Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 31 OCTOBER 1961

£4,985 11s. 10d. for additional accommodation goods shed and office, £24,747 4s. 8d. for provision of a 35-ton gantry crane, £1,217 11s. 11d. for additional workshop buildings and £462 12s. 8d. for workshops machinery, why were these amounts not spent?"

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

"Additional accommodation goods shed and office—The contract date for completion of this work was June 30, 1961, but the contract was not completed until September, 1961. Gantry Crane—The review of the proposals resulted in a decision not to incur this expenditure at the present time. Additional workshops buildings—There was a transfer of an amount of £731 from Loan to Revenue expenditure and certain expenditure on work in the roller-bearing shop could not be incurred during the financial year owing to materials not being available within the required time but work on this section has since been resumed. Workshops machinery —Under-expenditure of £280 was due to certain tools not being delivered within the financial year; they have since been delivered. There was a saving of £43 on a machine, whilst it was found in the case of another machine proposed to be purchased at a cost of £350 that other arrangements could be made to avoid the necessity for its purchase."

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE AT AYR

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"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. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"Since there is sufficient accommodation for Diploma Students at the Queensland Agricultural College, Lawes, it is not proposed to establish another Agricultural College. Although sugar cane is not grown at the Agricultural College, arrangements are made for Diploma Students to visit cane areas at Bundaberg and Nambour. Consideration will, however, be given to the provision of a Junior Agricultural Course at the State High School, Ayr, when there are sufficient prospective students."

SHORTAGE OF TARPAULINS AT ROMA STREET RAILWAY YARDS

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) asked the Minister for Transport—

"(1) Is it a fact that wagons loaded with outward goods at Roma Street yards on Monday and Tuesday, October 23 and

TUESDAY, 31 OCTOBER, 1961

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

QUESTIONS

LAPSED LOAN FUND ALLOCATIONS, RAILWAY DEPARTMENT, TOWNSVILLE

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

"As the Auditor-General on page 182 of his Annual Report discloses that the following votes for the year ended June 30, 1961, for Townsville lapsed, viz.

24, were delayed in despatch due to the fact that no tarpaulins were available to cover the goods?"

"(2) What was the total number of wagons not sheeted and what were their various destinations?"

"(3) Were any of the goods loaded in the wagons damaged by rain as the result of the sharp thunderstorm on the evening of Tuesday, October 24? If not, how was this averted?"

"(4) Were any complaints received from the Commissioner's customers relative to the delay in the despatch of the goods consigned?"

"(5) Will he give an assurance that tarpaulins will be available at all times so that no delays will occur in the despatch of goods consigned?"

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

"(1, 2, and 5) Due to the non-return to Roma Street of a consignment of sheets there was a temporary shortage at that depot on Monday and Tuesday, October 23 and 24, and as a result there was a delay in the despatch of 27 wagons for Central and Northern destinations. However, positive steps have been taken to try to avoid any recurrence."

"(3) No. Wagons were placed under cover."

"(4) No."

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report upon the operations of the Sub-Departments of Native Affairs, "Eventide" (Sandgate), "Eventide" (Charters Towers), "Eventide" (Rockhampton), Institution for Inebriates (Marburg), and Queensland Industrial Institution for the Blind (South Brisbane) for the year 1960-1961.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

By-law under the Optometrists Acts, 1917 to 1959.

Orders in Council under the State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1958.

Report of the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland for the year 1960-1961.

Proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration of a State Forest of the land situated in the County of Merivale, Parish of Hanmer, described as Portion 29 and being part of Reserve 444 in Parishes of Canal Creek, Hanmer and Palgrave, under the Forestry Act of 1959.

LIQUOR ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 27 October (see p. 1118) on Mr. Munro's motion—

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

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.11 a.m.) in reply: In continuing my remarks about the principles of the Bill, I propose, as far as I can, to consider objectively the more important points raised during this debate, and in so doing, as far as practicable, I will apply my mind to the debate as a whole, and not to the speeches of individual members.

Before doing so, I should like to express my appreciation of the co-operation of hon. members generally in not prolonging unduly the second reading debate. Hon. members generally will agree with me that the Queensland Parliament is as democratic as it can possibly be. We have established the tradition of not applying the gag and that tradition is very dear to the hearts of all of us. Every hon. member has a full opportunity to express his views. However, it is obvious that those rights must be used with a certain amount of restraint, because on a Bill of this nature, if each one of the 78 members availed himself of his right to speak for 25 minutes on the introduction, and then for another 40 minutes at the second reading stage, the institution of Parliament would be unworkable. When expressing my appreciation of the attitude of hon. members generally, for their common sense, I refer particularly to members of the Government parties.

Mr. Walsh: You put the gag on them.

Mr. MUNRO: In adhering to the overall arrangement to get past the second reading stage on Friday it was the Government party members who had to make the major sacrifice. I know there were two or three hon. members who were very keen to speak.

As the hon. member for Bundaberg has interjected, let me say that although as usual he made a very useful contribution, he was probably the exception. When he commenced to speak at 4.30 p.m., knowing there was a time limit, he proceeded to exhaust substantially his full 40 minutes. He conjured up in my mind the picture of an elderly gentleman driving down the middle of the road, in an old-fashioned bomb, completely oblivious to the fact that he is holding up all the traffic behind him. However, it is good to know that he was the exception rather than the rule.

When considering the various points raised we should have in mind two background questions. The first is, what reasons, if any, are there to justify the Opposition in voting against the second reading of this

measure. The second is what useful points have been brought out in the course of the debate justifying the amendments that we might consider at the Committee stage.

Hon. members have had the Bill for a fortnight. The second-reading debate up to the present has occupied approximately five hours and I think it is appropriate now to examine just what has been established and what has not been established or satisfactorily answered.

Up to the present the debate has clearly established that there is a need for liquor law reform. It has further established that in the practical application of any reforms there are wide differences of opinion. Of course, we knew that quite well before we decided to introduce the Bill. But it has also established quite clearly, to my mind, that, despite the wide differences of opinion of hon. members as to method and such matters as time, there has been a general recognition that the five basic principles on which the Bill is founded are eminently sound. So I think it was unnecessary for the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Baroona, as they did, to spend very considerable time explaining why they voted for the introduction of the measure. I think they each spent 15 or 20 minutes doing so. If, in accordance with the report of the meeting of their party held the week before last, the Opposition decide to vote against the measure at the second-reading stage, I think they will be busy for the next 15 or 20 years trying to explain why they have done so. However, that is a matter for the Opposition and I leave it to them.

It appears that the divergences of viewpoint—and they are considerable—that have emerged during the course of the debate have revolved mainly around, firstly, mere differences of opinion as to the most effective means of achieving the generally accepted objectives I have outlined and, secondly, some rather pronounced differences of opinion arising from my second basic principle, which I stated to be—

> "The democratic principle of freedom of the responsible individual, commensurate with an adequate degree of responsibility of the individual to the community."

Hon. members will recall that in my introductory remarks I said that was a matter on which there would be no basic differences of viewpoint although there would be many different shades of opinion on the way to achieve the proper balance between individual freedom and community responsibility. I also said—and I think it is necessary to emphasise it—that the problem of the reconciliation of the need for the rule of law to protect the community interest with essential democratic freedom of the individual is one that has troubled our best thinkers for many generations. For that reason I am not surprised, nor am I in any way disturbed, by the fact that there have been so many differences of opinion expressed by various speakers from the Opposition side of the House.

However, I think I should proceed now to examine the main points of criticism and to endeavour to clarify our minds as to which of those criticisms are justified, which are not justified, and about any particular matters arising from those remarks that may enable us to improve the Bill. In doing so, I should like to say, as a general remark, that I think one of the greatest difficulties in life is to distinguish between matters that are matters of conscience, matters that are merely matters of opinion, matters of judgment, or matters of arriving at a decision after becoming aware of all the relevant background circumstances. I think that a number of hon. members who spoke perhaps with some degree of vehemence, as though they were speaking on matters of conscience, were merely expressing their views on matters that are only questions of opinion and in relation to which it is very widely known that there are great differences of opinion amongst the people of the State.

In looking through the rough notes that I took on Friday afternoon, I found that there were, as I analysed them, broadly ten main points of criticism of the Bill. I do not suggest that there were not more; there may have been some comparatively minor ones that I overlooked; but I think it is a fair summary to say that there were 10 major points of criticism, and I propose, if I have time to do so, to consider each of those main points.

The first one was the question, why alter the law relating to Sunday trading? Why not enforce the existing law? The answer to that is well known, at least by every hon. member representing an electorate outside the metropolitan area, because those hon. members know that this is a law which, for the past 20 years at least, has not been enforced. They should know, further, that the reason why it has not been enforced is that it is a law that is not capable of enforcement in some parts of the State. If it is a law that is not capable of enforcement, it is a law that is not accepted by the great body of people in this huge State. It is not a good law, and that is the reason why we should alter it.

The second question raised is, why distinguish between areas? Why not have a completely uniform law applying to the whole State? I have partly given the answer to that, but the complete answer is that Queensland is such a tremendous State, with far-flung areas, that the living conditions and requirements of some parts of it are essentially different from those of other parts.

Mr. Coburn: The moral standards are the same everywhere.

Mr. MUNRO: The moral standards are the same everywhere, but the living conditions are not the same. The moral standards throughout the Commonwealth are the same; but we have six States because, with six States, we can have separate laws to meet their different conditions and requirements.

Mr. Houston: That is not the reason why we have six States.

Mr. MUNRO: It is a very good reason why we have six States. Within the States we have local government.

Mr. Davies: What do you say is the difference between Redcliffe and the South Coast?

Mr. MUNRO: I will come to that. We have cities, towns, and shires. We have those divisions partly to bring government closer to the people, but partly because within cities, towns and shires we can have laws relating to a limited class of matters and adapted to the requirements of the people. When the former Government, and when this Government, decided on the broad lines of redistribution the State was divided into zones. I do not think anybody takes great exception to that because it is considered that the sparsely settled areas should have greater proportionate representation in Parliament than the closely settled areas. I give one further example. Do we apply the same speed limit on main roads in country areas that we apply in the centre of the city of Brisbane? Of course not. The reason is that there are different conditions. I have only given two examples, but it is obviously quite sound that where you have different conditions and requirements you should endeavour to adapt the law to meet those different conditions and different requirements.

I come to the next question arising from that, and here we come to a very difficult one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have appealed twice now to hon. members on my right about talking. I do not mind their talking but they are interrupting the Minister. It is difficult for me to hear him. If they must converse I ask that they converse quietly.

Mr. MUNRO: If we accept that there is a necessity to distinguish between areas, why should the dividing line be a 40-mile radius from the city of Brisbane? Quite frankly I am prepared to concede that that is one of the most difficult problems. There is an abundantly clear case for some distinction between the Brisbane residential areas and the far-flung northern, western, and north-western parts of the State, but it is extremely difficult to say where the line should be drawn. I can say only that the dividing line was arrived at after very careful consideration of a considerable number of alternatives. The reasons for this particular dividing line were dealt with fairly fully in my introductory speech. There is only one feature of the application of that division that causes me any concern. I refer to the point raised by the hon. member for Redcliffe. He pointed out that the Redcliffe Peninsula, although well within the 40-mile radius is, to some extent, in the nature of a tourist area. I think the burden of his remarks was that from some points of view Redcliffe more suitably could be classified, say, with the South Coast or places like Maroochydore and Mooloolaba. That is a point of difficulty, but we have to recognise that in this legislation we have to make a rule of law that is most suitable to the State as a whole. If we were to endeavour to make any exceptions for specific tourist areas, or to make a particular exception for the Redcliffe Peninsula, we would create anomalies very much greater than any at present, because Redcliffe is not only within the 40-mile radius but within a 20-mile radius of the Brisbane G.P.O.

Mr. Houghton: Why are we not entitled to all the other concessions that go with the city as regards franchise and everything else?

Mr. MUNRO: I do not follow that interjection. The Redcliffe Peninsula is dealt with in just the same way as the city residential areas. If I lived in Redcliffe I would be completely favourable to the present terms of the Bill, because, in my opinion, Redcliffe is in the process of developing from something of a holiday area to one of the best outer residential areas in Brisbane. If we made a special relaxation for Sunday drinking on the Redcliffe peninsula it would be the worst thing we could do for the residents of that delightful locality. I think they would be very much better off to remain as they are. If Redcliffe continues to develop in the way it is developing now it will not be long before its residents are in substantially the same position as those in my electorate of Toowong, and they are quite satisfied.

Mr. Davies: Can the Minister say what differences there are between Brisbane Street, Ipswich, and Stanley Street, Gympie?

Mr. MUNRO: It is quite impossible for me to answer all these questions. I should like to do so, but I have indicated that I will endeavour to deal with 10 points. I have seven more to deal with and I must press on.

The next point is a very important one that was raised by several speakers on the Opposition side including members of the Queensland Labour Party. In regard to the permitted hours on Sundays, they ask, assuming we are going to have certain permitted hours, why adhere to the existing travellers'

clause hours of 12 noon to 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. to 7 p.m.? Why not have other hours that will not be subject to some of the objections that might apply to these particular hours?

In answer to that, first of all, the reason why we adhered to those hours—and I emphasise "why we adhered to those hours" —in the Bill is that the hours of from 12 noon to 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. are those that are in the present law applicable to the travellers' clause, and we felt that there was some advantage in adhering to the existing provisions. They are the normal meal hours and they are the most suitable hours for persons who drink while partaking of a meal.

Nevertheless, I do recognise—and it has been brought under my notice not only by the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has kindly given me notice of certain amendments that he proposes to move, one of the most important of which is this one, but by others—that these particular hours might be suitable from some points of view but unsuitable from others, particularly in the north and western parts of the State. Therefore, I think we must very seriously consider, even at this stage, whether these hours are the best ones or whether we would not be wiser to amend the Bill to substitute other hours, perhaps even those that have been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. Instead of having the hours from 12 noon to 2 p.m. and from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., we should perhaps have them from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. That is something that we must consider and I should like to hear what is said in relation to it at the Committee stage.

Mr. Walsh: You have been talking to some sensible people in the meantime.

Mr. MUNRO: I generally speak to sensible people. One hon. member, I think the hon. member for Bundaberg, in relation to the clubs' hours asked why limit those particular provisions to bowling clubs and golf clubs? Why not extend them to other sporting clubs, such as surf clubs?

I will not take up much time on that request. There is a very good reason against it. The other clubs are mainly clubs of young people, and one of the features of the Bill is that it gives as much protection as possible to young people, before they reach the stage of maturity when they are able to exercise sound judgment. Apart from that, surf clubs and clubs of that type are not licensed at present, and there would be no point at all in extending the provisions of the Bill to them.

The next question was why give greater power to the Licensing Commission. Hon. members will notice from the Bill that in a number of matters we give greater power to the Licensing Commission in regard both to making determinations and to seeing that the law is enforced. The principle on these matters is, I think, eminently sound. The Licensing Commission is a very responsible semi-judicial body. Hon. members will note, however, that we have not shirked our responsibilities in preparing the Bill. Where there is a basic matter applying to the State as a whole or to a very considerable part of the State, we have laid down the rules very clearly and definitely in the Bill, but where it is a matter of considering whether a particular applicant should be granted a restaurant licence or whether a licence should be transferred to a particular area, or anything of that kind, obviously such a question should not be decided by the Government, by the Minister, or by any public servant. It can only correctly be decided by a quasi-judicial body such as the body already established, that is, the Licensing Commission.

The next question is why have licensed restaurants and, although that question is asked, the next one is why not give authority to have substantially all restaurants licensed, without any statutory maximum. These two questions are a good example of the fact that even from the Opposition side on the one point we have at times one hon. member's saying, "Why go so far?" and then immediately afterwards another hon. member's saying, "Why not go further?" In this particular matter I suggest the provisions of the Bill are eminently sound, because they meet quite a reasonable requirement for a limited number of licensed restaurants in the State. At the same time I think it is absolutely essential that we should retain the position where there are some well-established restaurants in the State without a licence. That point revolves around the matter of freedom of choice of the individual. One hon. member may like to take his girl friend to a restaurant where they can have a bottle of wine with their meal and, if it is their wish, they are entitled to do so, but there may be another young man—and I think of young people particularly—who would like to take friends to a restaurant without having a waiter placing a wine list under his nose and without being put in the rather difficult position of having to say he would prefer not to have a bottle of wine.

Mr. Tucker: What happens on our trains at the moment?

Mr. MUNRO: I am not dealing with trains and the question is not particularly relevant to the Bill.

