1d. for six glasses of beer instead of the 3d. minimum that can be charged for one glass of beer for the Government rake-off." Knowing the Minister as well as I do he will probably want two bob each way.

**Mr. Sullivan** interjected.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I understand the Minister has been given an undertaking by the U.L.V.A. that there will be no excessive increase in price. Will he undertake to tell the House in six months' time, if the Bill is passed, that that undertaking has been honoured? He has not misled the House, but in view of what he said about the railway men I doubt whether he would be the best authority to speak on behalf of the liquor people.

I come now to the matter of golf clubs, bowling clubs and the 40-mile radius. Recently the Minister for Labour and Industry drew attention to the need for greater care on the roads. He spoke about an education programme. He gave approval to increasing the maximum speed on the highway from 50 to 60 miles an hour. What are the Government doing? They are encouraging people who want to drink to travel 40 miles for their swill in the two-hour session. The Minister said that there would be strict enforcement of the law although he admitted that he could not enforce the existing law. If anyone wants to travel 40 miles for a drink—some no doubt will—otherwise why fix 40 miles, why not make it 35, 30 or 25—

**Mr. Dewar:** They can do that now.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** It would be wise if the hon. member voted in accordance with his conscience, but that is very unlikely.

**Mr. Dewar** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! In view of his statement previously that he was anxious to get this debate through I trust that the Leader of the Opposition will not be misled by interjections. I ask other hon. members, if they require to get the debate through, to refrain from interjecting.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your looking after my welfare like that. With due regard to your great ability I indicated that I wanted to get it through quickly.

Do the Government think that the great mass of people outside want to take advantage of the drinking sessions between 12 noon and 2 p.m. and between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m.? For that matter, what geni in the Government group fixed on the hours between 12 noon and 7 p.m.? The Minister says that practice operates in various parts of the State where they have Sunday drinking. He thinks it is reasonable, only it has not the force of law. He is not against the practice; he thinks it is reasonable. He said in his introduction that as long as a law is reasonable it should be introduced, therefore it is proposed to introduce a reasonable law. Therefore, it is reasonable in those particular areas. While he cannot enforce it in this case, because he fixes the hours when people may have this swill, between 12 noon and 2 p.m., and between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. If they are admitting that the principle is to permit two-hour sessions, are those the proper hours? I will canvass this with other members of my party in the Committee stages but I do not think it is right to provide an incentive to leave the family home during luncheon-hours in the middle of the day and again at meal-hour in the evening. In addition, would we be doing the right thing to the church organisations by throwing onto the footpaths at 7 o'clock, in some cases at any rate, the results of that 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. swill? I think that should be amended and we propose to move an amendment along those lines if the second reading is carried. We do not accept that such hours will provide the saner drinking that is alleged to be the Government's policy. We do not accept that principle and we will make some contribution towards not making difficulties for the churches or disturbing the family table. I think it is wrong to fix these sessions between 12 noon and 2 p.m., and 5 p.m. and 7 p.m., the two meal periods during the day.

The Government say to the golf clubs that power will be given to the Licensing Commission to fix such hours as they may determine. Why do they not accept responsibility for it as they have in the case of people outside and tell them what the hours should be? They say that some people may wish to play early or late. They may come to have a round of golf and miss part of the session and the Government allow the golf club committee to meet their convenience. It might be a hot day and, as I say, someone may want a game early or late. They have their round of golf and then come in for some refreshment and the Government are leaving it to the Licensing Commission to say whether there should be one period of four hours or two periods of two hours. If it is a good principle for the golfers or bowlers to have that opportunity, why should sectional legislation discriminate against other sporting organisations who feel that their recreation is as beneficial to them? And why should they be deprived of a similar opportunity in the matter?

I did not develop in great detail, and I do not propose to do so now, because we will do it in the Committee stages, the question I started on before I was interrupted by hon. members opposite—that of 32 licensed restaurants. I pointed out that they either come up to a standard or they do not and, according to the screening process, there might well be fewer than 32 but, if we are to cater for tourists who come here prepared to spend money, there may well be over 32. I suppose we will have less heartburning about the tourists than about regular citizens going to such places. In any case, I think the standard should be set high and, if it is high, why limit it to 32? I do not know whether the hon. member for South Coast will speak—he probably will—but it may well be that, if not now, at a later date, he could show that on the South Coast, where there is envisaged by some people a second Miami in the Pacific, people would be prepared to put in sufficient capital to open establishments of sufficiently high standards to justify the granting of a license. They would be prevented from getting one because this legislation prevents an increase of any more than two licenses a year. It may well be that 20 could be on the South Coast and if they have that proportion it will be unfair to the rest of the State. I will not mention their names now, but there are some cities in the State with large populations, and no restaurants that measure up to the standard necessary for the granting of a license. It may well be, as the Premier himself said when in Opposition that there should not be an arbitrary limit laid down but high standards should be set and enforced. If we have a restricted number of licences, what will happen? There will be trafficking in licences. There will be people who will say, "I know somebody who can influence the Licensing Commission." In saying that, I am not in any way reflecting on the integrity of the members of the Licensing Commission. The statement may mean that the person can present submissions in a very persuasive way, but, whether the licence is granted because of the persuasive way in which the submissions are made or whether it is granted purely on the merit of the submissions, it then becomes a transferable instrument to someone else.

The Labour Government laid down a policy on Casket licenses. If anybody indicated to the manager, Frank Burke, that there had been a financial consideration, even if it was only £25, he automatically refused the transfer of the Casket agency licence. If there was any evidence at all available to him that a financial consideration passed for the transfer of a Casket agency licence, the applicant's task in asking for the transfer was hopeless. I do not know how many Casket agencies operate throughout the State, but the number must be very high and, as it was thought by the Labour Government that there were some undesirable features about a financial consideration for the granting of a licence and

the creation of a monopoly, we view with great misgivings the restriction as to number imposed by the Bill, as it will lend itself to that practice, and we think that is undesirable.

We come to the matter of the Government's being concerned about people outside the perimeter of the Brisbane area and their requirements for beer-gardens. Admittedly the legislation gives the Licensing Commission power to determine that there need not be a beer-garden or lounge if it feels that the circumstances justify the non-provision of a beer-garden or lounge. Why not define the matter more definitely? Licensees do not know at the present time whether they will be obliged, for Sunday trading between 12 noon and 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. to have elaborate lounges, or whether they will be permitted to trade in the bar. There are two or three consequences of this aspect of the legislation that should be taken into account. If the Government are going to insist on lounges being much more attractive than the bar, and on the provision of a beer-garden with elaborate appointments and up to prescribed standards, will not those things in themselves be an inducement to people to go there and remain there? People in the outback parts of the State, where the roads are dry and dusty and where people are thirsty, may want to go into the bar on Sundays with the intention of having one or two drinks and going home. But if they become comfortably ensconced in a lounge or beer-garden, they are more likely to consume more liquor than the person who wanted one or two drinks in the bar before going home.

**Mr. Hughes:** There is still a choice.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member can argue that point. Further, if these facilities have to be provided, the price of beer or spirits served there will have to be higher. But as I said at the introductory stage, the Government are not concerned about price or moral principles; as long as someone is prepared to pay it, they are prepared to accept the principles for the purpose of getting an extra £500,000, out of which they say they will spend a sum not exceeding £30,000 on the encouragement of temperance throughout the State.

The requirements may be beyond the financial capacity of many licensees. The Licensing Commission determines what must be done and there is no appeal from its decision. I have knowledge of the case of a wine saloon in Mackay. The hon. member for Mackay will deal with it. Demands were made on the licensee of this wine saloon in Mackay to effect certain improvements to the premises. He pointed out that he did not feel the volume of trade justified the expenditure that would have to be incurred to carry out the directions of the Commission. He put in an amended plan, and the plan was summarily rejected by the Commission. I have seen the correspondence signed by the

secretary. The licensee was told, "You have to do this or else." He spent a large sum of money, running into thousands of pounds, and completed the work only a matter of a few months ago. This legislation is now introduced and all that work has gone by the board. There is no appeal, although the Minister will say that the Bill provides for the payment of compensation. I am not putting up a case for wine saloons, but I do think there is something wrong when a man can be told he must spend thousands of pounds on this work, against his will, or surrender the equity he has in the business, and, having done that, he can be told, "You will close it down forthwith and you will be dealt with according to the decision of the Licensing Commission." I have knowledge of many such cases, one being at Drayton. I have a very high regard for the members of the Licensing Commission. I served in the Army with the chairman, a man of great ability, who was secretary to Sir Arthur Fadden, and is a barrister in his own right. I have a high personal regard also for Mr. McCoy, and Mr. Doyle. However, they lay down a policy here in Brisbane which cannot be applied in all cases. For instance, certain conditions have been imposed for the hotel at Drayton in regard to accommodation. How many people would go from Brisbane or Warwick to Drayton to spend a night there? It is true that there may be an odd person, but in my opinion it is not right to demand that some thousands of pounds should be spent on these premises. If the requirements are not met the licence will be revoked, and there is no appeal against the decision of the Commission.

The Minister has made it abundantly clear that he has no desire to handle this hot potato. He wants to put it on the kitchen table to cool for a little while, put a little fruit juice over it, sprinkle it with sugar, and have a sugar-coated potato. When that is done, and the legislative wishes of his party have been met it will then be left to the Licensing Commission to handle any repercussions and there will be no appeal against its decision.

**Mr. Hughes:** Surely you will agree that there is need in Queensland to improve hotel accommodation?

**Mr. DUGGAN:** Yes, I quite agree, but on this occasion I am not concerned about standards, although I agree with the hon. member on that. I think it would be quite silly to expect too much in the far distant towns. When I was out at Betoota or Boulia, no-one would have wanted an air-conditioned room more than I, but it is quite unreasonable to expect people to build palatial premises out there. At present I am not talking so much about the standard of accommodation required, but the volume of accommodation.

The Commission has the arbitrary right to decide whether a licensee can sell beer

over a bar, or whether he must have a lounge or a beer garden. I think the Government should come out in the open and say quite frankly what their views are and lay down some principles for the guidance of the Licensing Commission. The Minister has said he does not want to interfere personally in any of these matters. From my experience I have found him very reluctant to interfere with the due processes of the law, and I commend him for that very proper attitude. I am merely pointing out that his administrative behaviour is such that he is most unlikely to intervene in any disputes that may arise from this legislation. He would say that they are matters for the Licensing Commission, and in my opinion, for the protection of the Licensing Commission, the conditions should be laid down more clearly than they are in the Bill. It seems to me that nothing will be able to influence the Commission on the decisions it may make unless there is some surreptitious approach, behind the Minister's back.

I do not intend to take advantage of all the time that is available to me. I believe that in a general way I have explained our attitude to this measure. To summarise my remarks, I might say that in our view the Government have not provided the proper facilities. We are in agreement with some of the principles of the Bill but we reject the general statement that the Bill has been designed to prevent the increased use of alcohol. It does not do that and the Government realise that it will not do that, but they have proceeded with this quite deliberately and premeditatively. We believe they have been dishonest in the way they have brought this Bill to Parliament. I should have had much more respect for the Government and the Minister if they had said, "We realise this is a controversial measure; we realise that outside opinion is divided, but we have had a very close look at the pros and cons of Sunday drinking, and, on the balance, we think steps should be taken to give effect to our general views; that trading should be so-and-so, and licences should be so-and-so." However, the Minister has tried to frame legislation which, by the use of words, and a lot of mumbo-jumbo, he is trying to prove meets the reasonable requirements of the drinkers and, at the same time, serves the interests of the temperance people. This is grossly discriminatory legislation and to my mind it does not contain a proper and reasonable approach to the general question of drinking. In view of the discrimination about sports meetings, the admission by the Minister that the law cannot be enforced at the present time, the absence of any undertaking that the law will or can be enforced any better in the future, and for many other reasons that will be developed from different points of view by speakers who will follow me, I want to indicate that the Opposition intend to vote against the proposals.

The Minister commended the hon. member for Carnarvon for speaking so sincerely from the heart and for leaving it to the individual members of the Queensland Labour Party to vote according to their own conscience. If he felt that that was a very good principle to be applied to the Q.L.P., let him apply it to the Country Party-Liberal coalition and let the members of the Government vote according to their conscience. If they do, I feel sure the measure will not be passed by this Assembly in its present form. If it is passed in its present form the least we can hope for is that there will not be this discrimination, that there will be more equitable treatment, and that the Government will accept the responsibility of providing for fair treatment when legislating to alter the drinking habits and drinking conditions in the State. If this is going to be their considered policy, reinforced by a community acceptance of the principle, we want to see that it is sanely, fairly and equitably administered amongst all the people in the State, and that those who are at present outside the provisions of the legislation will be treated on exactly the same basis as those who are included in it.

For those reasons the Opposition will vote against the Bill.

**Mr. DIPLOCK** (Aubigny) (12.22 p.m.): Before speaking in opposition to the second reading of the Bill I wish to thank my leader for yielding to me his place in the debate. He knows I have a very important engagement that I cannot break, and I very much appreciate the opportunity to voice my opposition to the Bill at this stage. I wished to speak on Friday last but I respected the Premier's request. However, as the Leader of the Opposition said, every hon. member should be given the right to say just as much as he wishes to say on this occasion.

I am not opposed to the legislation because of the opposition of certain groups of the community, which, to my mind, have not the right to impose their will on the whole of the community; but their wishes should be considered. When speaking against legislation introduced by the late Hon. E. M. Hanlon on liquor reform, the then Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, said that there was no reason for the Bill because no section of the public had asked for any change. If the Government are prepared to take into consideration the views of a section of the public who desire a change, they should give the same right to those who are opposed to it. So the Minister should consider the views of those who are opposed to the Bill. I realise that something should be done to enable all members of the community to enjoy the same drinking privileges. It is certainly not right that holiday-makers should have the privilege of having a drink on Sunday unless it is extended to the

community as a whole. I do not say that the principle is right or that it is wrong, but if the privilege is to be enjoyed by one section of the community it should be enjoyed by the others. I cannot see why a man who decides to go to a certain seaside resort to bask in the sunshine should have the right to a drink while the man who works in the fields in a rural area, and whose only opportunity, very often, to have a drink is on a Sunday, is denied it. The police in charge of the area now control the liquor traffic on Sundays. I believe that that system will prevail whether the provisions of the Bill are implemented or whether they are not. There is no possible way of overcoming individual treatment by either the officer in charge of the area or the policemen under his control.

Before offering any criticism of the Bill, I wish to say for the benefit of hon. members opposite who were not privileged to be here when a former Labour Government introduced legislation providing for certain liquor reforms that I am amazed at the change of front by at least some hon. members who are now sitting on the Government benches when I compare the attitude they adopted when in Opposition with their attitude today. Those of us who were privileged to be here well remember that the galleries were filled to capacity by reverend gentlemen and members of church organisations. They were entitled to be there, and I am sorry that they are not in the galleries now in such numbers. Those of us who were then sitting on the Government benches remember the nods of approbation that hon. members then in Opposition received from people in the gallery for a speech or an interjection. I cannot see what has taken place in such a short time to change the attitude of those hon. members who now sit on the Government benches. I do not quarrel with them for adopting that attitude on that occasion. But if they were sincere in what they said then, how can they possibly be sincere in supporting the legislation now before the House?

**Mr. Ramsden:** Did you support the legislation when it was brought down previously?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** It was never brought down.