A further question was why distinguish between a lounge and a beer garden. It is a difficult one. It is going to pose a difficult problem for the Licensing Commission, but in principle there is not the slightest doubt there is a need to differentiate, and the reason is that we must recognise that hotels are not merely places where people go to

have a drink. Hotels are places that provide accommodation, very often for a man, his wife and his children, and we must adhere to the present law that it is not an offence in any way for young people or children to be in the lounge or dining-room at the hotel. But the beer garden on the other hand is something that has developed largely as a place of entertainment and to some extent as a place for drinking, and not, I would suggest, as a place to which young people should be enticed and possibly to a considerable extent encouraged to acquire the habit of drinking alcoholic liquor. I think we must adhere very firmly to that distinction in relation to beer gardens. The important distinction there is the principle of making it clear that minors, with the exception, perhaps of employees, or possibly professional entertainers, should not be permitted to enter beer gardens.

Mr. Houston: How will you tell the age of married women?

Mr. MUNRO: I leave that matter to the hon. member who asked the question because I should say he would probably be much better at telling the age of married women than I.

The hon. member for Bundaberg asked why we should have these fees, or why we should increase them.

Mr. Walsh: I said the Government are depending on grog and gambling for their revenue.

Mr. MUNRO: He said, "Are not the Government the main beneficiaries from the increase in licence fees?" I would say yes, to an extent, but I wish to make two points clear: when we talk about the Government of the State we talk about the people of the State. We are not here as beneficiaries; we are here as trustees. Every pound that the Government obtain from licence fees derived from the sale and consumption of liquor will be put to a good and useful purpose. That is one of the reasons for having licence fees. Again, if we are not to derive revenue from this source, I ask the hon. member again, as I did by way of interjection when he was speaking, does he suggest that instead of obtaining this revenue from licence fees and liquor we should obtain a corresponding amount from licence fees on bread and milk? Of course he does not. There is no basis for that criticism of the Bill.

The hon. member for Ipswich East suggested that in the amount proposed to be allocated for educational and health measures there should be a statutory minimum amount as well as a statutory maximum. Superficially, that has some appeal because we certainly propose to see that there is a substantial allocation, but it is only a matter of machinery. I am sure that experienced hon. members will know it is not the practice to determine the precise amounts by legislation. All we do in legislation is give the authority, and that is what is done for all appropriations. In all measures giving authority for expenditure we give authority for a particular amount, but we do not particularise because it certainly would not do to endeavour to decide in advance how money could be most usefully spent.

As my time has almost expired, I should like to mention that on Friday last I circulated four proposed amendments that I believe will be acceptable to the Committee. I appreciate the courtesy extended to me by the Leader of the Opposition by making known to me a number of amendments that he proposes to move that we will have the opportunity of considering more fully during the Committee stage.

The hon. member for Bundaberg referred to vested interests on the one hand and fanatical prohibitionists on the other. I think those were his words. I do not like those terms. I think they are somewhat harsh. If there are any such people, we have not endeavoured to please either section. No section of that general nature has had any material influence on the preparation of the Bill.

The hon. member for Baroona said the Bill will not please either the "wets" or the "drys". That has not been the purpose. We have not endeavoured to please either the "wets" or the "drys". We have endeavoured to produce a fair and balanced measure and I realise that it probably will be improved in the course of consideration in the Committee stages. At least it will have provided the basis for what I feel sure will be in its final form a very great improvement on the present law.

The Leader of the Opposition told us on Friday last that the Opposition would vote against the second reading of the Bill. That is their responsibility. But in the years to come they will have very great difficulty in establishing in the minds of most people of the State good reason for having done so.

Finally, let me say again that the Bill is merely a fair, tolerant and wise approach to a very difficult problem. We know that we cannot please everybody but we believe the basic principles of the Bill to be right. I reiterate, too, the basic principle of making the law one that is capable of enforcement. I can speak on behalf of the Government when I say that the principle lying behind the Bill can accurately be expressed in the words that appear in the Coat of Arms of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in Australia, of which I am still a member, and that is "Nec Timens Nec Favens.", meaning "Without fear and without favour."

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time (Mr. Munro's motion)—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 38

Mr. Beardmore	Mr. Madsen
„ Camm	„ Morris
„ Campbell	„ Munro
„ Chalk	„ Nicklin
Dr. Delamothe	Dr. Noble
Mr. Dewar	Mr. Pilbeam
„ Evans	„ Pizzey
„ Ewan	„ Rae
„ Fletcher	„ Ramsden
„ Gaven	„ Richter
„ Gilmore	„ Row
„ Harrison	„ Sullivan
„ Hart	„ Taylor
„ Herbert	„ Tooth
„ Hiley	„ Wharton
„ Hodges	„ Windsor
„ Hooper	
„ Hughes	*Tellers:*
„ Jones	Mr. Carey
„ Low	„ Knox

NOES, 30

Mr. Baxter	Mr. Lloyd
„ Byrne	„ Mann
„ Coburn	„ Marsden
„ Davies	„ Melloy
„ Dean	„ Müller
„ Diplock	„ Newton
„ Donald	„ O'Donnell
„ Dufficy	„ Sherrington
„ Duggan	„ Thackeray
„ Graham	„ Tucker
„ Gunn	„ Wallace
„ Hanlon	„ Walsh
„ Hilton	
„ Houghton	*Tellers:*
„ Houston	Mr. Bromley
„ Inch	„ Burrows

PAIRS

Mr. Smith	Mr. Bennett
„ Lonergan	„ Adair

Resolved in the affirmative.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.54 a.m.): On line 20 of the second page of the Bill, the definition "Lodger" is altered substantially to read—

> "'Lodger'—In relation to licensed premises, a person—
>
> (a) to whom has been allotted in the premises a room (the number or description whereof appears in the register of lodgers with respect to the lodger and the day in question);".

It seems to me that the definition is not as clear as the definition now in the Act. It specifically related to the fact that the person concerned had lodged therein on the night immediately preceding the day whereon an offence is alleged to have been committed. It is only a minor point, but does the day in question begin at 10 a.m. in the morning? It is the usual practice in most hotels to vacate a room by 10 a.m. or you are charged for the rest of the day and the ensuing night. It seems to me that there could be a little confusion there.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.56 a.m.): It is merely a technical amendment. I do not think I should take up very much time over it. I could not use clearer words to explain the law on it than by reading the new definition of "lodger." I think it is perfectly clear. In reply to the hon. member I point out that the broad general intention of the provision is to meet the case of persons who, in this modern age, may arrive at a hotel some time during the day, and who should be entitled to the facilities of lodgers even though they have not slept in the hotel the preceding night. I think it is a reasonable amendment to the definition. I think that will be obvious to the hon. member if he reads the whole clause.

Clause 3, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 8, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—Amendments of s. 18; Fees—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.58 a.m.): The Opposition proposes to vote against Clause 9 because it increases the fees by 50 per cent., which we think is unnecessarily high. We indicated at an earlier stage of the Bill that there was abundant evidence available to prove that the increased charges would be paid for by the drinking public. When closing the second reading debate a few moments ago the Minister asked the Opposition to indicate where the Government revenue would come from for their financial operations. I have never heard a more barefaced suggestion that it is our responsibility to tell the Government exactly how they have to raise money to carry on their operations. They would be well advised to stop some of their extravagant schemes if they are anxious to live within the funds presently available to them. If they consider they can legitimately ask for increased revenue to finance the operations of Government they should ensure that the burden is imposed equitably.

At the introductory stage I indicated that when in Opposition the Premier very emphatically drew attention to what would happen if there were an increase in licence fees. There was no provision in the Bill to which he was speaking on that occasion to increase licence fees. He said that he was surprised to learn that there was no provision in the Bill for such an increase. He was obviously trying to make some political capital out of it. On the subject of political capital, surely it is an extraordinary situation when a Minister of the Crown chides the Opposition, and the Leader of the Opposition, for trying to make political capital out of a Bill. We had the spectacle the other day of the Minister's saying that the Leader of the Opposition was an experienced parliamentarian, skilled in the use of words. He said that the Leader of the Opposition was using that skill and experience for political purposes, political

advantages. After all, my purpose in being here is to prosecute a political purpose, that is, to get back into Government. We are quite entitled to use whatever experience and abilities that are available to the Opposition as a whole, to effect that transition in due course. It seems to be a remarkable attitude on the part of the Minister when he criticises us for exercising our undoubted constitutional prerogative and undoubted political responsibility in this matter. When the present Premier was in Opposition he made no bones about it. I have already read what he said. I do not wish to put it in "Hansard" for the third time but he said that it would not be the breweries or the licensed victuallers who would pay the additional burden, but the poor old drinker who goes to the hotel. He was very concerned about the drinker on that occasion when there was no impost put on him. Now, when he has an opportunity of showing some concern for the drinker in the community, he increases the charge by 50 per cent. There is no control over these things. I pointed out the other day that this increase of 50 per cent. in the license fees will represent something like 9d. or 10d. a gallon on beer. That amount of money cannot be absorbed by the publican at the present time.

Irrespective of whether this increase is imposed or not I know, from official advice tendered to me, that the U.L.V.A., of their own volition, felt that the time was opportune for a revision of their charges because of mounting costs in their industry—increased electricity charges, increased wages, and in some cases rentals and other charges that they, in common with other trading sections of the community, have to face. They felt it was necessary quite apart from this Bill. Therefore, the Bill will give them the opportunity of passing on a burden that a great number of them cannot bear at the moment.

I do not accept the view that every publican in the State has bulging pockets. I know some licensed victuallers who work very hard for long hours for relatively low incomes. Some, undoubtedly, have done very well in the business of conducting hotels and have been fortunate enough to amass reasonable sums of money for their retirement or for reinvestment or for whatever purpose they wish to put their surplus income.

However, as I say, there is a great number of hard working publicans in this State. The hotel trade is not the lucrative one that some people think it is, which is proved by the number of licences that have been surrendered in recent years. There has not been a tremendous demand to exercise licences currently available.

As the hon. member for Port Curtis mentioned a few moments ago, whilst it would be perhaps wrong that I should say that the number of hotels burnt down recently had some origin in economic factors rather than in fire hazards, the fact remains that I do know, again from advice tendered to me officially as the result of attending official functions, that many fire insurance underwriters look with concern at the risk to them of some hotels in certain parts of the State I remember the first occasion that I visited Mt. Isa. On reaching Cloncurry on my return somebody told me, speaking of one of the small places along the line, that the publican had said to the station-master, "Any news of such-and-such a place?" Obviously, he was waiting for what turned out to be news of the burning down of a hotel.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust the hon. member's remarks are related to the clause under discussion.

Mr. DUGGAN: They are related to the fact that publicans, in my opinion, have indicated that this is not the remunerative trade that so many people think it is, catering as it does for public requirements.

I should like to stress at this stage that, as much as I like to observe temperate habits in these matters, as much as I dislike excessive use of alcohol, the fact remains that it has become an avenue through which all Governments have been dipping deeply into the pockets of the workers for some considerable time. At present, the Commonwealth Government take 51 per cent. of the retail price of a glass of beer and 53 per cent. of the price of a bottle, by way of excise duty.

The Federal Treasurer, when presenting his Budget in the Federal House on 15 August last said it was expected that beer and cigarette consumption would rise in 1961-1962 and give the Government another £6.5 million in excise. He said that excise collections were £264,000,000 compared with £257.4 million in the previous year. Excise is estimated to produce one-seventh of the total cash receipts of the Federal Government of £1,918.7 million in the current financial year. Apart from the excessive excise on beer which has risen from 2s. a gallon in 1939 to 9s. 10d. a gallon today, the beer drinker has passed on to him all the costs of licence fees in the State, plus increases of brewery raw materials, income tax, local authority rates, and wage increases. Someone recently made the sardonic comment that Australians should honour the beer drinker and the smoker with a national statue, since he contributed so much to the national exchequer.

The additional £500,000 which increased licence fees will yield in a full financial year will inevitably be paid largely by the beer drinker. I will speak at greater length on that point during my other contributions at the Committee stage. The Minister hides behind the protection afforded by the Bill, in saying that the Licensing Commission is a semi-judicial body, and that it is not fitting that he, as the Minister, or some public servant should

administer the provisions applying to some of the controversial and difficult questions that have to be resolved. On the other hand I point out that he surrendered abjectly all forms of price-control administration. Recently, the hon. member for Tablelands asked a question about the price of milk to dairy producers in the State. The Minister said he had great concern for the hon. member but that he was not going to intervene in any circumstances as the matter was very properly one for the Commissioner of Prices. We read yesterday of the Government's intentions. They pose as being upholders of the law and with being very righteous in their attitude. They say, "We will see that justice is dispensed without fear or favour." Those were the closing words of the Minister on the Bill, but in the case of the milk people they use the back door and say, "The Milk Board will determine the price to be paid." Their attitude is a very improper one. Either the Minister accepts the determination of the Commissioner of Prices in this particular matter or he does not. For the moment I am not debating the merits of the price to be paid to milk producers. But the Minister does not give the beer drinker any protection. He leaves that matter to be determined by somebody outside. If there is anything to be done in this matter, it will be done by someone other than himself. Criticism of the Government is becoming solid and consistent even within their own ranks on this matter. The Government have been extravagant. They increased the fee on a previous occasion from 3 per cent. to 4 per cent. The Minister can talk until he is blue in the face of the fees that apply elsewhere. Before the Government assumed office Queensland had the lowest cost of living, the highest percentage of employment and the highest standard of living. Those things are going by the board. It is useless for the Minister to point to the position elsewhere. It only proves that other States have not reached the standard we consider to be desirable.

With the continuing inflationary spiral these increases will be reflected in due course in higher costs. At the moment, owing to the curtailment of quartely cost-of-living adjustments, the increases borne by the drinker will have to come out of the family income. The consumer index makes some provision for this sort of thing, and no doubt in due course the increases will be reflected in an increase in the basic wage. In several ways the principle being introduced is an undesirable one. Taxation is becoming too harsh and unconscionable, and in so many directions. From time to time we have to consider further amendments, imposing a still heavier burden of taxation on the people of the State. I think it is time for someone to protest. We have done so on many occasions. I shall refer only briefly to the fact that in the field of motoring we have seen how the charges on the motorist have been increased. And in the fields of stamp duty and others the taxation is being increased still further. Someone must take a stand. Unless the Government become cognisant of the strong body of public opinion outside, they will remain complacent and leave things as they are. The Minister, with a yes-no attitude in the closing stages, said he would consider some proposals from the Opposition, thus indicating the uneasiness on their side of the Chamber. On his own admission three Government party meetings were held to discuss the provisions of the Bill. They were not sufficient. They then had two further meetings, and today still another one —in all, six meetings, after having all facilities available to them to examine such things—as the Minister pointed out—over a period of three or four years. His statement was characteristic of the faltering, halting, confused actions of the Government. They do not know where they are going. They just stab blindly in one direction and in another direction. If the Minister gets any satisfaction from his statement that we will have some difficulty living down our attitude on the Bill, I assure him we can go outside and give a very good story to the people about the logic of the action we have taken.

Mr. Hart: You are voting both ways, in fact.

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. member says we are voting both ways, but the Government are trying to win support from both sections outside. All they will succeed in doing is lose the support of both sections outside. Instead of our getting it both ways——

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DUGGAN: If I have been out of order in acknowledging the interjection I express my regret. However, we can justify our action in another place, at other times.

The increase in fees is expected to yield an extra £500,000 and in our opinion it is an encroachment on the rights of people outside and should be resisted by someone. This is the place to resist it. I am sure that with those remarks I have given the Committee our reasons for voting against the clause.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (12.11 p.m.): I rise to oppose this clause. I wonder what the position would be concerning this legislation if a recent decision given by the Privy Council had gone the opposite way. I venture to suggest that it is possible that the Bill would not have seen the light of day if Mr. Whitehouse had been successful in his appeal to the Privy Council. He regarded this form of taxation as something like excise and it was argued along those lines before the Privy Council, but the Privy Council did not accept the submissions. However, we can readily see that these fees are akin to excise, and from the record of the Government in the past it is obvious that

in the future they will look upon the worker drinking his beer as being a milch cow for them forever. I visualise the time—and it may not be far away—when the Government may well have to appeal to the Commonwealth under special legislation for assistance for the States. As was intimated in the past, if Queensland is in desperate straits, the Government may renew its application. Possibly the Commonwealth Government may say, "Well, we have already levied excise taxes of over 50 per cent. on the workers' beer. Although you people may have travelled along the road very considerably in this taxation field, your taxation is still not equal to ours and we will not consider any special application from you until you bring your taxation up to a level equal to our excise duty."