I could quote a few of the remarks made by hon. members who were then sitting on this side of the Chamber. One or two statements made by the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition are interesting. In Volume 210 of "Hansard", page 1636, he said—

"For instance, it was forecast that we should have licensed cafes in this State. They are not provided for in the Bill, and that is wise, because the extension of drinking to cafes needs looking into very carefully indeed."

I think the Premier was correct, too, and I cannot see how he justifies his action in supporting this Bill.

In the same volume of "Hansard", page 1638—I am repeating a passage quoted by the Leader of the Opposition because I think here we find the real reason for the introduction of the Bill—he said—

"Seeing that it is their habit to collect all the money they can it would have been most surprising if the Attorney-General had not taken this opportunity to increase the licence fees. Surely the Premier does not think that the breweries and the hotel people pay these licence fees. They do not; it is the poor old chap who drinks the glass of beer at the counter."

That was true then, and it is true now.

I could refer hon. members to many other passages from speeches made by hon. members now sitting on the Government benches that make one wonder why they have agreed to bring the Bill before the House. If the remarks made by the Premier were correct then, they are correct now. To my mind his second remark is the real reason for the introduction of the Bill. It enables the Treasurer to collect more revenue which, as the Premier stated, is another instance of class taxation, because it will be paid by the poor old chap who drinks a glass of beer at the counter. I would not say that the Minister has tried to mislead the people, but he has tried to fool them, or pull the wool over their eyes, by suggesting that the Government's action has been prompted by worthy motives such as protecting and safeguarding our young people, establishing and maintaining a respect for law, etc. But I feel sure that the majority of people are awake to the fact that the Treasurer needs money, and that certain hon. members opposite have been plugging for this reform, not for any upliftment of the behaviour of the people generally but to satisfy the wishes of their constituents looking for further business.

In his opening remarks the Minister proudly recalled his words of 17 years ago. He says that our laws must be just laws, laws which are fair to everybody. Unless he is prepared to accept many amendments it would have been far better for the Minister to have forgotten those words because there will be thousands of people throughout Queensland who will consider that they have been the victims of discrimination when the Bill becomes law.

The Minister talks about bridging the gap between the law and the enforcement of the law. Does he really believe that the granting of Sunday sessions is an aid to bridging that gap?

The degree of enforcement of the law has always been a matter for the officer in charge of a district to decide. That is not good, but the Bill, to my mind, is not going to alter things.

Referring to the fairness of the Bill, I ask the Minister if it is fair and just and within the law for a person to have a drink on a Sunday 40 miles from Brisbane, what is

wrong with having a drink in Brisbane except that it is against the law? If it is morally right to have a drink outside of the 40-mile radius, it is morally right to have it within the 40-mile radius. As the Bill now stands there is discrimination against the people living in Brisbane as against those 40 miles out of Brisbane. I refer particularly to Redcliffe. I have been going to Redcliffe on and off for the last 25 years. I should say that 95 per cent. of the people who visit Redcliffe are workers. They go there because they cannot afford to meet the high expense of living on the South Coast. Those workers are to be denied the right to drink on Sunday, yet the Government think that it is morally right for the people who have the money and all the good things of life, to go to Southport or any other part of the Gold Coast and enjoy a drink. I am not saying that it is wrong to enjoy a drink at these places, but, if it is right for those who visit the South Coast to have a drink, it is right for the poorer class of people, who have to limit their travelling and go to Redcliffe, to have a drink. I am quite sure the hon. member for South Coast will agree with me on that.

The Minister claims to be doing something to bring about better conditions and better living for the people of the State. I think hon. members will agree that, whether a man has sessions on a week day or not, 95 per cent. of the people spend their Sundays with their families. Sunday has become the family day and, too, many poor people—I do not refer to hon. members opposite who have plenty of money and all they wish to eat and drink every day of the year—have one good meal a week—Sunday dinner. Sunday is the one day when these people get together to enjoy a good meal. Up to date, Dad has been prepared to stay at home, perhaps having a glass of beer that he has brought home on Saturday, taking the family for a drive and then having the evening meal which might be possibly termed the family supper. By suggesting that he can go to the hotel between the hours of 12 noon and 2 p.m. we encourage him to do so and leave his family at home.

I know many people would not think of doing that, but this will authorise it. Dad may be at home. Along will come his pal. After a short talk the pal suggests that it is time to go for a drink. Dad will go at 12 and, unless Mum is the person of authority in that home, he will not be home until 2. The Sunday tradition built up in that home will be broken.

To my mind, to allow drinking between the hours of 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. is quite wrong. In country areas many people leave work at 5 o'clock and get home at 6 because that is the accepted time for them to get home. If Sunday drinking is introduced, Sunday being more or less a holiday, such persons may be induced to spend more than one hour in the hotel in the evening.



The licensing of a fixed number of cafes opens the door to one of the greatest rackets conceivable. I am not suggesting that either the Minister or any of his administrative staff, or any member of the Licensing Commission would be anything but fair and honest.

**Mr. Nicklin:** Then why make that statement?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** I did not imply a racket by those authorities, but there are to be only 32 licences, increasing by a maximum of two in each year. Once a person gets a cafe licence he could ask any exorbitant price for it. A cafe may at present be worth £1,500—

**Mr. Nicklin:** The licence will not be transferred with the cafe without the consent of the Licensing Commission.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** That may be so, and it may be sold to an equally respectable and efficient proprietor but the owner can and the Premier will admit it, ask an exorbitant price for it by virtue of the fact that he has the licence.

**Mr. Houston:** There is no price control.

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** No. There was never price control of that sort of thing, because the person could get something on the side.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Would the position not be the same as when a casket agency is sold now?

**Mr. DIPLOCK:** The hon. member surely does not believe that there is no transfer fee when casket agencies are sold. I see a great danger in it. I want it to be clearly understood that I do not attribute any improper conduct to the Minister or any of his staff, or to any member of the Licensing Commission, but once a cafe proprietor gets a licence he will be able to sell it at any price he cares to ask, especially if his cafe is in a very good area.

In conclusion, I want to say that I am definitely opposed to the second reading of the Bill. I point out, however, that it will not be possible for me to vote against it because I have paired with a Government member who has helped me out on many occasions when I was sick.

**Mr. GAVEN** (South Coast) (12.42 p.m.): In rising to participate in the debate, I say at the outset that I have listened very attentively to hon. members who have spoken. The hon. member for Aubigny is very concerned about the fact that travellers to the seaside are able to obtain a drink although residents and workers in the area cannot get one. I should like to ask him, through you, Mr. Speaker, who introduced that legislation in the first place? Who provided the 40-mile limit in the first place? Who said that tourists and travellers would have to go 40 miles to get a drink? Not the present Government, but the hon.

member and other hon. members who sit opposite. They were the people who introduced that legislation. Now they have the temerity and colossal cheek to get up and tell the Government they are doing something that should not be done. They were the very people who were responsible for the legislation they condemn. Shame on them, as the hon. member for Gregory has said. I have never listened to such hypocrisy, poppycock, and nonsense in my life. When the legislation now being considered becomes law, the workers and the residents in those areas will have the opportunity they were denied by hon. members opposite. We are giving them the right to have a drink, under the Bill that we hope will be given effect to on 1 December of this year.

Then he went on to say he was very concerned about the restaurants down there that would be licensed. Only 32 are to be licensed throughout the State. There will be 32 plus 2, making 34. The hon. member for Aubigny was very concerned about the setting of an arbitrary number and said that we were discriminating amongst and between people. Who issued the licenses for wine saloons? Was there any discrimination in that matter? How many wine saloons are there in the State today—32. Who issued those licences and who kept the number to 32? We have heard a lot about rackets and graft and all the rest of it. I am one of those who are prepared to accept the fact that in this country there is a tremendous number of honest, decent people. There has been all this talk of graft, corruption and other nonsense. I have been in public life for 30 years and I know very little of it can be "shot home" or proved. We have heard a great deal of loose talk about corruption in the police force. Queensland has the finest police force in Australia, a police force composed of honourable, decent men. If a weed grows in their garden, and a weed will grow in the best of gardens, no-one can be blamed. We have an honourable police force, without any graft and corruption, and excellent hotelkeepers, and I honestly believe the restaurants or cafes to be licensed will be conducted decently and well. If they are not there is a provision in the Bill to deal with that, and it is almost as severe as Rule 62 of the Racing and Betting Act. There will not be any explanation and the licence will be cancelled.

I am very pleased that the hon. member for Carnarvon, the Leader of the Q.L.P., a sincere man whom I respect, and the Leader of the A.L.P., Mr. Duggan, rose in their places and said that they believed the licensing of cafes in the State was a step in the right direction. I have advocated it for years, and I take full responsibility for it. I will not shirk my responsibility or run away from anyone opposed to it. I make no apology for having advocated it. I have travelled extensively and I have watched very closely what happens

in the different countries. I believe that where people consume food with liquor there is far less drunkenness.

We hear about the two-hour swill, from 5 to 7 p.m., and 12 to 2 p.m. But who were the people responsible for fixing those hours? It was not this Government but the people opposite who criticise this legislation. I have never heard such hypocrisy, poppycock and nonsense in all my life. Let us have a little sincerity and genuineness in the debate. Hon. members opposite know as well as we do that their opposition to this legislation is not because they are antagonistic to it but because they wish to obtain a miserable political advantage, by worming in and out, trying to find how they can influence unthinking people to give them their votes at the next election.

It is inherent in the average Australian to have his glass of beer. All sincere hon. members in this Chamber will accept that statement, and, having accepted it, let them ensure that the beer can be drunk under the best possible conditions. Let us see that when drink is partaken, that food can be had with it in decent surroundings, so that the average man can enjoy a drink with his wife when he wants to.

The Leader of the Opposition complained this morning that he was asked to speak about the Bill without having had a chance to study it. The same principle has been followed in the 12 years that I have been in Parliament. When I sat on the Opposition benches for many years we were handed amendments to the Bill in the same way as they were handed to the Opposition today. Let us have a little sincerity in the debate, and stop all this nonsense and wasting of time. Let us get down to the principle of whether we should give the people better facilities for drinking, or whether they should continue as they are at present.

**Mr. Walsh:** Sit down yourself.

**Mr. GAVEN:** The hon. member can try to sit me down.

The Leader of the Opposition wanted to know why we were not enforcing the law at present. Did the Government of which he was a member enforce the law over the years? Hon. members opposite know as well as I do that it is impossible to enforce the law as it stands. Then the Leader of the Opposition said that people would get in their cars and drive 40 or 50 miles to bowling clubs to get a drink. That is an indictment of all decent members of bowling clubs and golf clubs in the State. As you are a sportsman, Mr. Speaker, you know that you have to be a member of a bowling club, and play on the green, before you can get a drink, or a member of the club can accompany you into the bar. People who are not members of bowling clubs cannot walk in and have a drink.

The hon. member who has interjected must be associated with clubs that are different from the ones I am acquainted with. I am the patron of many clubs on the coast and I know what goes on. I have never listened to such a nonsensical statement in my life. Fancy suggesting that a man would get into a car in Brisbane and drive around to all the golf clubs and bowling clubs to get a drink whether he was a member of them or not!

We have heard a great deal of talk about discrimination among various people and the areas in the State. If anyone knows anything about discrimination, the Australian Labour Party in this State had it down to a fine art. I do not want to involve you in this, Mr. Speaker, but you know the discrimination that was levelled against the areas we represented when you and I first entered this Chamber. They denied the people the right to build houses in your area and in mine, and they talk about discrimination!

What about the laws that have been in existence right up to the present time? At present a man has to travel 40 miles to get a drink. Now they say that, because under the Bill he will still have to travel 40 miles, we are discriminating against him. They themselves introduced it in the first place. We have heard a great deal of loose talk.

**Mr. Walsh** interjected.

**Mr. GAVEN:** Apparently I have said enough to draw quite a few interjections from hon. members opposite. But I am not going to deal with their interjections today. I am going to make my speech in my own way and in my own time. I always give hon. members opposite an opportunity to present their case to the Chamber but I know that if anyone replies effectively to them they cannot sit and take it; they are like Bill the butcher's dog.

Let us look at some figures of hotels in relation to population. In 1935 Queensland had a population of 970,719 and 1,342 hotels, or 723 people to a hotel. At 30 June, 1961, the population of the State was 1,466,579 and there were 1,157 hotels. So the number of persons to a hotel has increased from 723 to 1,268 and there are 185 fewer hotels in the State than there were in 1935. Where is the basis for all this talk about throwing the State wide open to drink? Those are the facts. There are fewer facilities for drinking today than there were in those days.

**Mr. Walsh:** What about the clubs?

**Mr. GAVEN:** I will not allow the hon. member for Bundaberg to draw me into discussion of a side issue. He is a very cagey gentleman who has been a member of this Assembly for a very long time. He knows every trick in the game but he cannot get me in because I have learned a few myself since I have been here.

The other day some speakers went to great lengths to talk about drunken driving and how it was responsible for most of the deaths and most of the accidents and so on. I believe that in a Chamber such as this we must take the opportunity to give the people of the State a clear picture of exactly what is happening. Let us look at the figures for September, 1961, released by the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics. These are for the State of Victoria; Queensland's figures have not yet been released.

Excessive speed claimed the greatest number of victims on Victorian roads last year. Fifteen point four per cent. of the accidents reported were shown to have been caused by excessive speed; 14.7 per cent. were due to inattentive driving and 14.4 per cent. to failure to give the right-of-way. The figures show that slightly fewer than 1 per cent. of accidents were caused by drunkenness.

That gives the lie direct to a lot of the nonsense we heard about road accidents, especially from the hon. member for Townsville South, who claimed that most of them were caused by people under the influence of alcohol while in charge of cars.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. GAVEN:** In the Road Transport Digest—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the hon. member is not going to develop his argument on road accidents. We are dealing with the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill.

**Mr. GAVEN:** That is right. With all respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I think I must answer some of the charges made by the hon. member for Townsville South in his speech at the introductory stage. Here are the figures given in the Road Transport Digest issued by the Australian Road Transport Digest issued by the Australian Road Transport Federation—

"Excessive speed having regard to conditions	6,327
Inattentive driving	8,476
Not keeping to the left	2,829
Not giving the right-of-way at intersection	8,816
Intoxication	1,506"

Hon. members will notice that intoxication is at the bottom of the list. It is seen from those figures that all the talk about liquor being the cause of most accidents and injuries has no foundation and will not stand up to investigation.

**Mr. Dewar:** Those figures will not stand up to investigation.

**Mr. GAVEN:** They will. They are figures given in the Road Transport Digest.

For centuries men have regarded the use of liquor as a matter purely for individual determination, controlled only by their religious beliefs and personal attitudes.

The colonists brought with them their drinking habits as well as the European licence system, and from the very early days this system has undergone many processes of modification. Changes have been made in standards demanded of licensees, in the types and numbers of licences authorised, and in the hours and conditions of sale, to meet altered situations. All these changes have been made by Parliaments of differing political colours in an endeavour to legislate fairly for the circumstances of the day.

The purpose of the amendments before the House is no different. We, as a Government, have accepted that, no matter what some people may think about alcohol and its sale, it is our duty to accept the demands of a modern society and to legislate accordingly.

In so doing, we know that we offend a quite vocal and quite respectable section of the community. This is unfortunate, but we should be unworthy of our trust were we to sacrifice our vow to modernise archaic legislation on the altar of political expediency.