When the Treasurer admits that the Government hope to gather at least £500,000 a year from this sectional taxation, it is obvious to me that that will not be the limit. Each and every year, when another big budget deficit looms, licence fees will be increased, and the workers will have to pay. The Government will say, "They want the beer, so they pay for it." There does not seem to be any limit in sight as to how far the Government will go. As one with a sense of equity and a sense of justice, who during a long parliamentary career has tried to fight for the rights of the workers and the average person in the State, I feel very strongly about this. As I said the other day, it is a great pity that the Government, in their professed objective approach to this liquor legislation should have included this very vicious class taxation. In the final analysis that is what it amounts to. Neither the Minister nor the Treasurer has given the Committee any indication of how far the Government propose to go in this direction. They have increased the fee in the past and by the Bill they are increasing it again. Do they intend year after year, as their Consolidated Revenue deficit increases, to levy still further this class taxation on the workers? There is a great danger of that. All the evidence before us indicates that that policy will be pursued. As it is vicious in its application to the average worker, it should be arrested. I strongly oppose the clause.

Mr. DEWAR (Wavell) (12.16 p.m.): The Leader of the Opposition is still trying to draw red herrings across the trail. He criticised the Government for spending so much time in considering these proposals. He even indicated that we had had three meetings. We probably had eight or nine and we do not conceal the fact or apologise for it. It merely shows that we consider the measure to be very important, and how thoroughly we went into the matter before we introduced it.

Labour are now in the classic position of having voted in support of the motion that it was desirable to introduce amendments to the legislation, after the amendments had been outlined, and then of having voted against the Bill on the second reading.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the increase in fees was unnecessarily high. It is not unusual to hear the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Labour Party talking in that manner when it suits them. During their time as a Government they kept the tax on alcoholic liquor down to 3 per cent. while it was 6 per cent. throughout the rest of Australia. Contrast that with their attitude to company taxation before the war, when they had the highest company taxation in Australia and so kept industry out of this State. When they want to pander to a particular trade they keep down the tax relating to it.

My views on some aspect of the liquor trade may be a little alarming to some. I contend it is ridiculous to force a licensee to provide so much accommodation. We must face facts. It has been said by hon. members on both sides that the vast majority of people want liquor reform. I dispute that. The vast majority do not drink regularly. We must realise that the motel type of accommodation is beating hotel accommodation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The clause deals with an increase from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent.

Mr. DEWAR: Liquor fees are wrapped up with what a person controlling a hotel has to provide in the way of services. With the increase in motels it is high time we considered this aspect. I believe the increase to 6 per cent. is highly merited. In fact, it is not high enough. The time will come when the fees will have to be greatly increased. It is high time a trade that causes nothing but misery, poverty and death should do something towards the allevation of the horrors it creates.

Mr. Lloyd: Why extend the principles—that is what you are doing—if you believe in that?

Mr. DEWAR: I really believe in that. I am sorry I have been sidetracked but, as I said at the introductory stage——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust that the hon. member will ignore interjections that have no relation to the clause.

Mr. DEWAR: I will try to do that. As I said at the introductory stage, I am supporting the Bill because it is a balanced Bill.

Mr. Walsh: You are making excuses.

Mr. DEWAR: I am not making excuses. I am giving reasons. Let me say at the outset that I think it is high time we had a look at the subject of fees and the cost of the liquor trade to human life. I believe that

alcohol was not created by God, that alcohol is not a true element. It is created by mixing——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust that the hon. member will not continue his speech along those lines.

Mr. DEWAR: No. I am merely giving reasons why the fees paid by this trade, which plays an important part in the life of the community, should be raised. We are our brother's keeper. I have in mind the story of the man who was walking along the road when ahead of him he saw an animal. When he got closer he saw that it was a man, and when he caught up with him he found that it was his brother. We cannot allow the position to continue any longer where a trade that is carried on legally causes so much misery and pays little or nothing in revenue to alleviate that misery and suffering. If an increase in fees will help to some extent in meeting the cost of our hospitals, where so many people are confined because of the effects of alcohol, our mental institutions, where so many of our people finish their days because of the effects of alcohol, and in providing services, I believe the increase is warranted and, in fact, that it is not high enough.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (12.22 p.m.): I do not think we have ever been treated to such a display of excuses and hypocrisy as we have just heard from the hon. member for Wavell. One of the most alarming statements that I have heard from any man with the principles that he espouses from time to time was his statement that the fees were not high enough, that he would like to see the fee of 6 per cent. increased even higher. I wonder whether he has ever considered that the greatest evil associated with drinking is not that a man drinks but that his wife and children go short of food and clothing because of the money he spends on alcohol.

Mr. Coburn: That is because he drinks.

Mr. LLOYD: Exactly, and the Government intend now to increase the price of that drink to the man who does drink, thus taking more money not from the man who drinks but from his wife and children.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: In their determination to secure more money to enable them to carry on the great extravaganza of Government that they have undertaken in the past four years, they intend to impose a further tax on the working people. The hotel is the working man's club; there he does his drinking. If he has to pay more for a small glass of beer, he has to get the money somewhere to pay for it. It comes out of his pay cheque and so he has less to take home to his wife and children. Someone suffers because there is not enough money for food and clothing.

Mr. Camm interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member might like to support the hon. member for Wavell and say that the licence fee should be raised even higher.

Mr. Camm: It affects everybody.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LLOYD: Fees were imposed on a percentage basis for one reason only—that the greater the inflation within our community, the more the person purchasing a commodity has to pay for it. The wholesale price is higher, and the retailer—in this instance it is the licensed victualler—must increase his price. The greater the price paid by the person who is selling the commodity, the greater the revenue received by the Government in licence fees. In a case such as this, there can be no analogy drawn with prosecutions under the Traffic Act, where at one time a fine of £5 would be imposed upon a person for a breach of the law. As the basic wage increased and inflation took control of the economy fees had to be increased in amount, but not on a percentage basis. With the 4 per cent. charge the Government were adequately recompensed for any effect of inflation by the very fact that the charge was not a fixed amount, but a percentage. The percentage stabilised the revenue raised by the Government from licence fees. In reply to the arguments we put forward no doubt the Minister for Justice will say that a quarter of the amount of the licence fee must be paid by the owner of the hotel, that ½ per cent. will be added onto the 1 per cent. the owner already pays, as contained in the original Act. However, we must read the Bill in conjunction with the principal Act. The 1½ per cent. increase in licence fee paid by the licensed victualler must be transferred to the consumer. The consumer must pay for it. I have heard nothing from the Minister for Justice about the rentals paid by licensed victuallers to the owners of hotels.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust the hon. member will keep to licence fees.

Mr. LLOYD: I intend to. I am trying to put forward the argument that if the Government wished to obtain further revenue from the liquor trade in Queensland they had ample opportunity to secure additional finance to balance their Budget by other means without imposing this taxation on the working people. Many other avenues were open to them. I know that one Newmarket hotel is paying a rental of £400; for the Regatta Hotel the owner receives a rental of £250. For various hotels in Brisbane and throughout Queensland owners are receiving phenomenal rentals from licensed victuallers. The real reason for the licensing of hotels and imposition of licence fees by any Government lies in the fact that by the very guarantee of prosperity within the industry, by limiting

the number of hotels and clubs, they can provide a public service. In other words, they can provide facilities for the public because they are guaranteed prosperity; their industry is protected. If, in this case, the prosperity is so great that tremendous rentals can be charged by hotel-owners, let the Government examine that avenue. Because there is a licensing system in operation which has resulted in such tremendous prosperity that hotel-owners can command a £400 rental, without doing any work for it, surely the owners should be expected to pay a greater contribution towards any licence fee that may be either increased beyond or set at 4 per cent.? I do not think the Minister for Justice has considered that point. All the Government are concerned about is to get extra money at the expense of the working people. They pay no attention to the people who are securing tremendous incomes from what is a Government-created monopoly within the industry. They are able to obtain that income without doing any work for it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member has made his point.

Mr. LLOYD: I think I have, but I am trying to tie it up in this way: the people who are actually paying for licence fees and the hotel rentals are those who are utilising the services provided. In other words, the charges are finally passed onto the consuming public. Any Government that continue to impose that tremendous burden upon the consuming public by means of extra taxation are only adding to the inflation already present. It does not matter whether it is an increase in a licence fee under this Bill, sales tax, or any other form of indirect taxation. It all adds to the cost to the consuming public and imposes an additional hardship on working people. It is also a disservice to the community.

Mr. Evans interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: The Minister has had a good deal to say lately and he is getting into much trouble. He made some statements that he may have to retract or explain. Are we as a Parliament going to add to the cost to the consuming public? The whole Bill revolves round this clause. The principle of extension of drinking facilities on Sunday and other principles in the Bill relate to this increase. It has provided the Government with an opportunity to silence people outside who were organising some resistance to the measure. The Government are to provide £30,000 from the licence fees to be collected and that perhaps caused the resistance to collapse suddenly. In other words, 30 pieces of silver silenced the resistance to this legislation apparent some time ago.

Mr. Windsor: That is a terrible thing to say and you should withdraw it.

Mr. LLOYD: It is the attempt by the Government to silence resistance to the introduction of the Bill that makes the hon. member for Wavell so uncomfortable and about which the hon. member for Ithaca is so silent. The £30,000 is to be provided for the purpose by increasing charges against the working people of the community. Other than from the Australian Labour Party, I have not heard of any resistance from outside to the increased fees proposed in the Bill. I think it is unfortunate. If they tax anybody, the Government should tax the people who secure the greatest profit from the industry, the shareholders in the breweries, owners of hotels and the people who benefit from the consumption of alcohol in the State.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (12.33 p.m.): I can sympathise with the Minister and some hon. members on the Government side for being forced into the position of putting a case on matters that are totally against their consciences, particularly when one hears the hon. member for Wavell making the remarks he made on this clause, and having regard to the attitude of many other hon. members opposite on the subject generally. I refer particularly to the hon. member for Ithaca who is in complete isolation this morning. No other hon. member is sitting near him.

This clause seeks to amend Section 18 of the principal Act. The Government and their advisers, to meet the Governments' wishes, have gone to a great deal of trouble in the preparation of the amendment which takes up almost four pages of the Bill. However, since the Minister has claimed that this measure will bring about substantial reforms, it is obvious that he has not given it much consideration, other than from the point of view that he expects to raise about 33 per cent. more in revenue. This is a matter calling for proper consideration. In passing I say it is a pity the Minister did not give some thought to the need to grade the purchase tax applicable to hotels, restaurants, clubs and the like, because a hotelier is subject to many obligations and restrictions, to conform to the requirements of the Act, yet he will be called on to pay the same purchase tax stipulated in the Act for other licencees who have not the same obligations.

By way of interjection, and during his remarks, the Minister asked whether in my view, instead of collecting revenue under this heading, in the form of a tax on liquor purchases by licensees, the Government should collect revenue by way of tax on bread, milk, and so on. How ridiculous, when we know the Minister has gone a very long way in increasing the impost on all those articles, by virtue of the policy of the Government, clear evidence of which is available in the recent consumer price index which showed an increase for Queensland as distinct from other States.

If the Minister and the Government continue to squander revenue, particularly consolidated revenue, as they have done in the last four years, I do not know where they will finish.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust the hon. member is not making another second-reading speech.

Mr. WALSH: No. I am drawing attention to the fact that this is a revenue measure and I am entitled to make the comment that the Government are squandering the revenue now available to them; that if they were not squandering their revenue there would be no justification for an increase in the purchase tax on liquor. From the documents submitted in the House it is seen that in the last four years departmental and general expenditure has gone from £25 to £36 a head, an increase of £11. Such an increase in four years proves the truth of my statement that the Government are squandering their revenue.

It may be of interest to those who were not in the Chamber when I said it recently to know that it took 19 years under Labour Governments to reach a purchase tax of 4 per cent. The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, by way of interjection a little while ago said that the Government were only doing what previous Governments did in this respect. That is perfectly true in regard to the incidence of the tax. It was introduced by a Labour Government but Labour Governments had some regard for the economics of the industry—so much so that the tax reached 4 per cent. only after a period of 19 years. The present Government have taken only four years to increase the rate to 6 per cent.

Clause 9 (1) (a) (vii) reads—

> "For a restaurant license—a sum equal to six per centum of the gross amount (including all duties thereon) paid or payable for or in respect of all liquor which during the twelve months ended on the last day of June in the preceding year was purchased or otherwise obtained for the licensed premises."

I draw attention to the words in brackets, "including all duties thereon". I do not know whether the Minister knows that at the present time country hotels, outside the metropolitan area—the position may apply even in Ipswich—purchase tax is calculated not only on the cost of the liquor but also on the railway freight, unless the position has been altered in very recent times. I know that that has been a ground for considerable complaint owing to the fact that if a hotel keeper purchased supplies from the local agent for the brewery, or a wine and spirit merchant, he paid tax on the price to him at that centre. If the Government have not already looked into this term, "including all duties thereon", I should like them to do so at some future time, and give it earnest consideration. I take it the Minister means excise duties and other things. I should like the Minister also to look into the taxation on rail freights and other transport charges to see if that practice still operates in country areas. It may be that if the liquor is bought direct from Brisbane, as would be the case with one of the breweries, the tax will not be charged on rail freights. It is all very well to say that the tax has increased from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent., but in some areas it may be 6¼ per cent., 6½ per cent., or 7 per cent.

While the constitutional right to make this charge has been decided up to the High Court stage, I should hesitate to think what might happen if the Privy Council finally decided it, although it is true that Mr. Whitehouse could not get the Privy Council to give him a decision on whether it was constitutional or otherwise. No doubt the Minister would not have presented the Liquor Bill that is before us but a very much larger one indeed. I am positive that the Minister could have come up with a different system for purchase tax, or licence tax, or whatever it may be. I should like to hear some comments from him about it.

I disagree entirely with a provision whereby a sum of money has to be paid into the Treasury for the specific purpose of educating people on the intake of alcohol. After all, we have a number of organisations.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think we will come to that clause later.

Mr. WALSH: Yes, I realise that, but I should refer to it now because it comes out of the purchase tax. I am just emphasising my objection. Since the Government have been in power they have resorted to all manner of ways of meeting their new and increased charges. The Minister for Labour and Industry has collected very substantial sums by ever-increasing taxation on motorists, and I have no doubt that the Minister for Justice is following his lead.

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (12.44 p.m.): This clause imposes an increase of 50 per cent. in licence fees which will mean an increase in the cost of beer. We must remember that when we consider all the arguments relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors.

One of the arguments advanced by the Government for an extension of trading hours and drinking facilities was on erroneous grounds. In my opinion and in the opinion of many others, total prohibition proved unworkable in America. When you prohibit people from getting something in one way they will devise other means of getting it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The clause does not relate to prohibition.

Mr. BURROWS: I agree with you, Mr. Taylor, but if you will be a little patient——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I want the hon. member to deal with the clause.

Mr. BURROWS: I will do that. I do not think you are able to say that any other speaker has followed it as faithfully as I

have. It is well known that if you put anything out of the reach of a man he will look for a substitute. By savagely increasing the taxation on alcoholic liquor and continually increasing its price the Government are putting drink beyond the reach of the people, so they look for an alternative. Is there any man of the world who will not admit that there are more stills and more manufacturers of "sly grog" today than there were 20 years ago? If I could not buy something I would seek a substitute. The price of liquor is prohibitive now and this Bill will force it up still further. If most people think that alcohol is a necessity—though I do not for a moment concede that it is—it must be put within the reach of the average man. If we savagely increase the price we will not do that.

The hon. member for Wavell put forward the excuse that part of the money derived will be used to relieve people suffering from alcoholism and to educate people. If that is a balm to his conscience he must have a very easy conscience. Any medical man will confirm that alcoholism is a disease. If it is logical to impose a savage tax on alcohol in order to raise money to spend on the relief of alcoholics, we might as well say the Government are prepared to bring in a tax on houses of ill-fame in order to get funds for the treatment of venereal disease. There is just as much logic in that, or just as little.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to stick to the point.

Mr. BURROWS: I am sticking to the point, and the point is the lack of morality in the clause. Here is the Minister, a pillar of virtue, a man who came in here absolutely beyond reproach. He came in just a little later than I did. Although he was a member of the Opposition, I thought, "Here is a man who will have the strength of his convictions."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This personal reference to the Minister has nothing to do with the 4 per cent. or the 6 per cent. and I ask the hon. member not to persist with it. I am fairly tolerant of repetition. I have not yet stopped anybody for repeating what a previous speaker said, but I am afraid it is reaching the stage where I must. The clause deals with the raising of the fee from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. The analogies drawn by the hon. member have no relationship to that subject.

Mr. BURROWS: The point I was making was that it is a matter of personal regret that the Minister has allowed himself to be used as the medium or vehicle through which the Government should levy this savage and exorbitant tax on the unfortunate alcoholic. I realise, as every other hon. member realises, and as I think every intelligent person in Queensland does, how desperate for money the Government are. They have embarked on reckless and extravagant expenditure and they have to look for some way of financing it. This is not the only avenue they intend to explore but it is one from which they expect to reap a great deal. All I can ask the Minister and his colleagues is, can they not find a more honourable way of getting it than this? What about imposing a sales tax on every transaction on the Stock Exchange?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BURROWS: This is a sales tax, and no-one knows better than the Minister how obnoxious sales tax is and how unfair it is when compared with income tax or land tax. But the Government persist in it. In fact, not only do they persist in it, but they increase it savagely.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Has the hon. member completed his speech?

Mr. BURROWS: Yes, I think I have done my utmost. I know I have convinced you, Mr. Taylor, but not the Minister.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (12.51 p.m.): I have a few brief remarks to make on the increase in the tax on liquor sales, because I think this clause is the key to the whole Bill. If the Government had a genuine desire to liberalise the drinking laws to provide for saner drinking, they would not have included a clause such as this in the Bill. They are not genuinely interested in liquor reform. It is obvious that the amendment is designed to give the Treasurer another opportunity of dipping his hands into the pockets of the workers, as he does on every possible occasion.

Mr. Ewan interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I do not wish to be sidetracked by the hon. member for Roma, but his interjection seems to indicate that it would be far better to impose a tax on prickly-pear juice.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It seems to me that the hon. member for Roma has been drinking prickly-pear juice.

This provision is a sop to the self-confessed temperance men on the Government benches. The hon. member for Wavell expressed the view that by liberalising the sale of liquor and then taxing it out of the reach of the working-man, we should be doing the right thing. If this provision is a sop to his conscience, in view of his professed concern about liquor reform in Queensland, it is a very sorry state of affairs. It is quite illogical to increase facilities for drinking if you are merely preventing certain persons from consuming alcohol by taxing it out of their capacity to pay for it. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, any increase in the tax means a decrease in the money available to families for food and other necessaries in the home. One hon.

member on the Government benches bleated out that it would apply not only to the working-man but to the community as a whole. As he would possibly have an expense account and would not care how high the price of liquor was raised, it would not worry him a great deal. However, there can be no doubt that the amendment will eventually mean an increase in the price to the consumer. My Leader interjects that that would be so. People with expense accounts would not care whether the price of liquor is raised. It is only another tax deduction for them.

Mr. Hughes: Is it in the C Series Index?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: You get up and make your own speech. If the Chairman cannot silence you, I will.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member please resume his seat. I think it is necessary to make an explanation. When an hon. member assumes that the Chairman cannot carry out his duties properly and he presumes to say that he will silence an hon. member, I think it is time that hon. member was asked to resume his seat.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I wish to explain that not for one moment was I imputing that you had lost control over the Chamber, but the hon. member was continually interjecting——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That was the inference by the Chair, and that was the reason for my action.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (12.55 p.m.): I rise to oppose the clause, mainly because it imposes an indirect tax. It makes provision for a 50 per cent. increase in fees, which will be a harsh imposition on the average man. When I say that it is an indirect tax I am reminded of what my Federal Leader said about excise tax; he described it by saying that when you bought two beers you bought one for Bob Menzies. On this occasion I do not know how much the indirect tax will add to the cost of the glass of beer for the average working man, but probably it will be over a half-penny, or possibly almost a penny. In future this indirect tax will be described by saying that every time you buy so many beers you buy one for Tom Hiley or for the Minister for Justice, whoever he may be.

The harsh part about excise tax and the present indirect tax is pointed out in what my Federal Leader used to say about Bob Menzies, "He will never shout back for you."

Mr. Ramsden: Which Federal leader is that?

Mr. TUCKER: The one that will be Prime Minister after 9 December.

I protest strongly against this indirect tax being placed on the average working man. The previous speaker pointed out how big business executives have expense accounts. It does not matter to them what the price of beer may be; it does not matter to their companies who are able to claim expenses as taxation deductions. But the average working man has to bear the additional cost, whatever it might be. To use the vernacular, I say that he has got to cop it; there is no way in the world he can pass it on. Hon. members opposite do not understand that sort of thing. They represent big business. They only laugh and jeer whenever we talk about the average working man having to bear additional costs, but it means a big thing to him.

The Bill is purely and simply a revenue-producing Bill. No attempt has been made to bring about any real liquor reform. The whole purpose of its introduction was to produce additional revenue. It is obvious that Clause 9 is the crux of the whole Bill; the rest of it is only flummery and dust put up to hide the real issue. It always appears to be the Government's attitude to leave the big man alone and slog the little man. I am speaking on behalf of the little man, and accordingly I oppose the clause.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (2.15 p.m.): It is not my intention to take up the time of the Committee in referring to past debates, but I should like to refer to one in 1954-1955, recorded at page 1730 of Vol 210 of "Hansard," where there appears the noting—

> "Clauses 5 to 19, both inclusive, as read, agreed to."

Mr. Davies: Does that tell us what the Government are doing on this occasion?

Mr. RAMSDEN: It tells us that the Government are doing exactly as the A.L.P. did, when in Government, in dealing with the very same question. Pages 273 and 274 of the 1954-1955 statutes reveal that the Labour Government of the day, in Section 16, one of those to which I have already referred, repealed subsection (1) of that section. The statute goes on to say—

> "By repealing in subsection (2) of that section the words 'two and one-half per centum' and by inserting in lieu of those repealed words the words 'four per centum'; also by repealing in that subsection (2) the words 'to sell liquor and other than to registered or exempted clubs' "

and so on.

Surely the Opposition are not asking the Government now to accept the proposition that although what they themselves did in 1954-1955 was logical what we are doing, on exactly the same basis, is illogical?

Mr. Houston: You are raising it to 6 per cent.

Mr. RAMSDEN: We are raising the tax from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. The Opposition, when they were the Government, raised it from 2½ per cent. to 4 per cent., just one-half per cent. less than we have done.

Since we have heard so much today from hon. members opposite about the imposition this will be on the working man, let me point out to them, if they have not already worked it out for themselves, that this increase of 2 per cent. in the present tax means .24 of a penny in every 1s.

Mr. Rae: It would take 50 beers to make an extra bob.

Mr. RAMSDEN: As the hon. member for Gregory interjects, it means that the ordinary man will have to drink 50 beers to spend an extra shilling. Those are the facts.

Mr. Hanlon: How much has the Federal Government increased tax since 1944?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I remind the hon. member for Baroona that whatever the Federal Government are doing has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. Hanlon: The effect on the drinker has.

Mr. RAMSDEN: There is only one other comment I should like to make. It appears that the Opposition are treating this clause as being one solely devoted to the question of whether or not licence fees are to be increased from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. In paragraph (7B) of this clause there is an entirely new provision, that the Commission may grant an extension of time for payment of an assessment or fixed annual fee or permit payment to be made by instalments. That is an improvement in the powers of the Licensing Commission. Previously, if the licensee were behind in his payments the Commission had no alternative but to deal with him under the Act. Now the Licensing Commission can consider hardship and may grant an extension of time for the payment of an outstanding fee. Under the following sub-clause the same principle is applied. The Commission is given power to decide whether it will charge interest to the defaulter who has not paid his annual fee. I am assured that the Licensing Commission will exercise its power rightfully and justly. If a licensee wilfully refuses to meet his obligation, he can be dealt with under that provision, but when hardship is apparent the Licensing Commission will have the right to grant an extension of time in which to pay the fee, and a further right to remit the penalty that normally would be imposed.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (2.21 p.m.): I shall speak only very briefly to the clause, because I think it is fair to say on the four speeches from Opposition members that their consideration has passed from an objective consideration of the Bill, with a view to the improvement of it, to something very much in the nature of playing party politics.

We all know that the additional revenue from the increase from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. in licence fees has been included in the budget already passed.

Mr. Duggan: We voted against it.

Mr. MUNRO: That is the position. It is an essential part of the financial plan for the financial year, which has already been approved. We are not expanding it. Of course, it is good party politics for hon. members opposite to talk about the effect on the worker and the heavy impost on licensed hotel-keepers. They may win a few votes from certain unthinking people; they might even win a few votes from licensed victuallers, but that is not our purpose today. In my view we are trying to see if we can improve the Bill, and that certainly cannot be done by any further consideration of the clause.

As a matter of fact, as I listened to the remarks of hon. members opposite I was reminded of the man who had been a politician for very many years and who, when he retired, boasted, "I have never voted for a tax and I have never spoken against an appropriation." That seems to be the spirit adopted by Opposition members to the clause. They must know, as we know, that the Government require revenue in order to carry on essential services in the interests of the people as a whole. Broadly, we are merely bringing our licence fees into line with those of the State of Victoria which are considered in the South, as far as I can gather, as being fair.

I make one additional point, merely for correction of the record. There have been references to a purchase tax. Let me make it quite clear that this is not a tax; this is merely a licence fee.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (2.24 p.m.): It is extremely unfair of the Minister to argue that we have not much right to argue the matter in the Committee stages, because of some announcement by the Treasurer in his Budget speech that the licensing fee would be increased from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent., and that the passing of the Budget automatically removed any objection we had to the clause. I remind the Minister that we voted against the Budget, by moving a motion of censure on the Government in the traditional form, to reduce the item by £1, and thereby drew attention to the effect of the increased fees being levied by the Government. Surely the Minister cannot argue that merely because the Budget has

been passed and contained some fleeting, passing reference, to the intention to increase liquor fees, that that should keep the Opposition quiet on all measures that may come later on which have some connection with increased revenue that may be required by the Government? There may be many things in the Budget which we do not like, and merely because the Government forced the issue through by weight of numbers, is surely no reason why the Minister should take umbrage about our arguing the merits and demerits of the matter. I think it is most unfair of him to do so. We have no guarantee, in the light of the Government's record, that even if the matter were included in the Budget that they would proceed with it. We have had so much evidence of withdrawal and amendment to Bills that we do not know what the Government's intentions are until the Bill is actually presented in its final form. Again, the Government's administrative measures have been characterised by halting, and confusing steps, and this change from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. is evidence of further confusion and further establishes the need of the Opposition to speak, as we have on this matter.

I regret very much that the Minister made a great display of histrionics during the introductory and second reading stages. He said that we would be given a full opportunity to speak on the measure, in Committee and when we take advantage of our right to do so, we are rebuked and told, "You should not talk on this matter because the Budget has been passed. It contained a reference to the 4 per cent. and 6 per cent." If that is the Minister's attitude, why does he not go the full hog and say, "After you pass the Budget and Appropriation Bill, all go home and be good boys because we are not going to take any further notice of what you say in Parliament. The Budget and the Appropriation Bill have been passed, and no matter what more you may say we will not take any notice of you."

Mr. Houghton: Don't you think the same principle applies to the Government now?

Mr. DUGGAN: That is exactly what I am saying.

Mr. Dewar: Why don't you go home and be a good boy?

Mr. DUGGAN: Because I believe in the interests of good government we should stay as long as we can, and expose the Government. If we do that, they will be most anxious to go home, because every day the margin between us is narrowing. If they remain too long, they will be told compulsorily to go home and some, like the hon. member for Wavell, will be directed to stay there permanently.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (2.28 p.m.): The Minister, from time to time, takes great pains to say that the case put forward on certain questions has been misleading. He has a very difficult row to hoe and I believe that he has a very uneasy conscience about some parts of the Bill. How often have we heard him speak about the effect of this tax and that tax on industry, and how taxation retards the development of industry generally? For a man with his wide experience to say that this particular tax, and I emphasise the word "tax", is not a tax, is misleading to the community. I do not ask him to accept my interpretation of what a tax is. All I ask him to do is to look at the document presented by his colleague in the form of the Tables relating to the Treasurer's Financial Statement. On pages 18 and 19, in Table C5 he will find taxation per head of population, and then, if he looks at page 8, Table B, under the various headings of revenue, he will find, "Taxation —licences and permits." The actual receipts are £2,699,819. I am not saying all that was derived from this source, but I do say it is included in the £2,000,000-odd as a tax, which the Treasurer himself says is a tax, and is noted accordingly in this document.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (2.30 p.m.): I propose to be brief. In reply to the Leader of the Opposition I want to make it clear that at no time have I made any endeavour to limit the debate or to prevent any hon. member from speaking for as long as he wished, but, if I find after listening carefully that a series of speeches from the Opposition side is nothing more than playing politics, then not only have I the right to make that criticism of it but also it is my duty as a responsible Minister of the Crown to make it.

The hon. member for Bundaberg purports to correct me when I say this is not a tax but a licence fee. What evidence does he produce? He does not look at the law. He does not look at the words of the statute. He produces a document in which it is classified under a general heading of taxation. It is not worth while wasting any more time on an argument such as that.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (2.31 p.m.): The Minister forgot that I still have five minutes in which to speak.

Mr. Morris: So has he.

Mr. WALSH: I realise that. I do not know what evidence I have to produce to convince the Minister that this is a tax. I do not know that any statute that has been approved by the Parliament in any way refers to a fee that is charged for a licence as a tax but I know that throughout the length and breadth of Australia, whether in State Parliaments or in Commonwealth Parliaments, a fee of this nature—if I might use the word "fee" now; purchase tax is the proper term, of course—if a fee of this nature is provided in any legislation it is put

among the categories of taxation by any one of the authorities, including the accountancy profession of which the Minister is a member.

Mr. Hart: The High Court said it is not an excise tax.

Mr. WALSH: True, the High Court has said that, but, as I pointed out this morning, the Privy Council has not yet said whether it is or not. When we remember that the High Court judges were almost equally divided—five to four——

Mr. Hart: Four to three.

Mr. WALSH: Or four to three. The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt will know just how close that interpretation was. There it is. I do not know what other proof the Minister wants. On page 8 of the tables relating to the Treasurer's Financial Statement are set out the sources from which the revenue is received and they are—

Commonwealth Payments to the State
Taxation
Territorial
Interest
Receipts for Services rendered
Miscellaneous Receipts

Licences and Permits, or fees paid, are under the heading "Taxation".

Question—That Clause 9, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 40

Mr. Beardmore	Mr. Low
„ Camm	„ Madsen
„ Campbell	„ Morris
„ Carey	„ Munro
„ Chalk	„ Nicklin
Dr. Delamothe	Dr. Noble
Mr. Dewar	Mr. Pilbeam
„ Evans	„ Pizzey
„ Ewan	„ Rae
„ Fletcher	„ Ramsden
„ Gaven	„ Richter
„ Gilmore	„ Row
„ Harrison	„ Smith
„ Hart	„ Sullivan
„ Herbert	„ Tooth
„ Hiley	„ Wharton
„ Hodges	„ Windsor
„ Hooper	*Tellers:*
„ Houghton	Mr. Coburn
„ Jones	„ Hughes
„ Knox	

NOES, 28

Mr. Baxter	Mr. Inch
„ Bennett	„ Lloyd
„ Bromley	„ Mann
„ Burrows	„ Marsden
„ Davies	„ Newton
„ Dean	„ O'Donnell
„ Diplock	„ Sherrington
„ Donald	„ Thackeray
„ Dufficy	„ Tucker
„ Duggan	„ Wallace
„ Graham	„ Walsh
„ Gunn	*Tellers:*
„ Hanlon	Mr. Byrne
„ Hilton	„ Melloy
„ Houston	

PAIR

Mr. Lonergan	Mr. Adair

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 10 to 14, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—Amendments of s.27; Registration of spirit merchant—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (2.41 p.m.): I refer to subclause (6) which provides—

> "The provisions of subsection (3) of this section shall not apply or extend to any application for a spirit merchant's license or a transfer of such a license made on or before the twenty-sixth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one, and every such application shall be dealt with in all respects as if that subsection had not been enacted."

I should like the Minister to give the Committee an indication why that date has been selected. The Opposition have no particular views on the matter except that we should like some clarification of the reason for the date. Is there any significance to be attached to it?