In our opinion, it is useless to have on the Statute Book an Act which in many respects is flouted every day of the week by accepted customs and habits that make restrictions steeped in antiquity appear ridiculous. Officialdom, in the form of the Licensing Commission and the police, know full well that the majority of bowls and golf clubs in the State serve liquor on Sundays. They know too, that the law in regard to travellers is observed in the breach. Some people refer to wine saloons as dens of iniquity. I would not go as far as that. I would describe them as unsavoury places that make no contribution to civilised drinking habits.

Are we, as a Government, supposed to turn a blind eye to a fait accompli and refuse to legalise something that is already a fact because of possible political dangers? I say again that we should be most remiss in our duty to the State and to the wishes of the great majority of its people if pressure groups were allowed to dictate the form, indeed the very introduction, of legislation. Further, I say that in grasping this nettle so assiduously avoided by the A.L.P., we will not only enhance our reputation as a Government of strength and determination but will have behind us all fair-minded Queenslanders who acknowledge that it is a Government's duty to legislate for the majority without fear or favour.

This is the third time since we came to power that we have amended the Liquor Act. In 1958 the amendments were substantial; in 1959 there were only four amendments, and they were comparatively minor ones. This time we are breaking new and very important ground. We have removed the blot of wine saloons. Do we hear the commendation one would expect from the prohibitionists? No, we do not hear one word. We have legalised for respected and responsible members of bowls

and golf clubs what they did illegally before; we have brought sense to regulations covering travellers and we have introduced the sanity of drinking with meals in selected premises.

There is to my mind nothing in the proposed amendments that is worthy of condemnation even from the most bigoted point of view. We have merely brought club drinking into the open where it can be better policed; we have acknowledged the proven fact that drinking with meals is the sensible way of consuming alcohol; we have replaced phantasy with fact in the travellers' law, and we have transferred wine saloon licences to chosen cafes. I wonder at the opposition to those amendments.

We know golfers and bowlers drink on Sunday; we know that the signing of travellers' books is a farce. All we have done is to legalise what was done illegally and make basically law-observing and respectable citizens, law-observing and respectable once again.

The sole remaining major amendment, the closure of wine saloons and the transfer of their licences, should earn the commendation and thanks of all citizens. The point it is my intention to make is that there has been no extension of note, merely a recognition that certain practices were in existence and should be legalised, and that the transfer of saloon licences to cafes was the sensible and most progressive thing to do.

The principle of legalising accepted practice is important. I quote from a book "Toward Liquor Control" written by two Americans, Fosdick and Scott—

"Established customs cannot be brushed aside at one stroke, and, in some places at least, it may be found necessary for a closely regulated sale of spirituous beverages for consumption with meals. The legitimate need must be measured in terms of insistence of demand."

That is exactly what we have acknowledged, yet that book was written way back in 1933—28 years ago.

It always has been a source of wonder to me that no Labour Government in Queensland were willing to face the facts of changing drinking habits, and legislate accordingly.

In 1959 the Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to support the amendments brought down by my colleague, the Minister for Justice. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition said—

"The Labour Party concede that there is a need for possibly a new approach to the problem of liquor reform in Queensland."

It is a pity his party did not practise its belief during its long and unproductive term of office. However, let us hope its weakness then has been translated into strength now

and that it will be behind the Government with unstinted and constructive support on this important issue.

This is an excellent opportunity for both Labour parties to come out clearly and unequivocally with statements of policy on how they think the Liquor Act should be framed and administered. The Government would appreciate constructive contributions on this subject, as would the people generally. I sincerely hope that the debate will develop along those lines.

During my speech I hope to canvass the so-called problem of drinking and its relation to alcoholism because, unfortunately, the two are deemed in some quarters to be inseparable and synonymous. That, of course, is a fallacious assumption. The great majority of those who use alcoholic beverages do not become alcoholics. Moreover, most people do not support sympathetically any sweeping nihilistic solution which deprives them of the use of alcoholic beverages in moderation. That being so, it is surely up to the "wets" and the "drys" to acknowledge the need for their getting together to fight an enemy common to both—excessive drinking. Whether we like it or not drinking is here to stay and this must be accepted by the "drys" as willingly as the need for moderate drinking must be accepted by the "wets." At present, the public is quick to suspect that any education on the subject of alcohol is either wet or dry. They believe the average man thinks that there is nothing that can be done about a heavy drinker who is perverse and refuses to listen to reason. The work of Alcoholics Anonymous is breaking that thought down and is the best example of the great need for all of us to lay aside our differences and unite on the one and only great problem—alcoholism.

Through that we can open doors and move faster to greater moderation by a larger proportion of drinkers. This should be the aim of the "wets" and the "drys." The "drys" should be satisfied with the fact that those they cannot convert to abstinence are at least moderate drinkers. The "wets" should be satisfied that their supporters are conditioned to approach with sanity and judgment the product the law entitles them to drink. This, to my mind, is a far better approach to the general question of drinking than constant and interminable wrangling of immutable forces.

It might interest hon. members to know that a body was formed in America in 1945 for just that work. It was known as the National Committee for Education on Alcohol. I would strongly suggest to the "wets" and the "drys" in Queensland that, while each camp is entitled to respect for its basic principles, there is fertile and common ground in between that can be tilled with mutual reward and great personal satisfaction.

Now I wish to return to the difficulty confronting any Government in legislating on liquor. Throughout the world there are great variances in hours and conditions. Even Governments in Australia cannot agree. Some countries permit trading over staggered hours throughout the whole 24-hour period. Others are completely dry. Some forbid the sale of liquor to people visibly intoxicated but court opinions on whether a person is visibly intoxicated would fill books. Some forbid the sale to insane persons but is insanity to be defined according to the special meanings of psychiatry or by reference to the legal distinction of whether the purchaser knows the difference between right and wrong? Some forbid sales to persons convicted of drunken driving.

In America, as an example, Delaware prohibits sale to University students within two miles of the State University. Minnesota does likewise but does not add the 2-mile limit. Louisiana forbids sale to women and girls. Massachusetts prohibits sale to women at bars unless they sit on stools. Men are permitted to stand and drink in Connecticut bars, women are not. Michigan punishes retailers who sell to truck drivers on duty.

So it goes on in practically every country in the world. Why do not all countries forbid all these sales, or why do they forbid any? Why do the statutes differ so much on these matters? Is there actually a difference of opinion among the people who command these Governments? If so, why do such differences exist? When did they start, and what caused them.

There is no easy answer to these questions. Indeed, the only conceivable answer is in the book that I quoted earlier, and which says—

“The plain truth is that the legitimate need must be measured in terms of insistence of demand; it cannot be measured by what we might hope will be satisfactory. Thus measured, the legitimate need will be found to vary considerably from State to State and from locality to locality within a single State.”

So it is in Queensland. Our hotel hours differ from those in Victoria and our club hours from those in New South Wales. We consider tourist areas need special consideration and we appreciate that bowls and golf clubs are often the focal points of community interest and life in most rural areas, and should, therefore, be catered for also. In other words, we have continued to adhere to the principle of measuring legitimate needs in terms of insistence of local and particular demands.

That to my mind, is the only way to frame and to implement a liquor Act.

It is not one iota of use applying nineteenth century outlooks and reasoning to the Soaring Sixties of the twentieth century. We are in an atomic age with a responsible and

educated citizenry. Yet we have some who would aspire to the moon in their adoration of technological advances yet would seek to enforce a horse-and-buggy pace in sociological advances.

It is this strange paradox that renders completely ridiculous the organised and quite virulent opposition to the measures before the House. It is an opposition completely out of touch with modern custom, usage and demand; an opposition that would make Queensland a ludicrous Mother Grundy in the eyes of those who want to live in enlightened fashion in an enlightened age.

No, my Government do not countenance the arguments advanced outside the House. We acknowledge intemperance as a substantial danger yet cannot concede that, if the State is to remain wet, this danger can be overcome by harsh restriction. Our view is that by legislating sanely and urging education on drinking we will have fulfilled both our parliamentary obligations to State and our responsibility to society.

The facts must be faced. The use of alcoholic beverage is a very ancient custom which has survived until the present day in spite of many attempts to control or abolish it. Its persistence through the ages clearly shows that it has been of some positive value to mankind and is cherished. Primitive peoples used alcohol chiefly as a form of magic. It induced a frame of mind conducive to worship of the good spirits or to propitiate the evil ones. On ceremonial and festive occasions communal drinking was often accompanied by weird music and rhythmic dancing. Some of these drinking feasts were extended over several days; the participants invariably drank in a crescendo of revelry, recklessness and wild abandon until they reached complete intoxication.

Nowadays people seldom indulge in prolonged orgies of drunkenness but they still feel the need for some artificial means of release from anxiety and tension.

Alcohol in moderation plays a useful part in social life. It helps put our guests at their ease and keeps them in good heart and humour. It counteracts shyness and awkwardness when people are meeting for the first time.

From time immemorial the opening and sharing of the bottle has been the universal emblem of cordial hospitality whenever people have assembled together for the purpose of celebration.

Many people regularly take wine with their meals because they believe that by doing so they stimulate their appetite and the flavour of the food is enhanced.

Drinking of this moderate kind is socially accepted and generally approved. The moderate or social drinker fits easily into the approved pattern of drinking without suffering any ill-effects. At the end of the day he has his few glasses of beer and finds that they

produce a pleasant sense of relief and relaxation. Drinking is not a matter of vital moment to him and he can take it or leave it as he feels inclined. This group of people comprises by far the great body of drinkers, and it is for them, in a wet State that a Government must necessarily legislate. How vastly different from the addict who boasts that he can take it or leave it, and, having said as much, usually takes it, only to find he cannot leave it.

The primary aim of the moderate drinker is refreshment of body and mind. When he finds it, he is content. In this respect, his attitude to drinking is exactly like that of others to athletic recreation, theatre-going, reading and music. Such activities help us to find release from the harsh realities of life by escaping into the lighter and freer world of phantasy. These are all healthy forms of escape, but when a man depends on alcohol or other drugs to drown his sorrows or to achieve in imagination, success and the fulfilment of ambitions he cannot attain in actual life, then this way of escape is fraught with the utmost danger. The reality of his life situation may be subordinated to an alcoholic unreality and when this begins to happen the moderate drinker is slowly induced to become a heavy drinker and possibly an alcoholic.

It is to the redemption of the very small proportion of alcoholics in our drinking community and to the education of the remainder that our very worthy church and temperance organisations should direct their earnest endeavours. It is no use criticising a Government for modernising their laws on a social practice that has been in existence in this State for over 100 years.

They must face the fact, as I said before, that the great bulk of the people want drinking to stay and appreciate, this being so, that their vitally important role must lie in the sociological fields of redemption and education of the victims of excesses and human weaknesses, not in attempting to retard progress.

Any Government worthy of its name must face up to their responsibilities and legislate for the majority of the people whether their individual members personally agree with the legislation or not.

I sincerely hope that the church and temperance groups clearly understand that this is now, and always will be, the fundamental on which this Government is predicated.

The State will always be placed first and the Government will stand or fall on this principle.

I shall not have anything more to say on the outside opposition to this measure and should like to refer now to the relationship of civilised drinking facilities to the tourist industry.

As is generally known, we consider tourism eventually will equal the great primaries as an income producer and as an absorber of man-power.

We have the natural attractions, the climate and a Tourist Bureau with the drive and imagination. But all three must remain complementary to other pre-requisites to overall enjoyment—accommodation, entertainment and sane liquor laws.

We have been making wonderful progress in the exploitation and development of nature's bounties; we have vastly improved accommodation, services and entertainment, but we have always lagged behind in our acknowledgment that the modern tourist does not want to be irked by archaic restrictions on drinking. He must return from Queensland satisfied that his holiday was perfect in all respects—not just some—before he will become a true ambassador for our great State.

This is the tourist State of Australia, and if we are to attract the millions in revenue that it means and to increase the thousands of jobs it has created, we must view the requirements of the tourists clearly and most sympathetically.

It is my personal view that eventually we may have to consider separate liquor and entertainment laws for tourist areas. It is no use saying we will attract thousands of Americans if we refuse to allow them to live in the manner to which they are accustomed.

Hawaii appreciates that, and as a result, nets hundreds of millions of dollars in tourist income.

Travel-hungry Americans would come to Queensland in great numbers, too, if we add to our undoubted world-class attractions facilities for drinking and night life which these people demand and obtain in other areas.

The world tourist of today is not satisfied merely with seeing something new, he is exacting in his demand for service in all forms, when he wants it, not when he is told he may have it.

This amendment to the Act goes a small way towards improving service to the tourist; it is a start. It is a forerunner to the attention I have no doubt will continue to be given to an industry that will make Queensland the Mecca of the South Pacific.

Hon. members will see that the amendments to this Act all serve useful and reasonable purposes. We have removed the blot of wine saloons and opened the way for tourists and residents to have a pleasant and leisurely drink with their meals in well-conducted cafes; we have made honest, members of bowls and golf clubs.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister and the members of the Government on their undoubted political courage—

**Mr. Davies:** Courage to cut out Ipswich and Brisbane.

**Mr. GAVEN:** That, the hon. member never had and never will have.

I congratulate them on their political courage, foresight and initiative in endeavouring to bring in legislation which will undoubtedly be the means of making Queensland the greatest tourist State in Australia, and the greatest tourist attraction in the southern hemisphere.

A great deal has been said about an amending clause circulated this morning. I was responsible for it. When I examined the Bill I found that it was not desirable in its present form, that it would be of no use to the people of the State. When this amendment is carried it will clean the matter up so that it will be acceptable to all the people in the State. Before resuming my seat I again commend the Minister for his political courage, for his foresight and for his initiative in doing something that should have been done in Queensland 20 years ago by a former Government who did not have the courage to do it.

**Mr. HANLON** (Baroona) (2.35 p.m.): I rise to oppose the second reading of the Bill, not, as the Leader of the Opposition very clearly pointed out, because we are opposed to liquor reform, not because we do not think it is desirable that a Bill should be introduced to amend the Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1959, but because we are not prepared to give our approval to this hotch-potch legislation that the Government has introduced under the guise of a liquor-reform measure.

When the Bill was first mooted members of the Opposition, including me, and I imagine members of the Government, received a number of letters from various people about it. As far back as early September, before the Bill was introduced, Press publicity was given to the matter and I feel sure most hon. members received letters urging them to oppose suggested measures the Government might introduce to amend the Liquor Act. As an example of the attitude the Opposition have adopted on this very controversial question, let me quote the reply I sent to one person who wrote to me, and I replied along the same lines to most of those who wrote to me—

"I thank you for your letter of the 16th instant, the contents of which I have noted.

"Any alteration of the current provisions of the Liquor Act will of course have to be initiated by the Government (of which Mr. Nicklin is the Premier). Whilst there has been Press speculation in the matter Parliament has as yet been given no indication of the Government's intentions.

"If and when such a Bill is introduced it will be given close attention by myself and fellow members of the Australian Labour Party in the Opposition but—"

and this is the part that I think indicates the attitude adopted by me, and it is the general attitude adopted by the Leader of the Opposition and followed by other members of the Opposition—

"you will appreciate that until I have the opportunity of studying the actual proposals by the Government it is not possible for me to comment."

**Mr. Davies:** What was the date of that letter?

**Mr. HANLON:** 19 September, before the Bill was introduced, which was on 13 October. So that was the general attitude adopted by the Leader of the Opposition and followed by other Opposition members before we saw the Bill. We do not give the Press of this State the right to decide Government policy any more than we give it the right to decide the Opposition's policy. We retain the right to decide our own attitude, as the Government themselves do. They were not told by "The Courier-Mail" or the "Telegraph" or the A.B.C. or somebody else what they were to do. They made up their own minds.

When the Bill was introduced on 13 October, what was the motion moved by the Minister and voted upon? It read—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1959, in certain particulars."

We supported that because we believe that it is desirable that a Bill should be introduced to amend the Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1959, in certain particulars. We think the time is due—overdue to a degree, perhaps, as this Government have been in power for four years. It has taken them four years even to make up their minds what they are going to do. As the Leader of the Opposition points out, they have given notice of amendments before the Bill has even passed the second reading stage. We should be hypocrites if we voted against a motion that merely said it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Liquor Act. Nobody denies that. If the chairman of the temperance organisations was brought into the House, he would also support a resolution that said, "That it is desirable that the Liquor Act be amended," because the temperance organisations want to amend the Act and the liquor interests want to amend the Act. In fact, I guarantee that every person in Queensland wants to amend the Liquor Act, in some way. When we supported the introduction of the Bill, I might point out that the division was not called by members of my party. We supported the resolution at the introductory stage because we thought it was self-evident that every person in the State, whether he believed there should be no liquor at all or whether he believed that everybody should be able to drink from dawn

till dusk, was of the opinion that the Liquor Act should be amended. The division was called by the hon. member for Townsville South, and I do not think members of the Q.L.P. even came into the Chamber for the division. I am not denying them their right to stay out of the Chamber; it is the easy way out. As I said, we supported the motion for the introduction of the Bill, and our action was in accordance with the stand that we adopted in correspondence and when people approached us in the early stages when the Bill was first mooted in the Press. We said that we wanted an opportunity to study the actual proposals of the Government in the Bill to amend the Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1959.

Having studied the Bill as a party, we are now of the opinion that we are justified in not giving it our blessing as a measure providing for liquor reform. We say that it is a hotch-potch piece of legislation and that the Government, like their colleagues in the Federal sphere, do not know where they are going. They have not the courage to deal with inflation or unemployment in the Federal sphere, and here they have not the courage to provide for the man who drinks too much or the man who drinks little. They want to carry on and introduce this legislation which, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, has a number of very undesirable features inherent in it. If we thought that the Bill was 99 per cent. good but that there were some minor matters in it that needed amending, well and good. We would support the second reading and then introduce our amendments in the Committee stages. But we say that there are clauses in the Bill and principles in the Bill that we are not prepared to accept as the correct standard under any circumstances. For that reason, we say that whilst the Government bring the Bill forward in its present form we will oppose it. That is what we are voting on now. It is no good the Minister's getting up and saying, "You can move amendments in Committee." Although that is true, the motion now before the House is, "That the Bill be read a second time," and if we give our seal of approval to the Bill as it stands, we are saying that the Bill is 99 per cent. all right but there are some minor defects in it that we shall move to amend later. If one goes through "Hansard", one can find numerous instances where the Labour Party when in Opposition or the Government parties when they were in Opposition adopted the attitude that a certain Bill was 99 per cent. all right but that there were some minor segments to which they were opposed and on which they would move amendments. They gave their blessing to the Bill as a whole as being an improvement on the existing legislation, then moved amendments to certain clauses in the Committee stages.

**Mr. Duggan:** There is any amount of evidence that when they were in Opposition they supported the introduction of a Bill and voted against it in Committee.

**Mr. HANLON:** As the Leader of the Opposition points out, if one looks through "Hansard" one finds a number of instances where the Government parties when in Opposition allowed a Bill to be introduced and then violently opposed it on the second reading.

I know the concern that has arisen in the ranks of the Government parties since they heard the news that the Opposition were going to call for a division on the second reading. When your conscience is troubled it can be very warm to have 39 or 40 people sitting with you, but if you have 65 or 70 beside you it gets even warmer and the old conscience does not prick as much. When the vote was taken at the introductory stage there was an audible sigh of relief from the Minister for Justice, the Premier, the hon. members for Ithaca and Wavell and others when they found that there were going to be only four, five, or six, whatever it was, to vote against the introduction of the Bill.

**Mr. Coburn:** Three.

**Mr. HANLON:** It made them feel a little happier with their conscience. But now the Government are very concerned because the House is going to be split on the vote. Even though it will be split perhaps 40/30 there will be hon. members like the hon. member for Ithaca who in conscience will want to vote against the Bill. In fairness to the hon. member for Ithaca and other hon. members opposite whom I have mentioned, let me say that they would not necessarily be voting against the Bill on the same ground as the Opposition will be voting against it. Nevertheless they will want to vote against it. When the hon. member for South Coast was speaking the hon. member for Bulimba mentioned that it was significant that for the first time in his memory, and in the memory of many of us here, the hon. member for South Coast found it necessary to read verbatim from a prepared speech. As the hon. member for Bulimba pointed out, it is an indication that all speeches to be delivered by Government members on this occasion have been vetted by the Government before they deliver them. I suppose that is why the hon. member for Ithaca is not speaking. His speech was so much against the Government that they stopped him from speaking altogether.

The motion before the House is "that the Bill be now read a second time." Do not let anyone say that the Australian Labour Party is trying to curry favour with people who hold strong convictions against the consumption of alcohol. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the Australian Labour Party under its policy at successive conventions has moved by resolution, "that the Government should amend the liquor laws to allow sensible drinking in cafes and clubs." That is part of a resolution passed at the 1956 conference. We are not



trying to say to people who feel that there should be no extension at all of facilities for drinking, even though it may be extending drinking facilities under a sane approach to drinking, that we are opposing the motion because we do not think there should be drinking in cafes or there should not be other principles incorporated in the Bill. I pointed out before to the Premier, the Minister for Justice, the hon. members for Ithaca and Wavell, and others with strong feelings about the consumption of alcoholic liquor, that in opposing the Bill on the ground that we are not prepared to accept it as a Bill that means liquor reform in the sense that the A.L.P. regard liquor reform, or the general public of Queensland regard liquor reform, we are throwing out a challenge to hon. members like the hon. members for Ithaca and Wavell to vote against it if they feel in their hearts that they are opposed to it, whether they are opposed to it on the grounds that the Leader of the Opposition submitted or for some other grounds of personal conviction. Consequently we look forward with interest to seeing the attitude adopted by hon. members opposite.

If we were to accept the idea that because there is an atom of good legislation in a Bill that becomes before Parliament, the Opposition, or even members of the Government, are therefore obliged to support it and disregard all the bad elements as there happens to be some small measure of good sense in it, what sort of position would we develop into in this Parliament? Take the amendment to the arbitration Act. We had the example of that early this year when the Government brought down its amendments to the arbitration Act. I am not going into that issue deeply but I hope you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, to draw the analogy that I want. That is all I wish to do. When the Government introduced their amendments to the arbitration Act this year—and the same applies to previous Bills on many other subjects—there were quite a few points that the Opposition freely acknowledged were good. They freely acknowledged that they were beneficial to trade unions and to the people of the State as a whole, but that did not mean that they would vote for the Bill on the second reading. It did not mean that we said, "Because there is 10 per cent. of good sense in this Bill, we will support the lot."

What did we do? We opposed the Bill on the second reading just as we propose to do with this measure. If the Government carry the second reading—I am not conceding that they will nor did the Leader of the Opposition concede that they will—we say the balance of probabilities are that they will—then the best thing we can do, as we did with the arbitration Bill, is to try to make as good a job of the legislation as is possible by putting forward Amendments.

**Mr. Tooth:** You opposed the Arbitration Bill on the first reading as well.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is correct, but we also opposed it on the second reading. Because the arbitration Bill was loaded to a degree against our principles—much more so than this Bill is—that does not say that the liquor Bill is not loaded to a great degree against them. Having had an opportunity to examine it we feel that the very limited benefits that would come from it would be more than offset by the overall position that will develop. We say that it will be preferable for either of two things to happen, either for the Government to be forced to withdraw it, if defeated on the second reading, and to bring another Bill forward for the consideration of the Parliament, or, alternatively, for the Bill to be defeated, and in 1963, for an Australian Labour Party Government to introduce real liquor reform through legislation that will give a really balanced approach to the liquor problem in the State.

What is this legislation? It is similar to the arbitration Bill and other legislation this Government have introduced under the guise of assisting the workers. It is a case of kiss you on both cheeks in front and kick you on both cheeks behind. That is the attitude of this Government on the liquor Bill. It is their same attitude as on other Bills. They come forward and parade themselves as looking after the people of this State, trying to do the right thing, and at the same time the real shot in the barrel is against the interests of the great mass of the people.

**Mr. Windsor:** You do not believe that.

**Mr. HANLON:** I do believe it, and I venture to say that so far as the liquor Bill is concerned, the hon. member for Ithaca believes it too but he has not the courage to go against his Caucus decision because of Dr. Hartwig of the Liberal Party—it is significant that the Minister has quoted him as an authority on liquor reform—who is already arranging to secure pre-selection for the Ithaca district for the Liberal Party in 1963.

I am surprised at the hon. member for Ithaca's approval of this Bill and his silence, because he has not spoken yet. I do not want to be personal or unfair to the hon. member, but, if he wants to interject to me, I say that for a man who holds strong convictions on the subject of alcohol he is remarkably silent on this legislation, from beginning to end, from barrier to box. I venture to say that he will be just as silent when the Bill goes through and receives Royal assent.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I trust the hon. member will not continue with personalities, that he will get on with the business before the House.

**Mr. HANLON:** I am indeed pleased to do so, but I am not going to give the right to Government members to chide the Opposition on this matter—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! When anyone gives any rights, it will be myself. I wish to assure the hon. member that each side of the Chamber will get equal treatment so far as this measure is concerned.

**Mr. HANLON:** I accept your assurance in that regard, Mr. Speaker, although I know you cannot follow every item of the debate as it arises. But I remind you that Dr. Hartwig's name was introduced in the debate by the Minister. He was named as an authority. I understand he is also an Executive member of the Liberal Party. I should like to continue on that line, but I content myself with saying that I suggest the shadow of Dr. Hartwig, which is also hovering over Mr. Drury of the Ryan electorate in the Federal sphere, has frightened the hon. member for Ithaca out of the debate.

Let us look at the principles of the Bill to which the Opposition take strong exception, the principles that compel our opposition to the second reading of the measure. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the Opposition has prepared a number of amendments, in preparation for the Committee stage if the motion is carried. I do not think there is anything illogical in that respect. The Minister approached the matter from two angles. First, he said we should not oppose the second reading because in any case the Government will defeat us. If we as an Opposition adopted that approach, there would not be any divisions at all, and we would not oppose any Bill. If that was our attitude, it would be a waste of time having an Opposition in Parliament. If we adopted the attitude that we are going to be beaten anyway, we may as well retire to the bar and partake of liquor or fruit juice according to our inclination. But we are carrying on as the Government parties carried on when they were in opposition. We believe the Opposition is part of democracy; that it is not a sham; that just because matters are decided in the Caucus of the Government parties it is not a waste of time for us to oppose them.

I have a lot of respect for the Minister and the attitude he adopts to Parliament, but I do not think he did much to enhance my opinion of him by suggesting that we are only wasting our time in opposing the second reading. He said, "Let us get it through and get to the Committee stage. You are going to be beaten anyway."

As the Leader of the Opposition said, our amendments were prepared so that they could be put forward if and when the Bill was carried. The Minister said, "You know it is going to be carried. Why don't you let it go through the second reading so that you can put your amendments at the Committee stage?"

**Mr. Munro:** I said you could make a more useful contribution at the Committee stage.

**Mr. Duggan:** We will make further useful contributions at that stage.

**Mr. HANLON:** That is so. We will not have burnt ourselves out during the second reading. For that reason we have prepared a number of amendments of various clauses, so that they can be put forward at the appropriate time. In normal circumstances, if we were supporting the second reading, we would circulate the amendments now so that hon. members would have an opportunity to study them. The Premier has suggested they should be printed. Even so, we are not prepared to concede by circulating them now that the Government necessarily are going to carry the second reading.

The Leader of the Opposition has asked me to point out that as soon as the second reading vote is taken the amendments of the Opposition, at least the Australian Labour Party Opposition, will be circulated so that hon. members will have an opportunity to look at them before the Committee stage.

What are the principles of the Bill to which we are opposed? First, we are opposed to the taxation element in the Bill, the increase of licence fees on the basis, generally speaking, for a licensed victualler from 4 to 6 per cent. of turnover with appropriate increases for packet licences and so on.

The hon. member for Aubigny, and the Leader of the Opposition before him, quoted some statements by the Premier and showed that he had shed tears when a Labour Government were in office about the effect on the working man of increased licence fees that would be passed to him by the brewery and hotel interests. I point out that since the Government took office licence fees have been increased by 100 per cent. Admittedly they are now being increased from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. on the purchase turnover, but when the Government came to office the figure was only 3 per cent. on hotel purchases. In 1958 they increased the fees to 4 per cent. and now they are to increase them to 6 per cent. In four years there has been a 100 per cent. increase. If we had done that in our term of office from 1932 to 1957, and increased the fees every four years by 100 per cent. the price of a glass of beer would have been nearly all tax. Everyone knows that already the Federal Government tax represents more than half the average glass of beer.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out this legislation has not been based on the desire of the Government to bring in liquor reform which would be acceptable to the Opposition. It is being used as an excuse to take more money out of the average consumer of liquor in the community. Parliament is not the place to argue whether

people should drink liquor or not although I have no doubt that we could have many arguments about the evils that follow over indulgence in alcohol and, no doubt, there are many people more fitted than I to argue that cause. A tremendous number of people partake of liquor, some in moderation, and some not in moderation. It is scandalous that the ordinary hard worker who likes to have a couple of beers on his way home has to pay so much tax, and the Government are now increasing it.

The second principle that we oppose is discrimination between one part of the State and another. As my Leader pointed out, the Government are not honest about this. If they agree that Sunday drinking should be approved, why should they pick out those who live within a 40-mile radius of Brisbane for different treatment? The Minister tried to justify this by saying that we cannot compare the area within a 40-mile radius of the G.P.O. with sparsely-populated areas. He admitted that everyone knows that people are drinking on Sundays in these sparsely-populated areas. They are doing it regularly and have been doing it regularly for many years, under this Government and other Governments. I am sure that there would be very few people, even including those with extreme temperance convictions, who would care to say that someone at Winton or in some of the other pastoral towns in the western areas of the State should not have the right to have a drink at the week-ends just the same as people who live within a stone's throw of the hotel. If the Government had said, "We want to legalise a position that is generally accepted throughout the State for the fellow working at Longreach, Winton or Charleville who only comes to town at the week-end for part of Saturday or Sunday, and whose boss may pick him up at 3 o'clock on Sunday afternoon so that he may have a drink." I am sure the Bill would have met with a different reception. People who live in Brisbane, Toowoomba, Rockhampton or Townsville can have a drink every afternoon at the hotels and make social contacts in that way, but a person working out West has only a very restricted time for doing so at the week-ends. If the Minister had introduced the legislation and said, "We are amending the Act to give these people reasonable opportunity to have a drink," that would have been a different proposition from the one the Minister now puts forward. What did he say? He advanced the illogical proposition that the shop assistant at Ipswich is in a different position from the shop assistant at Toowoomba. I am not saying that because the Leader of the Opposition was a shop assistant in Toowoomba many years ago, but that is the argument the Minister wants to put forward—that the ordinary person who lives within 20 yards of a hotel in Ipswich is different from a person living in Toowoomba or Bundaberg. How can Ipswich be called a sparsely populated area of the State? How could anybody call the South

Coast a sparsely populated area? You cannot find an inch of space for parking or drinking or anything else 99 per cent. of the time in the holiday period.