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (2.42 p.m.): To some extent Clause 15 clarifies and widens the powers of the Licensing Commission to grant and transfer spirit merchant licences. It was considered desirable that those provisions should apply to the future but not have retrospective application. There was a probability that some information as to the nature of the proposed amendment might have become known. That possibility arose after 26 September this year. For that reason we have protected the rights of applications which, in terms of that subclause (6), were made on or before 26 September, 1961.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (2.43 p.m.): On previous occasions I have made the point that in many instances in country areas, particularly in western and northern towns, spirit merchant licences have been the means whereby many people had been selling goods, including alcohol, in bottles or some other form, to people who normally would purchase them through the retail trade. I have already mentioned this morning about the high rentals being charged and the prosperity of the industry, particularly in Brisbane. However, in many country areas because of the numbers of hotels, the prosperity is not so great. The Licensing Commission has been set up to ensure that the standard of service to the public is the highest possible. That includes accommodation, particularly in country hotels in the West and North. Many spirit merchants in those areas have only the one licence to sell all goods on nothing less than a 2-gallon basis. Under the old legislation there was nothing to prevent them from competing with the hotel trade. The actual sales by hotels were limited because many graziers and pastoralists, and in some cases people actually living in hotels, could get from spirit merchants all the home supplies they wanted. That has to be considered with the fact that people travelling

and utilising these hotels demand the highest possible standard of accommodation. They cannot get it, mainly because the hotel licensee is limited in his sales because of spirit merchants selling in competition with him.

In the Bill there is provision for the Licensing Commission to refuse to grant or transfer a license where there is already in existence a retail business that can provide for the retail trade, in the whole of that district. I understand the reason for that was a High Court decision that the previous section was invalid, but it is not much use legislating for something unless it is rigidly policed.

In country towns these merchants have a licence to sell two gallons of any alcohol, spirit or beer, or any other commodity, but, in actual fact, by means of plain invoices many of them sell bottle by bottle. Many of them have bottlers' licenses and unless the Licensing Commission have the power to say, "All right, we have found that you are selling bottle by bottle, instead of by only two-gallon lots to such and-such a retailing firm or hotel. We will cancel your licence," the same set of circumstances as has operated in past years will occur and hotels will not provide the high standard of accommodation provided by hotels in the metropolitan area or provincial cities because competition from the sources I mentioned will prevent it.

I believe a very important feature with licensing is that, when the Government licence, they do so on the understanding that the licensee will provide the public with appropriate service. As a matter of fact, the Government can demand that a licensee improve his service to the public, but that cannot be done unless the licensee is afforded some protection in the industry for which he is licensed. You either have licences or you do not and leave it to "an open slather," with the hotels competing against spirit merchants. If hotels were to sell groceries or some other commodity handled by mixed businesses there would be objections from all such business people in the community, yet, at the present time, spirit merchants in different parts of the State have their agents who have been granted licences in country towns, entering into competition with the licensed hotel-keepers.

Mr Hughes: That applies in New South Wales.

Mr. LLOYD: We are not considering what happens in New South Wales. We have to consider what happens in Queensland. I think the Minister will appreciate that in many northern hotels at present, and in the past, sub-standard accommodation has prevailed because the Licensing Commission realises that the income accruing to the licensee is limited by this competition from agents of say Dalgetys, Australian Estates, or some other wine and spirit merchant based in Brisbane.

If it is possible for a grazier or a pastoralist to get all his drinking supplies wholesale, should not the same opportunity be available to a station-hand, a shearer, or a ringer working on the property? I maintain that the hotels in country towns should be the sources to supply the retail markets in those towns. The clause could be a progressive step if it was enforced by the Licensing Commission. Wine-and-spirit merchants in country towns should be supervised adequately and, if they are infringing the law, their licenses should be cancelled. I appeal to the Minister to look closely into this matter. We demand a high standard of accommodation. Many country towns have as many as seven hotels; some have too many to allow every hotel-keeper to make a prosperous living. If wine-and-spirit merchants and their agents undercut the retailers, the travelling or visiting public will not receive the accommodation they desire.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (2.51 p.m.): I find myself substantially in agreement with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He has put the case clearly, with very good illustrations, and I should say that his remarks substantially give the reason for the inclusion of Clause 15. Perhaps I should emphasise my statement to some extent by saying that the policy of the Commission over a long period of years has been to grant spirit merchants' licences, or to transfer such licences, only to wholesalers. The difficulty arose through a recent challenge in the Supreme Court. The effect of the clause is that in granting a new licence, or in transferring an existing licence, the Commission may have regard to the extent to which it is proposed to sell by wholesale, and also to the demand for liquor in quantities of 2 gallons and upwards in any locality. The clause generally is directed to a correction of the present position and the maintenance of a fair balance.

There were two further points, first, the suggestion that this particular law should be enforced. I have already made it clear that the intention of the Government generally with reference to the Liquor Acts is that the provisions of the law should be enforced, but it is generally undesirable to make changes of this kind with retrospective application, and for that reason the present provision, as I indicated in reply to a question by the Leader of the Opposition, will not apply to the holders of existing spirit merchants' licences, nor will it apply to any application made to the Commission for a spirit merchant's licence on or before 26 September, 1961. However, it will put the law in such order that gradually, with the effluxion of time, there should be improvements in the general position, and it will give among other things a reasonable degree of protection to hotel-keepers in outlying areas.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (2.54 p.m.): The Leader of the Opposition raised the matter of the date, 26 September, 1961. I am still not quite clear about it. Clause 15 (3) (6) provides that the provisions of subsection (3) shall not apply to any application made on or before 26 September, 1961. If those words were not included, the provisions would apply to applications made before that date. If the Government's intention was to make the provisions applicable to those who applied after 26 September, I should have thought it would be more logical to reverse the order of saying it by providing that the provisions would apply to applications made after 26 September.

I do not want to discuss another Bill, but the attitude of the Government and the Minister on this occasion is different from the attitude they adopted on the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, when they made no provision for the hearing by the Industrial Court of the bonus application then before it. I will not go into that any further, but we know what has happened since then. In that case, the attitude was adopted that the Bill as introduced had to apply to applications already lodged. However, on this occasion a different attitude is adopted. The provisions of subclause (3) will not apply to any application made before 26 September. From the wording of subclause (6) it seems to me that the Government have some particular applications in mind otherwise they would say that the Bill would apply to all applications after 26 September. They seem to be particularly concerned with applications before the 26th.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. HANLON: As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, that raises some cause for concern. Does the Minister admit that there was some leakage of information which caused people to put applications in? We need some explanation about it. If that occurred, it may have been safer to tighten up still further. If there is a possibility that there was a leakage of information round about 26 September, the Minister has no way of knowing that that was the actual date when it occurred. The Government are being inconsistent in their approach to this matter, just as they were in their introduction of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (2.57 p.m.): The remarks of the hon. member for Baroona are quite unnecessary. The clause is quite clear. If subclause (6) is read in conjunction with subclause (3) the position is quite clear. Subclause (3) says—

> "The Commission shall not grant or transfer a spirit merchants' licence unless it is satisfied——"

Then it sets out certain conditions, and subclause 6 operates as a qualification.

Mr. Hanlon: What would happen if you left sub-clause 6 out?

Mr. MUNRO: I have already explained that. I am not going over it again. However, I will give a further explanation about 26 September. If the hon. member looks at the parliamentary records he will find that 26 September was the date on which I gave notice of motion to introduce this Bill for the amendment of the Liquor Acts. There is no particular significance in the date, but having given notice of the motion to introduce the Bill, and it being publicly known that there were certain cases at that time pending before the court, it was a very wise safeguard for the Government, instead of merely saying that this provision will apply from the date of coming into operation of the Act, we have said, in effect, that this new provision will have application as from 26 September, 1961.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 22, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 23—Amendment of s.47; Borrowing powers—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (2.59 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 14, line 34, after the word 'not,' insert the words—
>
> 'less than twenty-five thousand pounds and not'."

The reason for this amendment is because the clause makes provision for the allocation of a sum not exceeding £30,000 from a trust fund established at the Treasury under the Act for the purposes of assisting in an educational programme to discourage intemperance and assisting in a health programme in relation to the problem of alcoholism. I do not think anyone will cavil at the action of anyone encouraging temperance activities that will result in a lessening in the incidence of alcoholism or will educate people in the desirability of being temperate in their habits, whether drinking or otherwise. But I did indicate at the introductory stage that we had no guarantee that the Government intended to set aside a large sum of money for the purpose. They could say, "Because of our commitments for hospitals and in other directions, though this is a very desirable campaign which we should like to support, we will have to defer it for the time being." Then it would be easy for the Minister to say, "We did not promise any specific sum. All we said was that there would be a sum not exceeding £30,000 for the purpose." If the Government are sincere in their expressed desire to support such a campaign, especially, as the Minister said in his speech, at the schools and in such other ways as the Minister for Health and Home Affairs and the Licensing Commission might determine in collaboration with him, they should say exactly what sort of a campaign

it will be. As I indicated earlier, we have something like 1,500 primary schools and 50 secondary schools and even £30,000 divided among them will not mean a great deal for each. If you superimpose a campaign by the Department of Health and Home Affairs, it will not measure up to very much.

I think the clause was included as a further sop to people outside who were feeling critically disposed towards the Government so that the Government could say to them, "We are doing something positive to deal with alcoholism. We are establishing a trust fund for the purpose." We will have a little more sympathy for the Government's aim if they accept our amendment.

When I asked about the matter previously, the Minister's first reaction was to reply that it is not possible to determine what sums will be available. Today, anticipating argument on the matter, he pointed out that it was not customary for the Crown to indicate in detail what sums of money might be allocated to a campaign on which the Government proposed to embark. He merely said that a sum not exceeding a certain figure would be allocated. In this case it is most important that we have some understanding of what is involved. If the Government allocated only £500 it would not be a violation of the clause because it would be a sum not exceeding £30,000. We could have moved an amendment to propose a sum not less than £29,999, but we have given the Minister a little flexibility. In the first year he may not have the organisation functioning on quite the lines he wishes. We are prepared to give him a reasonable time to establish a basis.

However, there should not be any great delay because immediately the Bill is proclaimed the increase in licence fee from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent. will become operative and the extra revenue will accrue right from the beginning. If there is to be a correction of the evil effects with the altered drinking habits, it is essential that the temperance campaign should start simultaneously with the increased use of alcohol. It is not much good providing in one clause for hotel hours that will give a greater opportunity for drinking and then deferring the launching of the temperance campaign. In my view and in the view of the Opposition, they must proceed simultaneously.

Mr. Hughes: There is no suggestion that there will be more drinking.

Mr. DUGGAN: There will be more opportunity for drinking.

Mr. Hughes: Is it not possible that a man will have only a certain amount to spend on drink? The increased price may mean fewer beers for him.

Mr. DUGGAN: Mr. Holt whose campaign the hon. member will be supporting in the next few weeks, anticipates receiving some £5,500,000 more this year than last year in Federal tax from excise so apparently he does not expect less drinking. In any case, on simple arithmetic, there will certainly not be less drinking, or I do not know how the Treasurer would be able to determine that the amount coming to him would be £5,500,000. Obviously there is not going to be less drinking, on the Treasurer's own estimate, which is based on the assumption that the consumption of alcohol will be not less than that. The probability is that there will be more. Irrespective of hypothetical cases, the actual fact is that legally there will be greater opportunities for drinking under the Bill. If there are going to be greater opportunities for drinking, people will not open their premises and commit themselves to operating their establishments unless they think there will be some response from people who want to have a drink and take advantage of the altered hours. If that is so, I do not subscribe to the belief that, because this provision is in the Act, a man who might drink on Monday and Tuesday will say, "I will not drink on Monday and Tuesday. I will wait till 12 till 2 or 5 till 7 on Sunday."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member has been diverted from his purpose.

Mr. DUGGAN: No, with all respect, Mr. Taylor, because it has enabled me to make a stronger argument for the attitude that we are adopting. There is every reason to believe that the Government's temperance campaign —I am not suggesting that they are not sincere in their desire to do something— which will cost £30,000 for the whole State will not be very effective. The money will be distributed to schools. If temperance organisations undertook to spend £30,000 throughout the State, I could understand their campaign having an impact in the area in which the message was received. For example, if they decided on a large-scale advertisement in "The Courier-Mail", every person reading it would see the advertisement. If they conducted public meetings and asked certain people to come to them, that may have the effect of influencing somebody who was attracted to the meeting and may have some effect on temperance.

It is hard to follow the Minister's logic. One minute he says that because conditions vary throughout the State we must have a law for variable conditions. Then he says it is no good having one law here and another law somewhere else; if we have a law it must apply with equal validity to Cooktown as well as to Coolangatta. If we are to have £30,000 spread over the whole State and not expended as a temperance organisation would expend it, in nominated and specified areas, it does not represent a very large-scale effort. As I say, in my opinion this is merely the provision of a sum of money for political purposes. It might just as well have come from the coffers of the Liberal Party as a direct grant to the Liberal Party. The children will not have votes,

but it is hoped that it might influence the parents of the children and cause them to say, "We are grateful to the Government because they have linked with us and are trying to support a temperance campaign." The truth is that the Government are trying to repair some of the damage done outside by including this provision in the Bill.

We approve of the action being taken by temperance organisations outside this Chamber, and we want to see that they have funds available to them. We intend to see that this money is not left up in the air like Mahomet's coffin. The way it is left at present, it could well be merely a political gesture on the part of the Treasurer. By tying it down to £25,000, although it is not a very large sum, at least something might be done.

For those and other reasons that I might advance in anticipation of the Minister's taking a certain attitude, I move the amendment.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (3.9 p.m.): I rise to support the amendment, but I do not think that even the amendment goes far enough. The clause as drafted would permit the Government to put the sum of 1s. into a trust fund and not one penny need be paid into the fund thereafter.

Mr. Munro: And the amendment would make it worse.

Mr. HILTON: I say that the amendment does not go far enough. However, there is this important point: that if in any one year —I emphasise the word "if"—the Government do decide to pay any money into the trust fund, they will at least have to pay £25,000 into it. This is only a piece of window-dressing. Under the clause, all the Government need do is pay 1s. into the fund, and for 10 years they need not pay another razoo into it. The amendment would ensure that if at any time they elected to open the trust fund, at least they would be compelled to pay in £25,000 for that year.

Mr. Coburn: You could move for the disallowance of the Order in Council.

Mr. HILTON: That does not alter the argument. What if the Government, in order to comply technically with the provisions of the clause, said, "We will put 5s., 1s., or 10s. in the trust fund and forget about it."? Who is going to worry about the Order in Council or anything like that? What an absurd interjection!

Mr. Coburn: You should do it if you think it is wrong.

Mr. HILTON: If the Government were sincere about doing something effective, at least they should commit themselves to paying some reasonable sum each and every year into the trust fund. That is a fair proposal, but they are not doing that. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that there is wonderful scope in Queensland for an educational campaign to reduce the incidence of alcoholism; there is a wonderful opportunity to assist those who are doing a great deal to rehabilitate alcoholics. To use the vernacular, I say, "Let us be fair dinkum." If the Government intend to do something why do not they bind themselves to providing a reasonable amount each and every year? Let them do away with what is apparent window-dressing. I should like to see the amendment accepted but I know the Government are engaged in mere window-dressing in this matter.

Mr. Dewar: You don't know that.

Mr. HILTON: I repeat that if the Government were sincere would they not tell the public that they were committing themselves to a certain amount each and every year for the laudable purposes mentioned in the clause? But they are doing no such thing. I rose to expose that sham. I support the amendment. If the Government's conscience pricked them a little and they said, "We had better put something into the trust fund this year", at least they would be obliged to pay in £25,000 for that year.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (3.13 p.m.): If the intention of the two hon. gentlemen was to express general support for the principle of the clause, and to express a desire that because of that clause there should be full and effective use of the money, I should be completely in accord with everything they have said, as that is the Government's intention. As I think there would be general agreement amongst hon. members on that, it is not necessary for me to amplify it any further. But let us look at the terms of the amendment. I am rather surprised that it should be submitted and supported by two hon. gentlemen who have had ministerial experience. They should know a little more about administrative procedures. I have not had legal advice on the matter, but it would seem from a quick reading that the clause as framed gives power to allocate in any financial year an amount up to £30,000.

Mr. Hilton: It is not mandatory.

Mr. MUNRO: No, it is not mandatory, it is purely authoritative. The amendment would limit that authority. It says in effect that the Government will have that power but the amount must be somewhere between £25,000 and £30,000. In other words, if the amendment were accepted it would mean only that it would be illegal to allocate in any financial year £23,000 or £24,000. That is all it would achieve. If the amendment were inserted the clause still would not be operative except upon the recommendation of the Minister by Order in Council. So let us be quite clear. If this amendment were accepted it would weaken the clause, not strengthen it. The next point

is that if that were accepted and the clause were then drafted completely differently to make it mandatory that a specific amount will be allocated in each financial year, that would be unwise. That is not the way for a Parliament to function. A Parliament has to authorise expenditure. The purpose is not to get rid of money; the purpose is to give the Executive the power so that those expenditures that have been authorised can be made in the best possible way.