The hon. member for South Coast has vigorously defended the legislation, particularly the sectional side of it dealing with licensed cafes. I should have been very interested to hear him if the Government had brought in a Bill providing for licensed cafes and for Sunday drinking at Redcliffe and excluded the South Coast. We should have heard him from here to Kalgoorlie. As it is we have heard him yelling on these matters for four years since this Government took office. What sort of a turn would he have put on if they had said that people could drink in licensed cafes at Redcliffe but not on the South Coast? I ask the Minister and the hon. member for South Coast to answer my question. As the Leader of the Opposition said, why should a man who swims at Redcliffe be treated differently from one who goes an extra 20 miles to swim?

The hon. member for South Coast deprecated the argument put forward that the Bill will encourage people to drive to a drinking place. We have heard a lot about the problem of the drinking driver and it is a serious problem. The Bill will encourage it. It is true that under the existing law people who travel 40 miles can get a drink under the provisions catering for travellers, but that applies uniformly throughout the State. Nothing creates an urge to do something more than seeing the person nextdoor doing it. If the Joneses have a T.V. set the nextdoor neighbours want one too. If the people know that the Government think it is all right to drink on Sunday they will feel they should drink on Sunday, too. People who previously would not have bothered going 40 miles to drink will say, "They can get a drink at Toowoomba. Why not I in Brisbane?" And they will get the inclination to drive 40 miles to drink for two hours and then drive back with probably the effects of alcohol on them.

The Minister boasts that he will be able to enforce this legislation, but I very much doubt it. I do not regard this aspect lightly. If the Government put forward the principle that it is all right to drink on Sunday, hotels within the 40-mile radius will take the law unto themselves as they have done in country areas before. They will open on Sunday and say, "Let the Government live up to their legislation and prosecute us if they are game. They have said that certain people can drink on Sunday." The Minister says there is no problem. He says there may be some very isolated cases but that generally speaking there is no Sunday drinking in hotel bars and lounges in Brisbane at the present time. There will always be the publican who is after the elusive quid more than his neighbour and there will always be those who, wanting a drink on

Sunday, will knock up the hotelkeeper in a suburb of Brisbane and say, "How about a drink?" The publican will reply, "I am not allowed to serve you. You are locals; you live within the 40-mile radius." They will say, "Munro says it is all right to drink on Sunday. Can't you give us a beer or a rum or something?" Gradually the abuse will creep in. The Government, having said it is all right to drink on Sunday, will have to prosecute those within the 40-mile radius. A publican at Redcliffe will say, "Why should the Chevron at Surfers Paradise be allowed to serve liquor on a Sunday? I will see how the Government feel about it through Mr. Houghton, the hon. member for Redcliffe." I will open at Redcliffe on Sundays and see if they are prepared to come down and prosecute me for opening." The Government will be forced to prosecute those people till it hurts them, not just raid them occasionally for the collection of licensing fees. Money counts with the Government and they might do that. But if they are going to enforce the legislation as they say they are, they will have to raid people such as that time and time again, until they put them out of business by means of fines. If they have not the political courage to do that, and the Government's political courage has not been obvious in their administration, they will allow to grow up in Brisbane the very conditions that they deprecate and say they are trying to remove. In country areas it will more or less legalise the illegal drinking now going on on Sundays.

When we come to the question of beer gardens, again we see that the Government have approached the problem in a lopsided manner. Generally speaking, I think most, if not all, hon. members would say that it is not a good thing for young people to be in bars, beer gardens, or anywhere where extensive drinking is going on. The Government's attitude is again illogical, and if the legislation reaches the Committee stages we intend putting forward an amendment dealing with entertainers in beer gardens. The Government say, "As long as you are an employee of the publican, you can be in a beer garden if you are under 21; but anybody else who is under 21 cannot be in a beer garden." In these days of rock-and-roll, many of the artists are teenagers. If they are booked to appear in a beer garden in Brisbane or on the South Coast, the Government will stop them from appearing because they are under 21. However, a boy of 16 can attend tables, pour beer, and have an intimate knowledge of the various drink—martinis, advocaat and cherry brandy, and so on—requested by the patrons. That provision is typical of the Government's illogical approach to the whole Bill. They say it is all right for someone under 21 to be pouring beer and perhaps going behind the counter to get the beer and throwing one down when no-one is looking, but it is not all right for a person under 21 who is an entertainer—a guitarist, a juggler, or any

other type of entertainer—to appear in the beer garden for 10 minutes or 15 minutes and perform his act. Because we believe that it is illogical, if the Bill gets to the Committee stages we intend moving an amendment. The Government's approach will throw quite a number of young people out of employment, because any entertainer under 21 who goes into a beer garden will be liable to a fine for breaking the law. Under the existing legislation, a person under 21 who consumes liquor in a dining room, bedroom, bar, or beer garden, is liable to a minimum fine of £10 and a maximum fine of £20. It is interesting to note that although the Government are talking about minimising drinking by people under 21, one provision in the Bill removes the minimum fine of £10 and leaves the maximum at £20. In other words, a person may be fined 10s. Perhaps in many cases it may be unfair to impose a minimum fine of £10 on a person under 21.

Although the Minister tells us he is trying to effect improvements in this Bill, many of the provisions contained in it do not measure up to the standard that we have in mind. For the reasons I have given, I think we are justified in opposing the second reading of the Bill. We oppose it not because we are against liquor reform, not because we think that the Act does not need amending, but because we are not prepared to give our blessing to this hotch-potch legislation.

**Mr. DONALD** (Ipswich East) (3.15 p.m.): I rise to oppose the Bill and to express my keen disappointment that it is not what I expected. The Minister and other prominent Government members assured us that the proposed legislation would curtail the consumption of alcoholic beverages. Unfortunately, in my opinion, it will not do so. To the contrary, it provides additional opportunities and facilities for the consumption of alcohol. It may close a tap here or there, but for every tap it closes it will open two somewhere else. It is not going to interfere with the interests of the breweries. They are not going to sell any less, but more, of the commodity they produce, a commodity which is supposed to cheer but in fact depresses and destroys. The drinking of it, the liquor interests would have us believe, is a very pleasant social habit and custom, but it is anti-social in every respect. Has not experience shown us that alcoholism and alcoholics form one of the worst and largest problems of society today? It cannot be truthfully denied that alcoholism has more direct and indirect victims, that it lasts longer and more dramatically impairs the very structure of society, and entails enormously greater costs than most of the other ills that receive concerted attacks from voluntary organisations, voluntary groups, foundations, and Governments? It has more

than most of them combined. The Medical Union of Montreal has the following to say:—

“In the first place, even in doses which do not intoxicate, alcoholic beverages, wines, beer, cider, have not really the advantages that were long attributed to them, and which are still attributed by many people who have never thoroughly studied this question, even if they have studied many others.”

There are no drinks conducive to health among the alcoholic beverages, even the extremely moderate use of those which have the lowest alcoholic content. Fermented liquor is never really beneficial to mankind. That is the considered opinion of experts who, by the nature of their profession, are in a position to give us advice on this very important subject. That is not merely an assumption but the opinion of medical men who, by the gravity of diseases, have been forced to let the public know just what is going on, and to draw the attention of the public to the disaster that is occurring every day.

The word “social” means our association with our fellows in all the activities of society, and may refer to our work as well as to our pleasure, our attitude to our neighbours, as well as our special companions. When we consider our social implications we must examine human beings as members of society in which they live. There are some very real social implications for youth in the workshop, the office, and other places of employment. Many a young man and young woman have taken his or her first glass of liquor at the invitation of a workmate or friend. The lunch-hour break or the journey home after work often are used by the drinker as an opportunity to have a drink or two. It is claimed on good authority that alcohol consumed in the lunch-hour can rob a worker of his best skill and often makes him a danger not only to himself but also to his workmates. That is recognised all the world over. We have quite a big list of offences in our own laws in this State against drunken drivers. That is common throughout the world. We have locomotive drivers and taxi drivers and others and no man in his senses would board a train with a drunk at the lever any more than he would get into a taxi-cab with a driver under the influence of alcohol.

A drink on the way home can and does, far too often, rob the family of the drinker's time and companionship. We know that only too well without my emphasising it any further. Anything that is against the best interests of the community or the family is, therefore, anti-social and alcohol is one of those things.

There should not be any need for it. In fact, it has a detrimental effect upon the life of the community. Every young person should know that at the present time no-one

can tell which person, when he or she begins to drink, is susceptible to becoming an alcoholic. Addicts to alcohol come from all sections of society, the educated as well as the ignorant, the rich as well as the poor, church men and even the cleric, as well as from the criminal classes. It is important that young people should know the risks they are taking in consuming their first drink of alcoholic beverage in a social group. The chance today, according to people who have studied the problem, is as much as one in nine and these people should also realise that it is true that all drunkards are not alcoholics, but that it is equally true that all alcoholics were, at one time or another, very moderate drinkers.

Economically speaking, liquor is a destructive public enemy and the time lost through alcoholism or even social drinking, amounts to a tremendous sum, month by month, and year by year. Some people, in an endeavour to justify the consumption of alcohol, will tell us that nature, or God, according to their belief or non-belief of the Christian faith, would never have created the fruit and the grain or any other commodity from which alcoholic beverage is made, if the ingredients were not to be consumed by man. I am not going to agree with that nor will any other man who has given the subject any consideration at all.

It is true that alcoholic beverages are made from grain. They are made from sugar, and grapes and that type of thing, but let me say that liquor is a wrongful and unnatural use of nature and that neither nature nor the Creator intended that grain, or sugar, or any other commodity should become a curse to mankind. Every measure of grain and every pound of sugar used in the making of alcoholic beverages represents the diversion of such elementary food products from their perfectly legitimate, constructive functions, to entirely destructive channels.

I submit that the waste of this and other bounteous gifts of nature is not good for humanity. Indeed, it simply does not make sense.

I think it is extremely unwise for parents to encourage their children, boys and girls, or young men and women for that matter, to drink at all, whether it be socially or any other kind of drinking. What guarantee have they that their instructions in the moderate use of alcohol, or in self-control, will have any good effect upon their children, or for that matter the example that they may set of moderate drinking in their own homes where it does exist? I am not denying that it does exist in many homes. Wise parents not only tell their children that social drinking deteriorates into problem drinking but, by example as well as precept, inculcate into them the basic necessity for abstinence. In the interests and welfare of our young people and the nation, social drinking must be condemned. It must be made clear to our growing youths that the only way to

avoid the danger of alcoholism is to abstain from drinking alcohol. Education on this subject, whether it be at home, in the workshops, in places of employment, in schools or wherever it may be would help tremendously, and therefore I am very keenly disappointed at not seeing in the Bill an effective minimum amount that the Government are going to spend on education about the dangers of alcoholism and of drinking intoxicating beverages, instead of the maximum that is included in the Bill. The Bill states that we cannot go beyond so many thousands of pounds, but it does not state that we are going in fact to spend 5s., 10s., or £2. I wish the maximum the Bill provided was the minimum to be spent and that the maximum was unlimited, because I think that every penny spent on trying to point out, particularly to young people, the danger of alcoholism, the danger of social drinking is money well spent.

I have given my opinion, but I think I should fortify it by quoting the statements of people who know the position better than I do. They are in a position to judge the effects of alcoholism; they meet it in their everyday life; they meet it in their professional life. The following passage is taken from "The Courier-Mail" of 8 August, 1961—

"End Alcoholism by education

"Education of Queensland employers and employees on the meaning and nature of alcoholism was suggested yesterday by the Health Director-General (Dr. Fryberg)."

That is our own Dr. Fryberg. The article continues—

"He also urged general education—particularly of children—on prevention of alcoholism.

"Dr. Fryberg was addressing the Health Inspectors' Association (Queensland Branch) annual conference.

"He said an employee should realise an alcoholic fellow worker was a danger to himself and others, and that he would do a disservice by sheltering him."

That is what I was trying to indicate a few minutes ago. I refer hon. members to the next article that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 7 June, 1961, which reads—

"Total Ban only cure for Drink

"It is a known scientific fact that the only cure for alcoholism is total abstinence," the secretary of the National Committee for the Prevention of Alcoholism (Pastor E. H. J. Steed) said on arrival in Brisbane yesterday.

"Pastor Steed, 36, said: 'You just cannot stop people from drinking. We do not believe in forcing them to stop drinking alcohol.'

"We believe that with proper education on just what the effects of alcohol are, people will have the intelligence to stop drinking of their own accord."

There is a lot more to the statement, but I think I have read sufficient to indicate that my remarks are correct.

The following cutting from "The Queensland Times" reads—

"DR. ANDREW IVY SPEAKS

"Dr. Andrew Ivy, Vice-President of the University of Illinois, says: 'Drinking in moderation is not scientific. The only factual or scientific guarantee against alcoholism as a vice and disease or the only scientific guarantee against drinking as a cause of accidents and human misery is Total Abstinence. There is no way to discover an alcoholic until he is an alcoholic. There is no cure for alcoholism except total abstinence.'

That is the opinion of a very learned gentleman, a very intelligent gentleman who holds a high position in America.

I also refer hon. members to the following extract from the statement of another American, which appeared in "The Queensland Times"—

"ARMY IMPOSES DRINK BAN

"BONN, May 22—All 200,000 American soldiers stationed in Europe have been banned from drinking liquor in United States Army clubs during normal daytime duty hours.

"An Army spokesman told reporters: 'We want to make sure that every man in the Army is alert and physically qualified to do his duties at any time of the day.'"

The Army of necessity had to stop soldiers from drinking. Why did the Army want to stop this drinking? It wanted to stop drinking because it realised from tragic experience that it was necessary, as it had been noticed that drinking impaired the efficiency of the soldiers, and decided that if a soldier was to do the duty his nation was paying for and carry out the job for which he was trained, he would have to leave alcohol alone altogether. I will just quote another article. I hope the people of Australia will take note of it. We believe that we are not a nation addicted to drink. We shudder to think of the plight of people in European countries and in America where there are hundreds of thousands of alcoholics. What is the picture in Australia? I quote from an article dated 25 April—

"Australia does not have as big an alcoholism problem as the United States, France or Sweden, but it has 120,000 alcoholics in a total drinking population of about 5,000,000.

"The Australian ratio of alcoholics is 2,000 in every 100,000 adults over 20.

"The English ratio is 1,100 in 100,000.

"These figures are revealed in an article in the current Medical Journal of Australia, on 'the problem of alcoholism in Australia and England'.

"The article, by C. G. Judge and M. M. Galatt, says there is a need in both countries for further research."