Mr. Walsh: It is reaching the stage when Parliament should take the power. You are making such a mess of it.

Mr. MUNRO: That is only a somewhat disgruntled interjection, which I am sure the hon. member does not really mean. Parliament carries out its proper function when it authorises this; surely it is then the responsibility of the Executive to examine the field in which the expenditure of this amount may be usefully made and then to approve of the expenditure from time to time as we can see that it can be usefully applied. The very best example of how badly the proposed amendment would operate would be in the first financial year, because we would only have approximately six months left, and, if we made arrangements in terms of which, perhaps, we might have a programme of spending at the rate of £28,000 a year, this amendment would make that completely illegal even to commence to allocate at that rate, say, as from 1 January, 1962.

Mr. Hanlon: You would only get £250,000 in that six months.

Mr. MUNRO: In reference to that interjection, there have been some references to this amount of £30,000 being a very small amount. Hon. members should not overlook the fact that the Government at present are speading substantial sums on education and health matters in different fields. This does not interfere with that in any way; this is an additional amount. From that point of view, I feel that, upon reflection, hon. members will accept this clause as being a very genuine one, likely to be quite effective in doing something worth while.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (3.18 p.m.): I should like to deal with one or two matters.

I was surprised to hear the Minister say that he felt the Opposition was unreasonable in regard to this amendment. I thought he was going to suggest that it had been badly drawn. In that sense, I asked the hon. member for Baroona to go to the parliamentary draftsman on this particular amendment and, if there is anything wrong with the actual phraseology, I am afraid the drafting staff will have to share the responsibility with us. However, the Minister shifted his ground and stated that it would be unwise because the Government might be prepared to spend £24,000 but as not less than £25,000 was specified by the amendment, that would be invalid.

Mr. Munro: That was just to give one illustration.

Mr. DUGGAN: The Minister gave me one illustration; I will give him another. He suggested that it might be £24,000; I suggest it might be £400, and there is nothing to say who might be right, because I do not know whether the Government are going to spend £24,000 or not.

Mr. Munro: I suggest that if we spend £400 in any one year the Opposition will be perfectly within their rights in castigating the Government.

Mr. DUGGAN: It is all very well the Minister's saying that we can castigate them. There are so many castigations now that one would need a session to state them all.

Mr. Evans interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: The Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity is in enough trouble now. He should keep to main roads matters and not interfere in this. He is in enough trouble with Mr. Murray and the Liberal Party now. He should keep to the main roads field for the moment because there is enough trouble there.

Mr. Evans: I have to tell you how inconsistent you are.

Mr. DUGGAN: All right, what field is the Minister in, the drinking field or the temperance field?

Mr. Evans: The temperance field; what the people want.

Mr. DUGGAN: It is hard to find out the intentions of the Minister in these matters. We were told a while ago that we must not criticise a suggestion when funds are affected, because in doing so we are really not attacking the Government but the people. Who are the people? Only 43 per cent. of the people voted for the Government, so the Government cannot say they represent a majority of the people.

The Minister said there may be an intention to spend £24,000. Let us be fair in regard to the £6,000 difference between the permissible maximum and what he said he might spend but would be prevented from spending by this amendment. As the hon. member for Baroona pointed out and as I said earlier, the Government will be collecting at least £250,000 in the next six months. If they are going to say that the campaign has to stop because of the miserable amount of £6,000, I cannot understand their logic. In any case the clause does not suggest that the amount must be spent in the financial year; it merely says that, "There shall be paid from the Trust Fund established at the Treasury under this Act such sums not

exceeding thirty thousand pounds in any one year." It may well be that the Government are unable to spend it this year. If the Minister would accept the amendment, I would even forgive that, seeing that the Government have only six months in which to spend it. I would say, "All right, if you cannot spend the amount this year, spend what you can and the money can be used later when you can spend the full amount."

The Minister said the Bill was prepared after careful consideration by committees. All these things should have been taken into consideration. Surely some consideration should have been given to the practical steps to implement the provision. Why say now, "We have only six months in which to find out ways and means to implement our temperance education plan?" The Minister has said the very reverse. He said that a very exhaustive, careful survey of the whole of the ramifications of the liquor problem had been made, that in dealing with this hot potato he had carefully examined reports, interstate, international and local, and that the Bill contained all the answers. That being so, there must be some answer to the question, what the Government propose to do about the proposed temperance fund, or are they merely adopting the attitude, "We will put it in there as a gesture and, if the temperance people come along we can in that way prove our bona fides and tell them that, owing to the many other problems confronting us and the bitter wrangling in the parties we have not had time to set up the committee and allow it to function in accordance with our wishes?"

The Minister has not given adequate reasons for rejecting the amendment. I do not accept his statement that it would be wrong for the Government to specify the amount. We may all be in agreement on the appropriation by Parliament of a sum of money for some project, for instance, a university on the Darling Downs. We may agree on the appropriation of a sum not exceeding £500,000. If I was the representative for the Darling Downs, I would want to know the minimum sum to be spent. The Government may erect a small college at a cost of only £10,000. That would not meet my wishes in the matter of a university, just as the Government in putting forward the present provision are not meeting the wishes of those hon. members who have a particular interest in the matter of temperance. The maximum is £30,000, but we want to know the minimum amount to be spent. We would not tolerate a taxation form that stated that the tax will not be greater than 15s. in the £1. We would want to know the minimum tax for which we were liable. We would want to know our minimum obligation just as we want to know the minimum obligation of the Government in this matter. Enough obligations are placed on the licensee and the drinker, goodness only knows. They do not receive much latitude and I do not think the Government should have much latitude in their obligations.

I was not impressed by the Minister's statement. I am sorry if we have embarrassed him. Obviously he is embarrassed. I thought he was going to say that he would accept the amendment. This morning he tried to pave the way for the reception of some amendments, and I thought during his speech, "This is the first one. We are making some progress."

Mr. Munro: You will probably do better on the next. You have a better case.

Mr. DUGGAN: The case for this amendment is very good, but we have to overcome the Minister's obstinacy. I am surprised at the stand he has taken. He is an accountant and I am sure he must have worked out these things. How did the Minister fix the sum of £30,000 in the first place? Did he pluck it from the air or did somebody come along and say, "We have this suggestion to make; it will cost so many thousands of pounds." Did the Minister then say, "Yes, I am prepared to go along with that." Someone must have suggested some figure otherwise it is purely speculative. The sum of £30,000 may sound very well from the lips of the Minister, instead of some other figure. I feel sure he must have had some advice. I cannot accept the Minister's statement that this sum was plucked out of the air. It may be that the Minister during some of his talks with temperance people asked, "Will this figure of £30,000 suit you?" They may have replied, "Very well, Mr. Minister." If they did say that——

Dr. Delamothe interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: If they give us the authority we will spend £25,000.

Mr. Munro: You did not spend very much when you were in Government.

Mr. DUGGAN: No, but we did not tax them 6 per cent. either. We did not provide for discrimination, and many other things that the present Government are doing. We left that to this Government. There are very many things that we gladly did not do that we are very sorry to see this Government doing.

I am not impressed with the Minister's argument on the rejection of the amendment. I think the amendment is reasonable. If the Minister thinks that £25,000 is too much for this year, why does he not say that it is too much and say, "All right, we will accept that figure for the next financial year." But he does not do that. He does not say that he will accept £12,500 for this year. That would be a fair approach, but there is no response from the Minister on that suggestion. He says that we have only six months. Let the Minister be magnanimous. Let him say that he will spend half of the £25,000 this year and £25,000 next year. Let him come forward and be frank about this matter.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (3.28 p.m.): The Minister has seen fit to reprimand the Leader of the Opposition and a member of the Q.L.P. because of their association with ministerial administration over the years. However, with the risk of being reprimanded by the Minister and getting down to legal technicalities, I want to know from him where in this clause is there any power to create this trust fund. There is, apparently, authority to pay out of the trust fund, but how can a sum be paid out of a trust fund that, in effect, Parliament has not approved of? I do not know whether the Minister will be influenced by any legal interpretation he may get from the hon. member for Mount Gravatt.

Mr. Coburn: It will be paid out of consolidated revenue.

Mr. WALSH: If there is to be a trust fund created, that is generally not the prerogative of the Executive, as the Minister well knows. The Executive creates special funds but generally it is Parliament that says whether a trust fund shall or shall not be created. There is this reference—

> "There shall be paid from the Trust Fund established at the Treasury under this Act . . ."

But that does not convey clearly to me that there is authority to create the fund in the first place. The Minister may perhaps deal with that.

Earlier in the day I said I was against the payment of any part of the revenue, specifically raised by way of purchase tax on liquor purchased by the various licensees, for this special purpose. When I remember that hundreds of thousands of pounds are paid out every year to charitable, educational and various other bodies without any reference to a specific sum having to be placed in a trust fund, I can only conclude that this is a bit of purely political window-dressing. The Minister is trying to satisfy some in the community who, he thinks, would normally be completely against the alcohol or brewing interests. The Government want to satisfy them by contributing to a specific fund.

The clause sets out two headings, the first of which is—

> "(a) assisting in an educational programme to discourage intemperance".

It may be that, under that heading, the Government want power to expend part of the proceeds of the fund in educating the Minister and his Government against intemperance. By the Bill they are doing everything possible to encourage intemperance so if part of the fund is to be used genuinely to educate them against the dangers of the consumption of alcohol, it will be all to the good.

Mr. Hooper: You are leaving yourself open.

Mr. WALSH: I am not. I am fully aware of the dangers of alcohol. I have demonstrated my ability to handle it. I never drank a glass of straight beer till I entered this Parliament when I was over 40 years of age, nor did I touch alcohol in any form until I was over 21 years of age. I know enough about its dangers and I do not need the hon. member for Greenslopes or anybody else to try to educate me on it.

I hope that no part of the proceeds of the fund will be paid under the first heading to any organisation that can be claimed to have a political taint. Over the years I have been in Parliament it has been customary just on the eve of an election for candidates and members to be circularised very widely and asked their views this way and that on prohibition, the control of liquor interests, and so on. Any body or organisation that in any way identifies itself with a political campaign for any candidate, irrespective of political belief, should be ruled out of the fund.

As to the part of the fund that is to be administered by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, I hope that due recognition will be given to the work that has been done by that band of men and women known as A.A., or Alcoholics——

Mr. Coburn: Anonymous.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member for Burdekin knows that there is an opposing organisation known as the A.U., or Alcoholics Unanimous. However, Alcoholics Anonymous do a great deal of good in their own quiet way and they do it at any hour of the day, any day of the week. I know of reputable citizens in Brisbane who are prepared to give their time even at 1 or 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning to go out and save the unfortunate person who has got off the track.

Mr. Coburn: There are hundreds of them, too.

Mr. WALSH: Yes, but we do not hear so much about them. The work of these people does not receive very much publicity in the Press. I do not know whether the Press gives them assistance in a quiet way. For example, I do not know whether Alcoholics Anonymous has to pay for the advertisements that it inserts. I think the Press might well insert those free. Whatever a man or a woman in a temperance organisation might do, here is a body of men doing real work for these unfortunate people.

Apparently the fund will be established—the Government will use their majority ruthlessly and, no matter what we might say, the Minister is not likely to listen to any sensible amendment to the clause—and I appeal to the Minister to see that he and the Minister for Health and Home Affairs take into consideration the principles embodied in the remarks that I have made.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (3.36 p.m.): I rise merely to express the views of people outside the Chamber who are opposed to the Bill and particularly to this clause. If ever there was an example of insincerity, this is it. I go so far as to say that this is a reflection on the intelligence of thinking people. In fact, I go further and say that it is one of the greatest examples of cant, hypocrisy and humbug that I have ever seen. Just imagine the people outside being taken in by camouflage of this kind. The Government are going to collect money from the liquor interests to support the temperance bodies.

Mr. Ramsden: Don't you think they should do something to help?

Mr. MULLER: The hon. member who interjected said, "Don't you think they should do something to help?" I do. I could not agree more. But if we are sincere, what is wrong with allocating a sum of money for the purpose quite outside the provisions of the Bill? But to collect money under this legislation to fight intemperance and try to tell the people outside that they are really genuine in their desire is, to my mind, nothing short of a reflection on the intelligence of those people. I think the Minister was most unwise to introduce the clause. He intended first that the sum should be £95,000. Now he has watered it down to £25,000. Even if it had been £5,000 and he had been really genuine in his desire to do something in the interests of temperance, why couple it with the Bill at all?

You have no idea, Mr. Taylor, of the hostility to this Bill in the community generally. I do not think the Government realise how serious it is. In the first place, the people think that the Bill is more or less a put-up job, and this clause merely adds insult to injury. Some hon. members have described the clause as window-dressing. It is not window-dressing; it is broken windows. The people outside to whom the Government are trying to square off are not so simple that they cannot see through this. I think it is my duty to rise in my place in this Chamber and speak on behalf of the people outside and let the Committee know that they are not stupid enough to believe that this clause is genuine.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (3.39 p.m.): The Leader of the Opposition brought this amendment forward to test the sincerity of the Government in their expressed desire to provide funds to assist in an educational programme to discourage intemperance and assist in a health programme in relation to the problem of alcoholism. From the desperate replies of the Minister, it is very obvious that sincerity has been found not at home on the Government benches in relation to the clause. The Minister has tried to camouflage the question by dealing with technicalities. From a reading of the clause it is not very clear what is going to happen to the money. There is no guarantee that any sum at all will be paid from the Trust Fund. The clause merely provides—

> "There shall be paid from the Trust Fund established at the Treasury under this Act such sums not exceeding thirty thousand pounds in any one year . . . ."

There is no certainty that anything is to be paid this financial year. When the Parliamentary Labour Party Committee was considering this matter the hon. member for Salisbury asked the question that the hon. member for Bundaberg has asked, about what happens to the money if it is paid from the Trust Fund. The clause continues—

> "All sums allocated for a purpose specified in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall be under the direction of the Minister for Education and all sums allocated for a purpose specified in paragraph (b) of this subsection shall be under the direction of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs who may direct the payment of such part (if any) thereof to such bodies or institutions carrying out work for the prevention or treatment of alcoholism and for the care and rehabilitation of alcoholics, as he deems fit."

That is very vague. The whole clause is vague. In moving the amendment the Opposition seek to put pressure on the Government to indicate whether they are at all sincere about the allocation of funds for that purpose. We are not asking for a greater sum than £30,000 in one year because we realise it would be out of order as an extra burden on the Crown. All we have done is to link up with the Government's protection against having to spend more than £30,000 in any one year a proviso that they shall not spend less than £25,000. The Minister says, "You are making it harder for us. If we want to spend £24,999 19s. 11d. we will not be able to do so because we have to spend more than £25,000." On the other hand, if they wanted to spend £31,000, £35,000 or £40,000 they could not do it. The Minister has already tied himself down to not spending more than £30,000. If his officers, the temperance people, the Minister for Health and Home Affairs or the Minister for Education and Migration came to him with an excellent programme that the Government would want to implement if they were really interested in the problem of alcoholism, should it be necessary to spend £40,000 on it he would have to say, "I cannot do it because I am allowed to spend only £30,000 in any year." Yet he chides us because we want to tie them down to spending not less than £25,000. If he had plans only to spend £23,000 and wanted to spend another £2,000 or £3,000 in that financial year, the temperance people, medical practitioners and others interested in the problems of intemperance and

alcoholism, would show him very quickly how he could spend the extra money to bring the total expenditure to £25,000 in that year.

The hon. member for Burdekin interjected that when the Order in Council was laid on the table we could decide what was going to be spent. That is not true at all. If an Order in Council were laid on the table showing that the Government had approved of the drawing from the fund of £1 6s. 8d. to spend in this direction, all we could do would be to move for the disallowance of the Order. We could not move to have the amount increased to £20,000.

The Minister has been challenged to explain the clause fully. Under an amendment to the Liquor Act in 1958, assented to on 16 April, 1959, the Treasurer has already taken unto himself the right to claim from Consolidated Revenue sums standing in the Trust Fund established before the present Government assumed office. I shall not read the whole amendment but it meant that the Treasurer was not obliged to maintain in the Trust Fund a greater sum than was required to maintain a credit balance of not less than £300,000. The amendment reads—

> ". . . the Governor in Council shall by Order in Council authorise the Treasurer to pay into that fund from the aggregate amount of the annual fees paid for their respective licenses by licensed victuallers and wine sellers in respect of the year in question—
>
> (a) One-sixteenth of that aggregate; or
>
> (b) If a lesser sum than one-sixteenth of that aggregate is sufficient, that lesser sum."

Previously, until this Government came to office, the Government were obliged to pay a minimum sum into this Trust Fund from which up to £30,000 can be drawn, if it is ever drawn. I have shown that the Government have already introduced an amendment in 1958, enabling them to take away from that Trust Fund a sum of money, if they wanted to, and put it into Consolidated Revenue.

The hon. member for Fassifern pointed out that there is nothing to prevent the Government from spending money from revenue by way of grant to the Department of Health and Home Affairs or the Premier's Department. There are many ways by which a grant can be made.

All the Opposition can do now is to take the Bill put forward by the Government and do the best we can with that. That is why we voted against the Bill on the second reading. We thought it was a mess of a Bill and we said so. We do not accept it as the answer to the liquor problem. All we can do now that the Government have carried the second reading, is to amend it in the best way we can. We did not draw up this weird and wonderful Clause 23 and we can only work on it as it stands. We cannot introduce new principles. We cannot very well scrub the whole clause and write a new one. We can only bring forward some amendments and try to work them into the Bill.

As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out we have endeavoured to do that without putting the Committee or the drafting staff to any more trouble than is necessary. It is not much good introducing long amendments unless the Government have some desire to accept the basic principle behind our suggestions. We brought forward the amendment with the basic idea of ensuring that if the Government are going to spend money in this regard they must spend a sum of not less than £25,000. If they spend a penny under this clause they must spend £25,000. They might never spend any more because the clause in the Bill reads—

> "such sums not exceeding thirty thousand pounds in any one year."

We put forward an amendment to provide that the Government spend not less than £25,000. That is only in the one year. We think that is doing only the fair thing by the people on whom they are trying to make an impression by this clause. If the Minister thinks he can improve the clause in such a way as to provide for a large expenditure, or a minimum expenditure in each year, providing it is a substantial sum, as the Leader of the Opposition said, we would be happy to look at it and support it if we felt it would arrive at the destination we are seeking in our amendment.

The Minister is only endeavouring to create confusion under the clause or make a smoke-screen under which he can withdraw and get on to the next clause, thereby avoiding the embarrassment he feels at this amendment. The Minister will not earn the support of anyone in the community, whether they be people who favour temperance or otherwise unless he demonstrates the Government's sincerity under this clause. All we desire by this amendment is to give the Government a chance to show their sincerity and, if they do not accept our amendment, to draft one on the same lines. If they do not do either of those things they will not be showing sincerity in regard to the clause.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (3.49 p.m.): I rise to support the amendment, which tests the Government's sincerity on a clause designed, no doubt, to placate certain interests in the State, without committing the Government to anything certain or to any positive condition whatever. The hon. member for Bundaberg drew attention to the Trust Fund referred to in the first sentence of the proposed new subsection. That Trust Fund is created by Section 47 of the Act, and already it has certain obligations, certain limitations in payments and many commitments. Nothing can convince

the hon. member that the Trust Fund will be able to meet any payment pursuant to the new subsection (2A).

Mr. Walsh: They paid nothing into it last year.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member points out that nothing was paid into it last year. If that state of affairs continues, obviously the fund will become depleted. In any case the section specifies certain obligations that are a first charge on the fund. I am sure the Minister would not endeavour to convince us that he will certainly be able to meet any payments out of it pursuant to the proposed subsection (2A).

It would read reasonably well to the ordinary unsuspecting member of the public who does not know of its creation, the payments credited to it and the obligations that have a priority higher than the obligation under the Bill.

Normally speaking it would appear that the clause is not skilfully drafted. In that regard I am not casting aspersions at the draftsmen because, although in itself it is not skilfully drafted, for the purposes of the Government its drafting shows particular and outstanding skill. In other words the whole thing is vague and nebulous. I cannot follow nor can I subscribe to the logic of the Minister. He said the amendment to set a minimum amount of £25,000 would weaken the clause. If the Minister had said that the insertion of a minimum amount of £25,000 would make the clause impossible of application, I would have been inclined to agree with him. It could have been argued truthfully that the insertion of a minimum amount of £25,000 would make impossible the carrying out of the obligations under the section, owing to lack of money in the particular trust fund. By claiming that the amendment would weaken the clause, it appears to me that the Minister is endeavouring to hide the fact that it would be impossible for him, for the Government and for his department to meet a minimum payment of £25,000 each year. In his opposition to the amendment he has not offered substantial and convincing argument. If he placed his cards on the table, divulged the real state of the Trust Fund and informed us that it could not meet a minimum payment of £25,000 a year, perhaps the Opposition would seriously consider withdrawing the amendment. The Minister's argument that the amendment would weaken the clause is not a substantial one. Obviously the Leader of the Opposition should persist with it.

The clause means virtually nothing. It is divided into two sections. Out of the Trust Fund an amount between nothing and £30,000 will be paid for the purpose of assisting in an educational programme. What educational programme? Through what sources will the money be channelled? It says in effect that if any money is available it shall be used at the direction of the Minister for Education. What is he going to do with the money? Is it to be given to an outside body or organisation? Is it to be spent on the education of certain classes, or is it going to be spent in certain areas?

Mr. Muller interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: A Kathleen Mavourneen attitude. There is no programme or policy set out for the Minister for Education for spending this money. Has he the facilities in the schools to use it to assist in establishing an educational programme to discourage intemperance? Are there any school teachers with professional and technical qualifications who can use £30,000 each year for such a programme? In other words, what facilities, if any, are available to the Minister for Education. Where is he to expend this money and what is the policy and principle underlying this clause?

Mr. Hanlon: You would think he would be here to tell us.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, one would think he would have some concrete proposals as to how he would use this money in an educational programme. I suggest that the Minister for Education has not given any thought to such a proposal.

There is an extraordinary conflict in subclauses (a) and (b) of subclause (2A). For some unknown reason an anomalous power is given to the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. He has the funds under his control and direction but he is not told what he is supposed to do or what he can do with them. In the second part, (b), we find—

> "the Minister for Health and Home Affairs who may direct the payment of such part (if any)."

The Government are already presupposing in their own legislation that the Minister for Health and Home Affairs will not have any funds at all because they play safe and say that he

> "may direct the payment of such part (if any) thereof to such bodies or institutions carrying out work for the prevention or treatment of alcoholism".

Therefore the Minister for Health and Home Affairs seems to have greater powers than the Minister for Education in the expenditure of the money, and from a reading of the clause it seems apparent that it is anticipated that although the Minister for Health and Home Affairs may have more powers, he will have no "dough." In my opinion, that seems to be an extraordinary clause that has been inserted to placate certain sectional interests. If it was meant to be sincere in its application the more important programme would be for assisting in a health programme in relation to the problem of alcoholism. It must be conceded that the vast majority of parents are sufficiently well

educated to be able to let their families know about the evil effects of the intemperate indulgence in alcohol and how misuse of alcohol can lead to ruin. The average school, with a Christian outlook, is also well able to educate school children about the effects of intemperate indulgence in alcohol. It would seem that, relatively speaking, it is not as important to educate youth as to cure those who are sick, and alcoholism is a sickness. Those of us who have knowledge of these matters know full well that a certain programme has to be followed to retrieve these people from the sloth of alcohol when it has gained control. For the last two decades authorities in Queensland have generally agreed that it is not a criminal feature in a man's conduct, but rather that there is something wrong in his physical or mental make-up, and in any case, it is a disease that requires treatment, and the treatment requires the expenditure of a fairly large sum of money.

The Minister for Health and Home Affairs has already made public pronouncements to the effect that it is a danger in the community; it is a problem that has beset his department, and he has already given us clearly to understand that there is not enough money in his Estimate to deal adequately with the problem of alcoholism in the community today. Therefore, one would consider that, if this sum of money was made available for this practical and no doubt desirable purpose, something certain should be given to him so that he could budget suitably for the proposed expenditure. Knowing how many patients he could cater for, leaving out the details of buildings required, instruments to be used, drugs, and so on, if he had a certain amount set aside to expend he could say, "I will be able to deal with so many this year and I will make provision accordingly." The way it is, he does not know whether he will get 1s. or the whole of the £30,000.

Dr. Noble: We can deal at the present time with all those who come along for help at our hospitals. The big thing is an education programme outside.

Mr. BENNETT: With all due respect to the Minister I think those who require ordinary education and those who have experienced difficulties with alcohol are in two diametrically opposed categories. I have studied a certain amount of philosophy and psychology and I judge people as an ordinary every-day man judges them. I have approached many of these subjects believing myself to be an ordinary, average person. If you embark on an educational programme in the schools for those who have no desire to drink alcohol, who have never tasted it and who therefore do not know whether they like it or not, who have never given any thought to going into hotels and who have no desire to acquire any further stimulation than their own healthy and boundless spirits—if you continually pound into them lectures on the effects of alcohol and stress how certain people drink whisky and what effect it has, and so on, you will in the end convince them that they had better try it out to see if what you are telling them is true.

Dr. Noble: So you think that the work of the temperance people and the churches in the field is wrong?

Mr. BENNETT: No. I am talking about a concentrated programme of education on alcohol. Alcohol is not the only subject of morality that must be dealt with by educationists. There are many others. For instance, the hon. member for Kurilpa dealt with a type of literature. To my way of thinking, if what he says is correct, that presents a more serious problem in the community than alcoholism.

An Honourable Member: Drugs, too.

Mr. BENNETT: We do not need to be lectured on the ill-effects of opium every day of the week, or even once a year. That is something that one needs to be told about only once in a lifetime.

Mr. Dewar: The sale of opium is illegal. Alcohol is a narcotic that can be sold.

Mr. BENNETT: It can be sold.

Mr. Dewar: It cannot be sold legally and you know it.

Mr. BENNETT: There would be nobody in this Chamber who would want to indulge in the smoking of opium. Listening to the speeches of certain hon. members opposite one would think sometimes, that they had been indulging freely in opium smoking. But they have been told what opium does, and you do not need to tell them it continually and frequently and regularly.

If a child is raised in home where liquor is not indulged in or not indulged in to excess and that child understands the dire results of over-indulgence from having observed it in others, that is the greatest educational programme any child or youth or person can get in a pure and practical fashion. On the other hand, the alcoholic is in a different category. He is beyond the stage of thinking for himself; he is certainly beyond the stage where he can help himself. As the hon. member for Ipswich East pointed out, a man does not know that he is going to become an alcoholic. If he did, I suppose he would take steps to avoid it; but he does not know until he has become one. It is difficult to know how to avoid it. One could certainly avoid it by complete abstinence, but I presume that any educational programme envisaged by the Government does not intend to advocate complete abstinence and intends to teach youth how to use drink. That is what it boils down to. I do not know that any public school is entitled to teach any particular ism, although it can teach or educate people about any topic or subject. I am not suggesting that I would

be opposed to it, but I do not think the Government would be prepared to say, "We will embark upon a concentrated programme of temperance teaching and teach absolute abstinence." In other words, if there is to be an educational programme about drink, they will teach the youth of the community how to use drink, how not to use it to excess, how to use it socially, and so on. I do not think that would be a good programme. The best education I know of for youths in regard to actions and habits is in the home, where they see the correct way to live.

Mr. Dewar: That does not happen in all homes.

Mr. BENNETT: I am certainly aware that it does not happen in all homes, but I do not see why the majority of the people have to put up with programmes of this type just because of the excesses of a few. I do not know how you would implement in a practical way a programme to meet the needs of those people. Perhaps visits could be arranged and canvasses made of those particular families.

I have always been averse to programmes teaching teenagers not only about drink but about the secrets of life, the ways of life, sex problems, and so on. If their minds are focused on such subjects, one always finds that, with their human inclinations and human weaknesses, they will be more inclined to want more knowledge of the subject and more experience of it than if you teach them to lead a clean and healthy life without stressing any particular topic.

I embarked upon my submissions in an endeavour to support the Leader of the Opposition's amendment, which was moved to test the sincerity of the Government. If we are being sincere, £25,000 is a mere pittance for this purpose, but we must have a limit within which the two Ministers can act and draw up a programme. If we are to have an educational programme in relation to drink and alcoholism, we must have staff and personnel. The Ministers must know how much money they have available to them. It is no good building up an expert staff this year and then having to say, "We do not know whether or not we will be able to keep you on next year."

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (4.9 p.m.): I oppose the amendment and support the Minister and the Government on the original clause before the Committee. I was rather amazed to hear the hon. member for Fassifern speak against the Government's sincerity in introducing this clause. I am sure we all recognise that people will drink. Whatever this or any other Government say, people will drink. Some will drink sanely and others will drink very badly. Surely we should not be asked to believe that the liquor interests should not be asked to contribute towards the healing of some of the damage that has been caused by the misuse of alcohol. An hon. member interjects, "Are not the liquor interests to blame?" Nobody asks anybody to drink. People drink voluntarily; they drink of their own free will. The Government are to be commended for taking their courage into their hands and setting aside a specific sum of money to be used for the purposes outlined. An hon. member opposite asks if I am supporting the amendment. I shall come back to that. I am talking against the amendment.

The hon. member for South Brisbane wanted to know through what channels the money would be used. He asked that in a rhetorical sort of way because he went on to tell us that the clause lays down that it shall be used through two agencies, the Minister for Education and the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. He took us to task because of the words "if any" where the clause provides—

> " . . . shall be under the direction of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs who may direct the payment of such part (if any) thereof . . ."

I suggest to the hon. member that it is quite possible in one financial year that the needs of the Minister for Education for an educational programme against alcoholism might require the entire allocation. Therefore the inclusion of the words "if any" is a very sensible provision.

I oppose the amendment because it is quite obvious that the Opposition, either deliberately or otherwise—to use the words of the hon. member for Baroona—are trying to put a smoke-screen around the Chamber. They are misunderstanding the functions of Parliament. The clause reads—

> "There shall be paid from the Trust Fund established at the Treasury under this Act such sums not exceeding thirty thousand pounds in any one year . . ."

That is the crux of it. The function of Parliament is to put a limit on what the Executive shall spend, not to give an order to the Executive about how much they must spend.

Mr. Houston: Don't talk rubbish.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I suggest that hon. members opposite study May to learn a little more about Parliament's functions and procedures. They would learn that it is the Executive Government's prerogative to spend money, but that it is Parliament's prerogative to put an upper limit on that expenditure. For that reason I ask the Committee to reject the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and vote for the clause as it stands.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (4.14 p.m.): The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition is absolutely necessary to give any strength and purpose to Clause 23. As it stands the clause means nothing. We are left wondering just what was the purpose

behind it. First of all the money has to be collected, then it has to be paid into a Trust Fund, and thereafter, on the recommendation of the Minister, by Order in Council, it may be passed over to the Minister for Education and the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. The Government have very well covered themselves. They have made sure that this money is harder to spend than is any money under any legislation that has been introduced into this Parliament. Whatever is left over from the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, if any, would be spent "for the prevention or treatment of alcoholism and for the care and rehabilitation of alcoholics, as he deems fit." There is already one very sound organisation controlled by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, the Queensland Health Education Council and, in the Estimates this year, less than £2,000 extra has been provided. The anticipated revenue from this increase in tax from 4 per cent. to 6 per cent., is £500,000 a year.

In providing this £30,000, the Government have attempted to placate the people from whom the money is to be collected and to curry favour with those interested in the prevention of excessive alcoholism, but I think that they have no intention of allowing any of this money to be devoted to the purposes set out in the Bill. It is certain that the £500,000 a year anticipated from this source is purely for the purpose of bolstering the finances of the State, but, in an attempt to placate both drinkers and temperance organisations, this clause has been inserted to give the impression that the Government are very concerned at the menace of alcoholism and intend to spend certain moneys in educating people to avoid it.

According to the Bill the department shall spend sums not exceeding £30,000 in any one year. Our leader, in his remarks, questioned the manner in which the figure of £30,000 was arrived at. Was it plucked out of the air or by what means was it arrived at? I suggest that the Minister's mind was so taken up with the thirsty thousands hounding him that the sum of thirty thousand pounds remained in his mind. The Government can give purpose to the clause by accepting the amendment that at least £25,000 be spent from the fund. Even that sum is most inadequate in view of the fact that £500,000 a year will be collected.