I have had quite a number of very close friends—intimate friends—with whom I have had a great deal in common, who have given many years of service to the working class movement in the industrial and political fields and I have no doubt that my experience has been the experience of members on both sides of the House—who have been extraordinary people with outstanding ability, and devoted to duty and have served voluntarily for worthy causes. These men have been strong enough to resist every temptation on earth except John Barleycorn. I have seen excessive drinking reduce them to such a state that they have become inmates of mental institutions, and most of them have died at an early date. They were taken away from the work that they loved so dearly and so well and served with pleasure and sacrifice. Their abilities to be of service to their fellow men were stolen not by any employer, or any organisation, but by the evil that follows the excessive consumption of alcohol. What I have seen has made me determined that I shall at all times do my very best to try to prevent the disaster inflicted on men by excessive consumption of alcohol.

In spite of my temperance upbringing, I was born and reared in a hotel. My mother and her family had been in hotels for over 100 years. My father died when I was three years old, and my mother reared four non-drinkers and four Rechabites. It was not a leasehold hotel. It had been a freehold hotel for over 100 years. The teachings of my mother have been of great assistance to me. If I needed fortification in my resolves I would find it in my knowledge of what has happened to my very close friends—brilliant men, Rhodes scholars, university graduates, men at the top of their profession, men who had startled the world with their brilliance—they have been destroyed by alcohol. Some of them had very few friends when they died. At the height of their brilliant careers people wanted to attach themselves to them but were afraid to meet them when they were on the downward grade. They became a burden not only to themselves, but to those who were near and dear to them. I admit I am old-fashioned enough, and conservative enough to believe that no good can come out of evil. I hope hon. members do not want to term me a "conservative" because I should hate to have it thought that I am a Conservative. We are legislators. Every one of us is lucky. We are sitting in this Chamber making laws for the benefit of Queenslanders because we have won the approval of the electors, firstly by pre-selection ballot and then by the ballot that was held to elect representatives to the Parliament. We are here by the goodwill of the people. I am not going to complain about

the uncomfortable seats in the Chamber. No matter what they are like, we all fight to hold them. We can do best by legislating as our conscience dictates. Instead of yielding to public pressure or to pressure from any quarter, instead of trying to convince ourselves that by legalising something that is not now legal we are righting a wrong or curing an evil, we should strive to amend the law so as to restrict this traffic as much as possible until it is abolished.

The "Telegraph" this afternoon reports that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan, had stated that the hon. member for Rockhampton North, Mr. Thackeray, had suggested that some arrangements were being made about the enforcement of the law and that there was graft. That report is not correct. The Leader of the Opposition did not say that Mr. Thackeray had made such a statement. It was made by a Liberal member, I think by the hon. member for Rockhampton South, Mr. Pilbeam. In his interjection, Mr. Thackeray asked the hon. member what he meant—did he mean the Minister or the police? Mr. Thackeray made no accusation whatsoever. Those are the tactics that we of the Australian Labour Party have to put up with again and again. Anything that can be published to injure the party as a whole or any individual member of it is eagerly seized on by the Press, who favour our opponents. When we are talking about decency we should at least have decency in reporting. It might have been—I am not going to suggest it was—a deliberate attempt by some humble reporter, but if that statement appeared in the "Telegraph" it bears no resemblance to good or fair reporting. It could create a wrong impression and it could put the hon. member for Rockhampton North, Mr. Thackeray, in a very uncomfortable position, a position not of his own creation but a position created either deliberately or through some misunderstanding.

Because of that I want to make this announcement in conclusion. Today five Opposition members are absent from the Chamber. I understand that last night an item appeared on the television service that members of the Parliamentary Labour Party, or members of the official Opposition in this Chamber were going to absent themselves from the House, implying, in the opinion of the person who saw it and who told me about it, that they were not going to vote with the Opposition against the second reading of the Bill.

I think every hon. member in the Chamber and every decent citizen will admit that Mr. Inch, the hon. member for Burke, is where he should be—attending to his electorate where there is a very serious industrial dispute.

The hon. member for Mourilyan, Mr. Byrne, is attending a public function at Ingham.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lloyd, is in hospital.

**Mr. Windsor:** The hon. member for Brisbane, Mr. Mann?

**Mr. DONALD:** The hon. member for Brisbane is in attendance here. There is no need to apologise for him.

My colleague the hon. member for Ipswich West must be unwell; that is the only thing that would keep him at home.

Another A.L.P. hon. member, Mr. Thackeray, hon. member for Rockhampton North, is attending either a High School speech night or some other function in his electorate.

All those hon. members have been given permission by the party Whip to be absent and all can be accounted for.

I conclude by expressing the hope that something can be done, before the Bill becomes law, to curtail to a very large extent the evil that is created by the consumption of alcoholic beverages.

**Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (3.40 p.m.):** At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I am not going to make a long speech. There are only one or two points that I wish to mention.

First, I support the Leader of the Opposition in his decision on behalf of the Australian Labour Party to oppose this iniquitous and sectional legislation, which to my mind can do nothing but increase the drinking of alcohol by the youth of Queensland.

My main purpose in speaking in this debate is to say that my actions in the Chamber have been misconstrued, and I believe deliberately distorted, by a person in my electorate. A letter written to the editor of "The Echo" at Sandgate on 25 October was headed, "Mr. Dean Favours new Liquor Law". I am reliably informed that the person who wrote the letter, J. Fieldhouse, is a member of the Sandgate Branch of the Liberal Party, and he should know better than to play politics to this extent in the local paper. I think I am in duty bound to defend myself against this person's attack. He is trying to mislead the people in my electorate about my actions and so put me under a cloud and a certain amount of suspicion. His letter certainly deliberately clouds the issue and misrepresents my actions and statements in this Chamber. He mentioned in the letter that I crossed the floor with other members of my party and voted with the Government in favour of the new liquor law, and I must clear the air and make my position plain to the people of Sandgate. I am very sensitive about this matter and could easily get carried away if I spoke at length, but I have no intention of doing that. In company with my fellow members of the Australian Labour Party, I voice my opposition to the second reading of the Bill because I believe it will not carry out the Government's stated intentions.

I have been very vocal on the subject of liquor reform and I just wish to clarify my position.

**Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (3.44 p.m.):** I wish to make some observations on the second reading of the Bill and to state most emphatically that I oppose the motion for its introduction. Before going any further, I wish to refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Baroona in his speech this afternoon, when he implied very strongly that members of the Q.L.P. found it convenient, perhaps, to be absent from the Chamber when the division was called on the motion for the introduction. I give an emphatic denial to that unworthy suggestion. When I spoke on the motion for the introduction, I made my position very clear indeed. On the information then available to me, had I known that the A.L.P. would call for a division I should have been present to vote.

**Mr. Herbert:** They did not call for it, and they did not want it, either.

**Mr. HILTON:** I knew at the time that they were not going to call for a division. Having expressed my thoughts, and my colleague, the hon. member for Cook having expressed his views, it is very unworthy of hon. members opposite to charge us with not having the moral courage to be present when a matter of such great importance was being decided.

The Bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before Parliament for many a long day. While it is within the province of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to make any arrangements they desire to limit the debate to one day, I certainly will take the opportunity to express my views irrespective of any such arrangement. It is extraordinary that the Government should plan to rush the Bill through the second reading stage. I listened intently to the remarks of the Minister when he appealed to hon. members to curtail their second reading speeches. If he was sincere at least he should have made some observations on the constructive suggestions put forward at the introductory stage, or given reasons for the Government's ignoring them. It is all very well for the Minister to say that amendments can be discussed in Committee. But from what he said this morning, and judging by the brevity of his second reading speech, it is very obvious that irrespective of what suggestion may emanate from the Q.L.P. section of the Opposition, or the Opposition as a whole, it is not going to be considered.

Since the introduction of the Bill the Minister has decided on certain amendments, but they have not emanated from the introductory debate. As far as I know suggestions made at the introductory stage have not received any consideration whatever.

I am going to reiterate my opposition on the principles that I referred to briefly at



the introduction. For such an important measure involving far-reaching moral principles the ideal approach would have been on non-party lines. In that way there could have been a really objective debate with hon. members voting according to their conscience. It is extraordinary that for long periods of the debate only four Government members have been in attendance. Is it not astounding that when such important legislation is before the House the Government can bring disrepute into Parliament's function by having only four members on their benches for so long? It is a shocking state of affairs, but it indicates very clearly indeed that a hard and fast binding has been placed on all Government members. They are not being allowed to express their views as they should express them in a democracy on such an important issue. In the final analysis, in a democracy, majority decision must prevail. In reaching that decision there should be a freer and more objective discussion on such important legislation. Other hon. members who have participated or have been allowed to participate in this debate have expressed their views on the drinking of alcoholic beverages. I made brief reference to it at the introductory stage, and a certain member of the Opposition, as well as other people, took me to task and denied the accuracy of my statement. In order to present my logical reasons for my attitude on this Bill to the people I represent, I restate my attitude to this all-important question.

First of all, on the moral aspect, I believe that it is perfectly moral and legitimate for a man to take alcoholic liquor if he so desires. Again, I believe that it is greatly immoral for him to drink to excess.

We have been told in this Assembly that the making of alcoholic beverages is something that the Great Creator did not intend at all. I respect the views of everybody on this question but I do not wish to be corrected by people in a most illogical fashion. If their argument that it is immoral to manufacture alcoholic liquor is correct, I refer them to the Scriptures, the authorised version of the Bible. There they will see that at the miracle marriage feast of Cana our Good Lord turned water into wine and supplied it. They will find, as I said before, that alcoholic beverages were known to civilisation or to mankind, centuries and centuries ago and that Noah was a victim of excessive alcohol drinking on one occasion.

So, how can people logically refute the argument that alcohol can be taken morally so long as it is not taken to excess? If it was entirely wrong for people to take drink, why should water have been turned into wine at the marriage feast of Cana? I do not think there is any need to pursue that argument any further so far as scriptural authority is concerned.

Like many other things that are beneficial in their rightful use, I refer now to drugs.

The drug morphia, which the medical profession and most other people know, is a most beneficial thing in its medical use, but taken as a drug it has a more devastating effect than alcohol. Many other things created by mankind for the benefit of mankind are good and useful when used in their right proportions, but again I repeat, they are soul-destroying and life-destroying when used to excess, just as alcohol can be. Many other drugs and devices of mankind have a similar effect on people.

In support of my views on the moral aspect, those remarks are perfectly correct and logical.

The Government say that the Bill will rationalise drinking in this State and perhaps one aspect of it may do that. However, I do not agree, as the hon. member for Barooka remarked, that the Bill is 99 per cent. O.K. and wrong in 1 per cent. I think there are some aspects of it that are O.K. and should receive the endorsement of every thinking person. One of those aspects is, of course, the licensing of certain restaurants to serve light wines and malted beverages with food. I agree with the medical argument, and the argument proved by experience that the taking of food with alcoholic liquor is calculated to reduce the incidence and degree of drunkenness. For that reason I am in favour of legislation under which certain suitable restaurants will be licensed to provide light wines and malted liquors with food. Such institutions will be novel in this State. Because of their nature and the conditions to be laid down they will be effectively policed and supervised and if not conducted in accordance with the required standards speedy action should be taken to close them. I think rational people who go to these places and drink will be more inclined to be temperate in the use of alcoholic liquor. For that reason I think the approach is a sensible one, but I am strongly against the principle of limiting the number of such restaurants. Having in mind the rational effect this move will have on drinking, experience may prove that Queensland requires more than the 32 envisaged by the Bill, plus the two that may be granted each year. If we are going to make a new and sensible approach—under very strong supervision—in this direction, I object to the granting of licences to a few favoured people. I object to the licensing of a few favoured restaurants. I hope that the Government or the Licensing Commission will ensure before granting the licences that those places measure up to the necessary standard. Assuming they do, let us endorse this rationalisation of drinking. Let us give free rein to a policy that is definitely calculated to reduce the incidence of drunkenness in our community.

I think the Government are most irrational in regard to the very vexed subject of Sunday drinking. I said at the introduction of the legislation that I was strongly opposed

to the extended period set out in the Bill. People who want to drink rationally but have not made provision to have a drink at home, and travellers who want a drink with their meals on Sunday, I concede, should be given the right, but I strongly object to a long Sunday session. We know from experience that it will have the effect of increasing drunkenness on Sundays. Sunday, apart from being a day of worship, is a day of family reunion, and, with extended trading hours—even if the drinking is done in a beer-garden—there will be a very substantial break-up in the present happy family relationships on Sunday. We will have the spectacle of people who perhaps now get drink illicitly rolling about the streets in greater numbers on Sundays. I made a suggestion at the introductory stage, and the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks today supported it. I asked the Minister to give further consideration, in order to meet the legitimate needs of sections of the community who may want a drink on Sunday, to an hour's session immediately prior to the lunch-hour, and again in the evening. If members of golf clubs and bowling clubs have this facility I believe footballers and cricketers should be able to enjoy the same rights in our democratic community, say, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. What will happen if beer gardens and prescribed lounges are allowed to serve for two hours on Sunday evening? People who go to church services will be confronted with the spectacle of drunks vomiting and rolling about the roadway. Undoubtedly that will happen. The Government should give serious consideration to the extension of open drinking on Sunday beyond 6 o'clock.

When all is said and done if a rational person wants a drink on Sunday and cannot get a drink otherwise, surely one hour in the middle of the day is sufficient, with one hour in the evening. I have my doubts about the wisdom of this measure because of what I have witnessed during my life. I strongly protest against open trading hours that are obviously calculated to increase the incidence or drunkenness on Sunday and cause great discomfort to many citizens. I know that there are people who will disagree with me, but I am stating my opinion. Whilst I can see that some people may say they have a natural and legitimate right to have drink on Sunday, I strongly object to the lengthy period of Sunday trading which can bring disaster in its trail. I also oppose the Bill because it is sectional. We are talking about rationalising drinking and introducing laws that may be acceptable and readily enforced. Can any thinking person say that when over one-third of the population in the State is being subjected to a different law from the rest of the population that that is a rational approach to the subject? Will it ensure due observance of the law, or easy enforcement of the law? The 40-miles limit applying under the Act was uniform throughout the

State. Although I do not live in the metropolitan area, or within a radius of 40 miles of Brisbane, in my opinion, if people are to be given certain rights in some parts of the State, the rest of the people should be given the same rights, and they should be strictly enforced. To my mind this provision is against the spirit of our constitution under which all citizens are considered to be free and equal.

If the Government are insisting on this for some political reason, in my opinion they lack political courage. It is entirely undemocratic to prescribe laws that will preclude over one-third of the population of the State from enjoying the same rights and privileges as the rest of the people in the State. That is an all-important principle. Of course, there will be people in certain clubs within the prescribed area who will be enjoying the rights and privileges that are denied to people who do not belong to clubs. That is another reason for strong opposition to the Bill in its present form. I oppose the Bill, together with other members on the Opposition side of the Chamber, because of the vicious taxation that it levies on a section of the community.

It is true that the man who has a drink or smokes a cigarette or a pipe pays enormous tax for the privilege. I should like to see the person who abuses alcohol taxed in a particular way, by the imposition of greater fines on people convicted of drunkenness. But why should the man who behaves himself, who wants to exercise a legitimate right, be called on to pay this extraordinarily high tax? It is wrong to incorporate the vexed question of taxation in a Bill such as this involving vital considerations. Certainly it will mean a further tax on many of the workers, on the ordinary people, exercising their natural and legitimate rights. Already, as the hon. member for Baroona pointed out, the Commonwealth Government are imposing by way of excise a tax of approximately 50 per cent. in the price of a drink. This Government will increase that because, without any control on the prices charged, people will be called on to pay more. The legislation will be vicious in its application. It is definitely sectional taxation and we already have too much of that in the State and throughout the Commonwealth. As it will affect so many workers, average people, who like to have a drink on their way home from work, I oppose it on that ground, too.

By and large the Government have made a sorry mess of the legislation. They should have sought opinions of people from all political groups and from all sections of society. Then it would have been possible for them to bring down a Bill that would be a step towards the rationalisation of drinking. They could have eliminated this vicious taxation and they could have eliminated the social dangers that have been referred to.

Because it cuts across the natural rights of people in so many ways, because it is

calculated to encourage drunkenness on Sundays, and for all the other reasons I have given, I oppose the Bill as it has been presented to the House.

**Mr. HOUGHTON** (Redcliffe) (4.9 p.m.): I rise to voice my emphatic protest against the Bill. Never has a measure aroused so much indignation as this contentious liquor Bill. It is sectional and unjust in the extreme. It specifically caters for certain sections of the community and denies rights to others. Any legislation that is sectional is doomed to failure and is bad. I firmly believe that no Government could be expected to frame a liquor Bill that would meet with the approval of everybody but the Minister must be very grieved at some of the submissions he has had to make. I admire him for some of submissions he has already made. Undoubtedly he has to accede to the wishes of the majority of his party. Nobody could ever doubt the honesty and integrity and uprightness of the Premier, and the introduction of the Bill must be very humiliating to him.

The only tourist area that is excluded from any rights under the Liquor Act is the Redcliffe area. I want to make it abundantly clear at this stage that I am opposed to any increase in Sunday trading hours at Redcliffe, on the South Coast, or anywhere else. However, I voice my disapproval of Redcliffe's exclusion from rights conferred by certain clauses of the Bill because it is within the 40-miles radius laid down in it. In my opinion the Bill has been drawn up specifically to meet the requirements of the Gold Coast, which apparently the Government have adopted as their standard. If the Government believe that Redcliffe should be excluded from any of these privileges, or so-called privileges—I cannot really see any in the proposed amendments—I firmly believe that its citizens should be given other concessions that are now enjoyed by people living within that 40-mile radius. I specifically mention the lifting of Redcliffe's exclusion from the S.E.A. franchise.

The Government were responsible for including Redcliffe in the tourist area, and no other area coming within the ambit of the Bill has been excluded from enjoying the rights that will be conferred under the proposed amendments. As I said before, the standard has been set to meet the requirements of the Gold Coast, and one has only to look at the amendments introduced by the Minister to see this. The Minister said in his introductory speech that a great deal of consideration had been given to the legislation, but I think it warrants a great deal more consideration. The fact that amendments were circulated this morning shows that there have been oversights by the committee. I can see no reason why it is necessary to increase the drinking hours on Sundays. After all, a person having a meal at a hotel can obtain a drink with his meal. I read in the Press today a statement by

the Minister relating to the metropolitan area in which he states that one can obtain a drink with a meal on Sundays. I do not know whether that is right or wrong, but I am lead to believe that the majority of hotels in the metropolitan area will not supply drinks with meals on Sundays. I do not know from my own observation whether that is correct, but that is my information. If the Government in their wisdom are going to lay down the 40-mile radius, with the movement of cars within and without the 40-mile radius there will be complete chaos and carnage on the roads on Sundays.

Many aspects of the Bill are of grave concern to the community. Instead of assisting the situation they will aggravate it. If the Bill has been introduced for the specific purpose of providing more revenue to overcome the economic problem facing us we are on the wrong leg in that honest endeavour to get more revenue.

Provision is made to keep children out of beer-gardens, but what is going to happen? They are going to be allowed to congregate in the lounges and elsewhere. If the Government want to legislate for the better operation of beer-gardens their first step should be to clean up some of the obscene entertainment. In that way they would be doing a far greater service to the people. Provision has been made for young people to listen to entertainment. Facilities are to be provided for the serving of malted-milk drinks and the sale of various foodstuffs. If the youngsters are not in the lounges they will be locked up in motor-cars. The Minister has said that the whole thing will be policed. If the police cannot enforce the law now how can they be expected to effectively carry out the additional work to be thrust upon them by the Bill? We are told that there are to be 32 licensed cafes, the number to be increased at the rate of two every year. Their supervision means even more work for the police. I think that the reason for the Government's sectional discrimination in the Bill arises from the fact that the police have not been able to enforce the law at some of the near metropolitan hotels. That is the reason for the 40-mile radius.

I congratulate the Government on the elimination of wine saloons. Every sane person will agree that that is a step in the right direction, but it is a retrograde step to make provision for the sale of liquor in cafes and restaurants. If a person wants to drink with his meals he can go to a hotel where such facilities are available to him.

It has been stated that 32 of these cafes will be licensed, increasing by a maximum of two a year and that they will be under the constant supervision of the police, but who will really supervise them? Will employees of the State Children Department, controlled by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, have to supervise these places

on Sunday to see that no children are served? If so, any additional revenue collected from this source will be swallowed up in overtime payments to these employees.

Dealing specifically with increased taxation or fees derived as a result of this Bill, I firmly believe that anybody who wants to drink should have to pay for it. I would not care how heavy a tax is levied. I have seen too much unhappiness and poverty caused by drink. I have had considerable experience in that direction and I feel very keenly about poverty and neglect of children in some homes, due mainly to the breadwinner's over-indulgence in liquor.

It is a fact, as other speakers have pointed out, that liquor quite often becomes a disease. I have had personal experience of such cases. One person of whom I had experience was confined to the Home for Inebriates at Marburg. As a result of representations made by you, Mr. Speaker, and myself, that individual was released in an honest endeavour to reconcile him to his home life and for the welfare of his children. He did not even reach his home and, as a result, will probably remain an inmate of that institution for the rest of his life. The Government do everything possible in an endeavour to rehabilitate such individuals and I voice my appreciation of the help I have received in cases of which I have personal knowledge.

I should also like to express appreciation of the fine work done by Alcoholics Anonymous in relation to this vexed matter. Undoubtedly, the individual must be prepared to assist himself but, the co-operation and strength provided by this organisation have resulted in the mending of many broken lives and the restoration of the individuals concerned to a happy home life, an environment that should be available to everyone in a great country such as ours.

Australians are noted gamblers and drinkers. Statistics place them third on the list behind America and another country, and every year gambling and drinking is increasing. The Government, in their wisdom, are trying to moderate gambling and the use of alcoholic drink. Too much emphasis has been placed on the wishes of tourists. That is the sole purpose behind the Bill. I am gravely concerned about the injustice that will arise through the licensing of cafes. I do not doubt the honesty and integrity of members of the Licensing Commission. I have found them at all times to be sincere. They will see that the public are fully protected. Nevertheless the person who is granted a cafe licence is in a far better position than the person with a hotel licence. The Commission decides how many bedrooms and what other facilities and amenities must be provided in a hotel. Some modern hotels cost as much as £250,000, yet with the outlay of a mere £10,000 a cafe proprietor may be granted a licence, and on a comparative basis he will then be much better

off financially than the hotelkeeper. In raising the next point I am thinking of my own area. I ask the Minister to state whether in regard to the granting of cafe licences a poll will be taken in the area, and whether the conditions of the poll taken prior to the granting of a hotel licence will be applicable to cafe licences?

Sunday trading is a vexed subject. Some people may say that Redcliffe should have the traveller concessions that will apply in other places. The Bill provides for trading hours on Sunday. I ask the Government to give serious consideration to the opening of home supply departments so that a person can take a bottle home. It is a retrograde step to allow people to congregate in lounges on Sunday, and a step that in my opinion will prove detrimental to the people of Queensland, particularly the youth of Queensland who are to be the men and women of tomorrow and responsible for the future of this country. Our plans for them must be laid on a sound foundation. Some people hold the view today that a person has to drink to be sociable. Such ideas may stem from their home environment. I appeal to the Minister to give serious consideration to the restriction of Sunday trading; if there must be Sunday trading, open the home supply department of hotels rather than the lounges.

I should like now to touch on a subject that is applicable to all areas, including my own. In my district we had a tragic road accident and it was found that the driver was under the influence of liquor. That will happen more and more frequently because the people will move outside the 40-miles radius to indulge in alcohol that will be readily available on Sunday, and then they will drive back from the North Coast and the South Coast and will be potential killers on the road. Things are bad enough now, without that. The Government should closely examine the possibilities because I firmly believe that an extension of trading hours outside the 40-mile radius will be detrimental to the welfare of the State and to the welfare of future generations.

We have already considered the easing of liquor laws as they affect golf and bowling clubs, and in my opinion what was done was sufficient, and no further concessions for Sunday are warranted. Many hon. members know that the liquor laws in the State are not policed simply because there are not police officers to do it. We will find that there will be more and more distress on Sundays which will be reflected in absenteeism on Monday morning because of hangovers. I believe that the amendments in the Bill will cause a great deal of concern to many people in this State and I have no intention of supporting it.

Another main ground for opposing the Bill is that it is sectional. It is fantastic that a democratic government should be sectional in

their implementation of legislation and discriminate against certain sections of the people. I voice my strong protest against this sectional legislation. I voice my disapproval, and the disapproval of the people whom I represent at the extension of Sunday trading hours.

**Mr. WALSH** (Bundaberg) (4.33 p.m.): I wish to refer to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he opened the debate this morning. He referred to an arrangement made with the Premier to close this debate at a certain time.

**Mr. Nicklin:** To complete the business of the House at a certain time.

**Mr. WALSH:** Very well, to complete the business of the House.

**Mr. Nicklin:** That does not mean the closure of the debate.

**Mr. WALSH:** There seems to be a gag applied here somewhere on both sides of the House so far as I can see.

In my experience of the House, when the Labour Government were in power, there was never an attempt on the part of the Labour Government to enter into any arrangements to limit the time of the discussion on controversial measures such as this which, one would imagine, would have attracted a considerable attack from the A.L.P. in Opposition. While I am not denying the right or the prerogative of the Leader of the Opposition to enter into any arrangement with the Premier—and I know it has been done over a period of years, for the orderly conduct of business—I wish to make it quite plain that we have our rights. While the Speaker is in the Chair, and so long as a member rises to his feet he may take part in the debate, and the only alternative would be for the Premier to move the gag, and I should have loved him to move the gag on me this afternoon.

**Mr. Nicklin:** I won't fall for that one.

**Mr. WALSH:** I know the Premier would not fall for it, but by some arrangement he has decidedly gagged not only the members of his own party but also members of the Opposition.

Mine is a realistic approach. A number of people here at the present time who might have had loyalties to a party machine previously cannot be expected to act in accordance with them now.

Debate on legislation of this nature should not be hurried. Anybody who understands the operation of the Standing Orders must realise that once a Bill passes the second reading, unless an hon. member adopts the course I adopted on the Transport Bill and talks in Committee on every clause, there is a definite limitation on hon. members. They cannot talk in generalities in Committee as they can on the introductory and second reading stages. I well remember the

Premier's attacks on us. I used to almost worry about him at times when it seemed that he would develop blood pressure or burst an artery in his attacks on the Labour Government of the day. Well do I remember an attack delivered from somewhere about this position in the Chamber by a former hon. member who is now Mr. Justice Wanstall. Why should not we as an Opposition adopt the same role on such a controversial measure as this?

**Mr. Nicklin:** Don't ask me!

**Mr. WALSH:** At least I am exercising my rights.

**Mr. Ramsden** interjected.

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not know whether it is true that the Rev. Pashen has been in touch with the hon. member for Merthyr this afternoon.

**Mr. Ramsden:** As a matter of fact he congratulated us upon the Bill.

**Mr. WALSH:** That reminds me of an incident some years ago. In 1956 there was an element in the Council of Churches that was keen on organising a campaign against the Government and the story was that the Minister for Labour and Industry rang them up during the tea adjournment in the afternoon and got a terrific surprise when he found that two Presbyterian Ministers had moved and seconded that they have nothing to do with the campaign against the Government.

**Mr. Morris:** Who was supposed to have phoned?

**Mr. WALSH:** The present Minister for Labour and Industry rang up the Council of Churches.

**Mr. Morris:** When?

**Mr. WALSH:** In 1956.

**Mr. Morris:** What poppycock!

**Mr. WALSH:** I am not talking poppycock at all because one of the members of the A.L.P. happened to be in the gathering at the time.

**Mr. Morris:** There is no phone in the gallery.

**Mr. WALSH:** Anyhow, thanks to the good sense of the clergymen at that time they did not fall for it.

Many of the speakers on the Bill seem to have been concerned with local problems—how it affects Redcliffe, how it affects the South Coast or some other electorate. Irrespective of what appeared in the editorial in "The Courier-Mail" this morning the main concern of any parliamentarian on either side of the House should be how the Bill will affect the whole of the community, not how it will affect the people in any one electorate. Some of the things I will have to say later will show that I am not pandering to any section, whether it be the vested

liquor interests, the fanatical prohibitionists, the golf clubs or the bowling clubs. I look on the subject as it affects the community.

Before I embark on a discussion of general matters I want to make some reference to the speech of the hon. member for South Coast. He talked about the restriction in licences and about the cancellation of wine licences. Does he know that it was the Labour Government who provided in the consolidated Act of 1936 for the limitation of licences to be granted in Queensland, where they fixed the maximum number of licences that could be held by hoteliers?

**Mr. Gaven:** Haven't we fixed them?

**Mr. WALSH:** Increased them. Does he know that it was a Labour Government who put the maximum on the number of wine licences and that not one wine saloon licence has been granted since that maximum was fixed? Now, although he says he is in favour of the cancellation of all these licences, he then speaks in favour of them under another heading. It does not matter whether the licences of 32 wine saloons now operating are cancelled. He and the others who argue for the granting of licences to cafes are quite content to have 32 wine saloons as long as they are cafes and restaurants.

**Mr. Gaven:** Different altogether.

**Mr. WALSH:** They are no different. They are still selling liquor. It is good to know that it was a Labour Government that introduced the complete control over liquor that operated until the present Government came into power.

The hon. member for Redcliffe, who has just resumed his seat, made the apology that the law was not being enforced because the Government were short of police. What humbug! In some places where there are two or three police stationed the law is being enforced to the limit; in other places they are given a free go.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for South Coast make the remarks that he did and pander to the Police Force generally. I do not know whether he has heard any suggestion of graft or corruption in the Police Force. If he has not, he would be the only one who has not.

**Mr. Gaven:** Very honourable men.

**Mr. WALSH:** When I was campaigning in the Gregory electorate—

**Mr. Rae:** You did a good job, too.

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not know whether I did. It may not have been in Gregory. I think it was a later campaign. Shortly after the appointment of the present Commissioner of Police, there was a suggestion that he went round to the various centres and, in effect, silently gave them the green light that there was to be a sensible and tolerant approach to the administration of the liquor

laws. I heard that suggestion in a remote area, and I said to the fellow who told me, "Don't you fall for that. If there is any 'blue' on this, it won't be the Commissioner of Police who will cop it, it will be you. You look after your own head." That is the way members should be talking in the House, not with their tongues in their cheeks.

As long as I have been in the House amendments of the liquor law have always been a controversial subject. Of course, substantial vested interests are involved. On the one hand we have the breweries, wine and spirit merchants, persons owning the freehold of hotels, and the lessees of hotels. On the other hand we have the moderate type of temperance advocates, who have some regard for the other fellow's right to live his own life, and the fanatical prohibitionists. I object to either the vested interests, on the one hand, or the fanatical prohibitionists, on the other, trying to ram down the throats of the people what part the consumption of alcohol should play in their lives. I recall that on each occasion on which a Bill of this type was brought into the Assembly, on looking into the galleries one found them packed to capacity, particularly with representatives of various religious groups, temperance organisations, and so on. One could see members of the Opposition almost preening themselves when the effect of their remarks was conveyed to the people in the galleries. Where are those people today when the Government are bringing down an amendment of the Liquor Act that will give more encouragement to the consumption of alcohol than any other amendment that I have seen introduced in my 25 years in this Assembly? I might say that their arguments were widely publicised by the monopoly Press. "The Courier-Mail" and other newspapers printed all the comments that were made and the criticism that was levelled against Labour Governments in those days. We do not find so much of it today. In "The Courier-Mail" this morning we find an editorial headed "Liquor Laws", which reads—

"Liquor laws have to consider not the people who have no use for liquor, but those who do use it."

What a shocking statement from a Press that is supposed to be giving leadership and expressing public opinion on the subject of political morality! What is going to happen to the families in the homes that have no desire to consume liquor? Surely they have to be considered somewhere along the line in this matter! Even if it is conceded that there is some justification for a relaxation of the present liquor laws, even if it is done to legalise what is at present an illegal practice that has been going on for so many years, very often with the approval of the local police administration, surely to goodness the Government, irrespective of what "The Courier-Mail" says, should consider the effect on home life and the morality of the community

generally when extending facilities to consume liquor! And I am no prude! The editorial continues—

“There are grounds for believing that abuse of liquor is becoming less prevalent than it used to be.”

How can that statement be reconciled with the featured articles written by the Director-General of Medical Health on the dangers of alcoholism and the fact that special organisations have been set up on an Australia-wide basis to combat the effects of acute alcoholism? Here is a newspaper with the hide to say that there is less abuse! I speak as a realist because I know of the dangers. To me the real damage is done to the teenage community. An adult in the 30 years-and-over group at least has gained some knowledge of the traps and what may follow if they fall for the alcoholic poison. The article continues—

“The Government’s Liquor Bill is a courageous attempt to adjust legislation to these social changes so as to encourage this trend away from abuse of liquor to temperate use of it by those who want it.”

I shall come back to that later to show what a ridiculous statement it is.

I should say that the Bill has been brought down because of pressure from Liberal sources. The tourist Minister is everlastingly telling us what has to be done for tourists. Nobody can blame the hon. member for South Coast or other hon. members representing seaside areas if they think they are presenting the views of their electorates on these matters. But when it is realised that in the implementation of the law the Government are going to bring about a phase of discrimination amongst the community, there is an obligation on every hon. member to examine every feature of the Bill to ensure that we do not develop into a Congo, or something of that nature, where the community is divided. The man from New South Wales, Tasmania, Victoria, or some other State is going to be given the right to enjoy certain things here, but that same right is not to be extended to the man out in the field cutting timber or down in the mine hewing coal. Apart from that pressure, the Government’s desire, if it is not the Minister’s desire—let us put the responsibility on the Government—is to protect the golf clubs and the bowling clubs. That is where the pressure has come from, the social side of our lives. These people pressed the Government to enable them to enjoy the consumption of liquor in conditions that they think will be suitable to their particular environment, in bowls clubs and golf clubs. I know members on both sides of the House do not like to express their views this way. To me it does not matter two hoots. I am talking as I see the matter from the community point of view, and if there is a golfer or a bowler who does not like what I say, I cannot help it.

It is sad indeed to think that any sport has to depend on the sale of alcohol for the financial wherewithal to improve their amenities. If it is to be given to every bowling club or golf club, why, if the Government are broadminded as they say they are, do they not give it to every football club or cricket club or surf club? Of course, it was refused by a previous Government, but, instead of having to run art unions as they do to get a few bob to enable them to function, why not give them all a licence to sell liquor? That is the realistic approach to it.

If the Government have adopted a policy of giving more and more recognition to clubs, in fairness to the hotel people the obligations and restrictions imposed on them by the Liquor Act which was consolidated in 1935 and came into force in 1936, should be reviewed. That is 25 years ago. Twenty-five years is a long time, and since then our transport systems have improved, road, rail and air, and it has had a considerable impact on the livelihood of many hoteliers in different parts of the State.

I can remember being in Kingaroy some years ago and being told by the licensee of a first-class hotel there—and it was a very good hotel—that years ago, before planes started to operate, and before roads and motor cars were as good as they are today, hotel rooms would be full for the whole of every week. The traveller who came by train had to stay overnight. He could not get out of the town until the next scheduled train service, but now travellers can fly into places such as Bundaberg and out again the same day. They get a service in, in the morning, do their business, and can get out again at night. That applies all over the State.

Car travel between centres is another factor that is mitigating against hotelkeepers in this way. In addition to that, there are motels providing a very good service and accommodation. I hope the Minister will not eventually open this up and extend to them the same liquor franchise that he has given to clubs on an increasing basis since this Government came to power.

**Mr. Houghton:** If they run cafes would they not be entitled to it?

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not know. That is another question of subterfuge. That is where the Licensing Commission will come in, carrying out the law as it exists. We cannot blame them. The obligation is on the Government to see that the obligations and restrictions imposed on hotelkeepers in regard to accommodation, dining rooms and so on, are completely reviewed. All the humbug of asking the owner of a hotel to provide 10, 15 or 20 bedrooms where they are not occupied, at a capital outlay of £3,000 or £4,000 for each bedroom, is just silly, while motels are giving these services without restriction. Hotelkeepers have told

me that they would not stay at a hotel if they could get a motel, because of the convenience of the motel. They can drive in and get car accommodation and facilities of that nature. They can get their breakfast at any hour. Motels are run on a family basis generally, and motorists can get away at an hour to suit themselves, whereas licensed victuallers are restricted by industrial conditions—breakfast between certain hours, lunch between certain hours, dinner between certain hours. The Government are more or less hounding the hotel interests into the ground, bit by bit. Anyone who has studied the subject must realise that only a certain percentage of community income is spent on alcohol, betting and various other phases of social life. If the amount spent on alcohol is divided among clubs galore as well as hotels, the hotelkeeper must get less.

From time to time we have had much advice from the temperance people about the cost of alcohol to the community. I wonder if they ever stop to think that the main beneficiaries are Governments, not the hotel-keepers or the monopoly breweries with their admittedly big profits. Governments are the main beneficiaries. As a matter of interest I should like to give some figures to illustrate my point. The latest figures I have been able to get from the Statistician, Mr. Solomon, are for the year 1959-1960. In that year the Commonwealth Government collected over the whole of Australia excise on beer amounting to £109,724,217 and on spirits £8,682,423, or a total of £118,406,640. The beneficiaries are the Government and the taxpayers. The non-drinkers are benefiting at the expense of the drinkers, as it were. If I may introduce a little local, Bundaberg colour, I shall give the quotation that has been appearing over the years, in regard to the Railway Department. I remember bringing these figures to the notice of Sir Arthur Fadden to show the discrimination as between Queensland and South Australia, where there is no excise duty on wine. The 1960 quotation was 1,630 liquid O.P. gallons at 6s. 6d. per gallon, the total cost being £529 15s. The Customs Department levy was 82s. a gallon on 2,200 proof gallons. Let it be remembered that the Railway Department bought only 1,630 gallons, so it would appear to me on a literal interpretation that the Commonwealth Government were collecting 82s. a gallon on 370 gallons of water. In addition to that, sales tax of 12½ per cent. came to £1,193 14s., making a total of £10,743 9s., for rum that cost £529. I ask the temperance people to dissect these figures and to go to town on the Federal Government. They are giving encouragement, because the greater the quantity of alcohol consumed, whether beer or spirits, the more revenue they get. Those figures cannot be disputed as they come from official sources.

**A Government Member interjected.**

**Mr. WALSH:** Do not tell me what I did. I quoted it to the Loan Council meetings and the Premiers' Conference, and Sir Arthur Fadden knows only too well the discrimination against Queensland. There is no excise on wine. You can put another 40 per cent. on that £10,743 and that eventually is passed on to the consumer as the retail price.

**Mr. Munro:** It is difficult to follow your logic. Do you suggest the Government should take off these duties and licence fees on liquor and put them on commodities such as bread, and butter and milk?

**Mr. WALSH:** I have known the Minister to rise and violently complain against words that have been put into his mouth. He knows I have said no such thing. I know he is very sensitive about these things, but I am not so sensitive. I am only concerned with stating facts and I state that the Government now appear to be depending on grog and gambling for their revenue. I think the Minister would be better advised to keep quiet because he only reminds me of things I may have forgotten.

**Mr. Munro:** You will not answer my question.

**Mr. WALSH:** I should love to answer it.

**Mr. Munro:** What are you trying to prove?

**Mr. WALSH:** I am sorry the Minister did not hear me. I have already stated that the Governments are the main beneficiaries from this.

**Mr. Ramsden:** They always were.

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member for Merthyr says that they always were.

**Mr. Munro:** Do you suggest we should remove all the duties?

**Mr. WALSH:** I have not made any such suggestion.

**Mr. Munro:** No! You do not know where you are going.

**Mr. WALSH:** If I intended to say that, I would say it, as the Minister knows I would.

If I can satisfy the hon. member for Merthyr, I would remind him that in 19 years, from 1936 to 1955, under the Labour Government, we reached a maximum of 4 per cent. purchase tax on alcohol in the State and it has taken this Government only four years to increase the tax by 50 per cent.—from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. Is that not evidence that the Government are more concerned about getting revenue because of their financial predicament with the Federal Government?

**A Government Member interjected.**

**Mr. WALSH:** We did not have to increase these fees. I have already told the hon. member. If the hon. member studies the balance sheets over the years he will find that we had only two deficits in 19 years. We had



surpluses without having to resort to the increases in the imposts on grog and gambling.

The Government have had to indulge in this form of taxation on grog and gambling—betting and booze as someone said earlier—and that simply emphasises the grip that the Federal Government have on the taxing powers of the country. The Government have had to get down to a low level to meet their commitments.

To run the numerous offices, and public administration, they have had to descend to taxing grog and gambling to get anywhere near a solvent State.

**Mr. Ramsden:** You do not believe in uniform taxation?

**Mr. WALSH:** No, of course I do not believe in it. The hon. member has not been here long enough. I do not want him to do penance by reading my speeches, but he will find that until some Government have the courage to demand taxation powers there is no future for democracy in the State.

I should say that the Minister has a certain amount of intelligence. I was somewhat amused at his reference to the Bill as being the result of the collective intelligence of the members of the Country Party-Liberal coalition. After hearing the hon. member for South Coast on the one hand and knowing the views of the hon. member for Wavell on the other, I am wondering how the Minister worked it all out and arrived at this decision. If this is the collective product of the intelligence of the coalition, it is a poor lookout for the future administration of the State.

**Mr. Munro:** Can I answer the question quickly? In a multitude of counsellors there is wisdom.

**Mr. WALSH:** The fault with the Minister and the Government generally is that they are listening to the wrong people; they do not consult the right people. Remember that the proposals in the Bill were carefully analysed by previous Labour Governments, who refused to have anything to do with them.

The licensing of cafes is not something new. It has not arisen only in the last four years and the community has got along all right without extending the facilities for the consumption of alcohol.

I pose this to the Minister. He has included a provision that any member of a golf club or bowling club will be at liberty to invite any guest. No-one can deny that. The rules of a club may provide for a normal membership costing £5 5s. or £10 10s. or £15 15s. a year, while the rules of some other clubs may provide for membership at £1 a year for what they describe as social members. I take it that the social member of a golf club or bowling club will have the same rights as those paying

the higher fee. So he will go along and say to John Smith, Jack Brown, Bill Jones, and Tom Robinson, "Come along. I know where you can get a drink on Sunday," and out they will go. The golf club then becomes the hotel, particularly in Brisbane, where the Minister is not going to allow the working-class community to enjoy the same concession as will be given to places outside. So the Minister will have no cause for complaint if sometimes when he goes out to play golf or bowls he cannot get his usual soft drink, or whatever he might drink, because the bar is too crowded. He will have only himself to blame because he is providing the facilities for everybody to go in off the street to have a drink.

**Mr. Tooth:** That is nonsense.

**Mr. WALSH:** It is not nonsense. I hope the Minister replies to this because it is clearly stated in the Bill—"A licensed bowling club or a licensed golf club may—

(a) Permit or suffer liquor to be consumed by members of the club, guests of members and members of another licensed bowling club or licensed golf club during the permitted hours on Sunday on the licensed premises of the club;"

Guests—not members—guests of the members.

**Mr. Ramsden:** Guests who play bowls.

**Mr. WALSH:** Of course the legal representative of the Crown Law Office, the hon. member for Merthyr, has come in to give his interpretation. That is up to the Minister. It is there and legal opinion will confirm that the guests may do that. I know what action had to be taken by the Labour Government before 1957. We had complaints from northern towns about golf clubs and bowling clubs putting up their 5's and 10's and 18's on a Sunday morning to provide the facility for people other than members of the club. It is no good talking to me. I have travelled too far over Queensland and seen these things, just as I have seen the sessions going on. I object to the particular provision. The hon. member for Carnarvon mentioned it. He said it should be an hour—12 to 1, and 5 to 6. I have seen the sessions operating in the North where the publican controlled them properly—from 11 till 1, when he threw them out because he wanted to get rid of them, and from 5 till 6. I do not think the Minister is doing the right thing by the community in extending the hours in the way proposed in the Bill. I say again that the hours fit in with the requirements of the bowling clubs and the golf clubs—12 till 2; 5 till 7. The Minister can talk around it as much as he likes, but those are the facts. The complaints have not come from hotel-keepers in the metropolitan area. They have come from bowling clubs and golf clubs following numerous raids made by the police, particularly in the metropolitan area.

I hope that the Minister will be able to give an explanation that will satisfy not

only thinking hon. members but also the body of thinking people outside the House. I hope, too, that he will be able to give an answer to the editorial in "The Courier-Mail" this morning, which said that the only people to be considered in amending the liquor laws were the people who consume liquor, not the people who do not desire to consume it. No politician wrote that editorial. The person who did, made a tremendous slip in making a statement such as that. To even credit the Government with being courageous is not the point. They have been pushed into it.

**Mr. Ramsden:** By whom?

**Mr. WALSH:** I told the hon. member earlier—by a particular small section of the community.

I know that the Minister wants to get up and peg his claim to reply on Tuesday, and I hope that he will give the House more information in his reply than he did when he introduced the Bill and when he moved the second reading this morning. He certainly did not go into great detail in his introductory speech. I hope that he will listen to reason and accept reasonable amendments. Personally, I am against the whole Bill because I do not think it satisfies anybody and I do not think it is in the interests of the community in general.

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (5.13 p.m.), in reply: I said I would be interested to hear the debate today, and I have been extremely interested in everything that has been said. However, I doubt whether hon. members who have other engagements would be equally interested if I were to attempt to continue the debate till perhaps 6 p.m. I therefore ask permission of the House to continue my remarks at some later date.

(Leave to continue speech tomorrow granted.)

The House adjourned at 5.14 p.m.

---