I commend the amendment to hon. members opposite. If they and the Minister fully consider it they will realise that only by supporting the amendment will any force or effectiveness be given to the clause.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (4.20 p.m.): I rise to support the amendment. I, like other hon. members on this side of the Chamber, could not help feeling that the Minister was not sincere in his opposition to it. His answer was very weak. I have some figures from Bulletin No. 36 of 1961 of the Bureau of Census and Statistics. In my opinion they show the need for the amendment. For the first quarter of the financial year the Bulletin states that intoxicated motorists caused 109 accidents, eight deaths and 56 cases of serious injury. The next set of figures provide a vigorous bolster to our argument that a specified amount should be spent annually on education against alcoholism. In the second quarter there were 136 accidents, 10 deaths and 58 cases of serious injury for which intoxicated motorists were held responsible. The latter figures revealed a considerable increase in the accident rate when alcohol was a factor.

The Australian Labour Party for more than a century has fought for higher education, better working conditions, higher wages, comprehensive health services, adequate housing and holidays and safety practices in industry. It has battled for nearly every condition that has brought an improvement in the standard of living of the worker and has provided him with a rich and rewarding life. If we sincerely believe in providing a rich and rewarding life for the people, we should educate them on the danger of misuse and abuse of alcohol. We of the Australian Labour Party have succeeded to a great extent in the past in the reforms to which I referred.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment, and not to drift onto the clause. We are dealing only with the amendment.

Mr. BROMLEY: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. I am pointing out that we of the Australian Labour Party have endeavoured to educate the people, particularly the young people, on the danger of abuse of alcohol. My remarks are directed to the amendment in that it seeks the expenditure of at least £25,000 a year on health education in relation to the problem of alcoholism and to assist in an educational programme to discourage intemperance. Whenever a new hazard to health or any particular weakness in the chain of industrial safety becomes apparent, and industrial safety is linked with the liquor problem, we waste little time in taking corrective action. That is why we have given our amendment a great deal of thought; we have discussed it at great length. We brought this amendment to the Committee suggesting that £25,000 be spent annually because we believe that it is a worthwhile amendment and should be accepted. I have listened to Government speakers, and Opposition speakers and I believe that all Opposition members are genuine in their support of the amendment.

I appeal to the Committee and to the community in Queensland to give closer attention to the disease of alcoholism. We should be serious about the money we are to spend. In our amendment, we suggest that the Government should spend at least £25,000

a year because the Bill specified only a maximum amount. The sum to be spent could be between 1s. and £30,000. There is no stipulation as to how much shall be spent. I ask the Minister to give our amendment favourable consideration.

The western countries of the world are giving more and more attention to alcoholism——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the hon. member could reserve those remarks until after the amendment is dealt with.

Mr. BROMLEY: I am trying to tie up the fact that we are moving an amendment——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I also fear that the hon. member is repeating the remarks of other hon. members.

Mr. BROMLEY: In that case, I will introduce some new remarks—about alcoholism in other countries.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must tell the hon. member that he cannot develop that line of thought at present. He must confine his remarks to the amendment, and the amendment only.

Mr. BROMLEY: In that case, if I am not allowed to digress a little and explain to the Committee how other countries are spending money on the education of people about the evils of alcoholism, I will resume my seat.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (4.29 p.m.): I was one of the members of the Committee that dealt with the Bill, and it struck us that Clause 23 could be described as a bunghole without any cask around it.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member repeat that remark?

Mr. TUCKER: Clause 23 could be described as a bunghole without any cask around it. As we went through the Bill we felt that some clauses were of serious consequence. There were various ideas and various methods concerning the collection of revenue, but suddenly we came to Clause 23 and it was like driving along a road and coming to a tree lying across it. We stopped at Clause 23 and it was obvious to all of us on the committee that here was a very insincere provision. Anybody with any political acumen would be aware that it had been included with the object of hoodwinking somebody. However, I do not think the public will be hoodwinked. They are not so naive as to fall for such a hypocritical clause. To test the sincerity of the Government the committee decided to pull aside the curtain and expose the clause for what it is, an attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the public, to delude them into thinking the Government were going to do something positive to help educate and rehabilitate alcoholics. That is why the amendment was moved to specify £25,000. At least by this means we are trying to ensure that some money will go into the fund. The use of such words as "if any" in the second part of the clause gives rise to grave doubt as to whether any money will go into the fund.

Mr. Ramsden: We have already explained it to you.

Mr. TUCKER: We do not always accept explanations from hon. members opposite.

Mr. Ramsden: You would be much wiser if you did.

Mr. TUCKER: We never accept them from the hon. member for Merthyr. If we had one from him we should walk round it and inspect it closely because there would always be a catch in it somewhere.

The Minister told us there were over 2,000 schools in Queensland. Suppose even the maximum amount of £30,000 was put into the Trust Fund to be divided between the two departments, or, for ease of calculation, suppose £20,000 was allocated to the Department of Education. That would mean only £10 a school.

How did the Minister arrive at the figure of £30,000? Did he grasp it out of the air? Did someone present at the counsels ask, "What will be put in as a sop for the temperance people or the other people?" and did someone else simply suggest £30,000? The source seems obscure to us. We are very doubtful about the sincerity of the whole thing.

A little while ago the hon. member for Merthyr said, "No-one asks them to drink." Yet I have heard him and other Government members on other occasions say that alcoholism is a disease.

Mr. Ramsden: You have never heard me say that.

Mr. TUCKER: Possibly the Minister himself will agree that it is claimed that alcoholism is a disease. If that is so, I point out that no-one asks people to get the measles.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must draw the hon. member's attention, as I did with the hon. member for Norman, to the fact that the general subject of alcohol and education is a matter for debate on the main clause and not one for debate on the amendment.

Mr. TUCKER: For that reason we felt that the whole thing was insincere. We felt that the Government were insincere in their approach and that no real thought had been given to the campaign. The clause was designed as a camouflage to trick the people outside. We moved the amendment to test the sincerity of the Minister and his Government. If the Minister is sincere he must do something about specifying a minimum amount.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (4.35 p.m.): I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I agree with the hon. member for South Brisbane that the clause proposed by the Government is very much clouded in obscurity. It says that from the Trust Fund shall be paid sums not exceeding £30,000 in any one year. This does not commit the Government to a yearly expenditure of money from the Trust Fund for education or for assistance to the Department of Health and Home Affairs for clinical treatment of alcoholics. The amendment was designed to put some teeth into the clause. It is very obscure as it stands.

The last paragraph of the clause says that all sums allocated for a purpose specified in paragraph (b) of the subsection shall be under the direction of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, who may direct the payment of such sums. It does not say that he shall direct payment, but that he may direct it. That is why we believe that the whole clause is indecisive and has no real meaning. There is no concrete evidence that the Government will be committed to spend a certain amount on this programme annually, nor will the Minister have power to direct that the money shall be spent.

I do not wish to go into more detail because hon. members on this side of the Chamber have already covered the grounds of our objection to the clause and I have no desire to indulge in tedious repetition. However, I believe that there is an obligation on me and all other hon. members who believe that provision should be made for saner drinking to add our voices in support of the amendment.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (4.38 p.m.): At an earlier stage—I think it was well over an hour ago—I gave completely adequate reasons why the amendment was not acceptable and why it would not improve the Bill. Since then, hon. members opposite have meandered on without a single constructive suggestion from them. Perhaps it would be proper at this stage—it is now approximately 4.30 p.m.—to do a little stocktaking of what has been put forward by the Opposition.

This is an important Bill containing very important provisions. I indicated in my second reading speech that I was prepared, on behalf of the Government, to give serious consideration to any amendment brought forward by the Opposition with a view to improving the Bill. We have now been in Committee for approximately four hours, and we have had the spectacle of one hon. member after another meandering on without making one constructive suggestion.

Mr. BROMLEY: I rise to a point of order. The Minister said that hon. members on this side of the House have not put forward one constructive suggestion.

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

Mr. BROMLEY: I should like to make the point——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the hon. member, who is comparatively new in this Chamber, that remarks were made about the Minister but that he did not rise to a point of order when hon. members talked about the Minister's insincerity and such things. I am of the opinion that the Minister is perfectly in order in saying what he is saying.

Mr. MUNRO: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. I feel that I am being singularly restrained. If I wished to be personal there are many things I could say. To convey in a few short words my general appreciation of what has been said in the last couple of hours by hon. members opposite I say that if the Opposition collectively are endeavouring to delay the proceedings of Parliament to such an extent as to bring parliamentary procedure into disrepute, they are succeeding admirably. If, on the other hand, they are endeavouring to improve the Bill they are failing abjectly. That is all I desire to say in a general way. I now propose to reply to the only two points of importance that have been made since I replied earlier.

The first point was made by the hon. member for Bundaberg who said, "What Trust Fund? Where is the authority under the law to create this Trust Fund?" He endeavoured to create the impression that the clause was ineffective because of a lack of particularity. There is only one Trust Fund mentioned in the clause, and that is the Trust Fund established by Section 47 (2) of the Liquor Acts, 1912 to 1959. I think the hon. member for Bundaberg had the annual report of the Licensing Commission in his hands at an earlier stage.

Mr. Houston: When did we get it?

Mr. MUNRO: A long time ago. If hon. members opposite have not read it, they should have done so. On page 8 of that report there is a statement showing the position of the Liquor Act Trust Fund. It indicates that the Trust Fund has been in operation since 1 July, 1936.

Mr. Walsh: If that is the Trust Fund, that is all I want to know. I shall have a few words to say about it later on.

Mr. MUNRO: That is very simple. One hon. member opposite after another has talked about the Government's lack of sincerity and the Minister's lack of sincerity, but they do not appear to have examined the subject. Without any prior examination of the matter they come in here and talk in generalities. The purpose of the clause is to give authority to the Executive to spend a certain amount of money, not exceeding £30,000, in any one year.

Mr. Melloy: What about the "if any"?

Mr. MUNRO: If the hon. member for Nudgee had read the clause he would not make such silly interjections. That applies only to the allocation of part of it.

Mr. Bromley: Why does not the clause provide that you can spend something between £25,000 and £30,000?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MUNRO: I realise that the hon. member for Norman is a new member. It is quite right for him to ask these questions but I suggest that he might read about the procedure of Parliament in respect of appropriation, the Auditor-General's report, and the Act dealing with appropriation. It has been explained already by the hon. member for Merthyr that the proper function of Parliament is to give authority to the Executive to expend money. Once that authority is given, then the details of the administration of the government of this country are a matter for the Executive, not for Parliament.

Mr. Hanlon: Parliament could cut off your supply altogether if it liked.

Mr. MUNRO: Exactly, that is the power of Parliament—the power of the purse. That is the way Parliament controls the Executive. We are asking this Parliament to give the Executive power to spend amounts up to £30,000 in each financial year, a perfectly simple proposition, yet we have this time-wasting policy from the other side.

Mr. Ramsden: If they are sincere they would delete all reference to any sum of money, if they say they do not trust the Government.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. MUNRO: I am prepared to consider any point put up fairly and reasonably. The point could be made that the mere passing of this Bill will not make any more money available. If it had been, I would say that it required some examination, but in fact it does make more money available. The point is that in this trust fund as at 30 June, 1961, we had £326,467 8s.

Mr. Burrows: Is not that a statute limitation? You cannot go below that, can you?

Mr. MUNRO: Yes, we can. We can go very much below that. This Government is using its financial resources for the benefit of the people of the State, and here is an amount of £326,000-odd tied up for a particular purpose, and it is, at the present time very much more than sufficient for that purpose. In addition to that, because of this increase in fees, the amounts that will be paid into this fund ordinarily will be greater than if the fees were not increased. Is it not a fair thing to say that out of those additional fees that go into the Trust Fund, we should have authority to make certain general expenditure in the direction of education as a safeguard against intemperance and health measures as a safeguard against alcoholism?

Those are sound suggestions, yet we on the Government side have to sit and listen for hours to political speeches. They are nothing more than that; they are not a fair consideration of the Bill, but political speeches.

Mr. Bromley: We are trying to tie you down to a figure. That is all there is to it. They are not political speeches.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MUNRO: I have already made it clear that this amendment would not make it any more mandatory for the amount to be spent. All it would do would be to place certain restrictions on the power of Executive government. I have already made this clear and I appeal to hon. members opposite particularly to realise that this is an important Bill.

Mr. Melloy: How much of the increased fees will go into——

Mr. MUNRO: I am not going to say any more about this. I will say that this is an important Bill, and despite all the remarks of hon. members opposite about insincerity, when all is said and done, I know they do not mean it. I will give the average member of the Opposition credit for being as much concerned about some of these problems as we are, so why not get down to a consideration of the Bill on its merits? Why not try to apply the collective wisdom of the Government parties and Opposition members to a consideration of the important provisions of the Bill on their merits and get away from the political hot air we have had up to the present? It has been no more than that. For those reasons I am not prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (4.50 p.m.): Whilst I am in this House, if I do not understand what I am voting for, I will not vote for it. That should be the attitude of every hon. member. The Minister says that this money will go into a general trust fund under the Liquor Act.

Mr. Munro: I did not say such a thing; I said it comes out of it.

Mr. BURROWS: If it comes out of the fund, it must have gone into it.

The clause states that the Government may spend up to a maximum of £30,000 on education about the evils of drink. The Minister has merely told us that the money can be paid into the fund. The provision as it stands is not worth the paper it is written on. It has been included solely for the purpose of fooling the people. We know that anything in excess of £300,000 in that fund can be and has been transferred to Consolidated Revenue. What is the use of

being politically dishonest? In effect the Minister has been forced to admit that the Government have included the provision as window-dressing. In that way they have indicated their insincerity. If as the Minister alleges the amendment is weak in that it does not state that the money shall be credited to a separate trust fund to be used for specific purposes, I point out that he has at his disposal better means than the Opposition to frame a further amendment. He could indicate that a certain amount will be credited to a trust fund that cannot, except with the aproval of Parliament, be used for any purpose other than the education of people on the subject. When cornered he was forced to admit that the clause was worthless. I am more convinced than ever of the justification for the amendment. I challenge the Minister to get up and give an assurance or guarantee that a certain amount will be spent on this form of education. If he had done that originally he would have saved the hours of debate to which he referred and he would have discharged his duties more honourably than he did by beating about the bush and accusing the Opposition of the very sins he has committed.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (4.53 p.m.): I do not wish to prolong the debate unduly. The Minister must concede that my remarks at all times have been relevant to the point under discussion. I resent being charged and chided with being one of the hon. members on the Opposition benches who are deliberately delaying the Bill.

Mr. Munro: I am referring to the collective effect.

Mr. HILTON: I am one of the collection on this side of the Chamber and I demand the right to express myself on these points. On the score of sincerity, I point out that as the law stands at present the Minister for Health and Home Affairs could spend this year on the treatment of alcoholism all the Treasurer is prepared to give him or all of the appropriation that could be made from Consolidated Revenue or, for that matter, from loan funds. Is that not correct, Mr. Taylor? I ask the Minister through you to say if that is so.

The CHAIRMAN: That may be correct, but I point out to the hon. member that his remarks are applicable to the clause in general and not specifically to the amendment dealing with the amount of £25,000. I think the hon. member could more appropriately make those remarks when the clause comes up for consideration after the amendment has been disposed of.

Mr. HILTON: The amendment would place on the Government an obligation to spend at least a certain amount in this direction. I am linking the obligation this amendment would impose on the Government with the maximum expenditure the Government will be able to make under the Bill. We say that if it is necessary to spend money for these purposes then we insist that it should be at least £25,000 a year. If it is necessary to give authority to the Minister for Education, let the Act be amended. I am only replying to the charge of insincerity, and I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Taylor. I am pointing out that the Government are practically limiting themselves to an expenditure of not more than £30,000, and if this clause was not in the Bill there would be no limit at all. The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that the Government will be obliged, in any one year, when they make an appropriation from the Trust Fund, to spend at least £25,000. The amendment is essential to offset the nebulous position created by the clause. After the amendment has been disposed of, we will deal further with the clause.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) (4.56 p.m.): I support the amendment and wish to express my resentment at the Minister's vicious and unsought attack on the Opposition. He unfairly claimed that the Opposition had brought parliamentary practice into disrepute and from his actions we know that the Government are very badly rattled. I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Minister will not necessarily be spending anything. The Bill savours of sickening hypocrisy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member wishes to speak, will he please address his remarks to the amendment?

Mr. DAVIES: Our whole point is to try to tie the Government down to something definite. If the Minister would show us that he was genuine and sincere in this matter by stating a definite amount, we could then go on with another clause of the Bill. We have no faith in the Government. We do not trust them because there have been so many broken promises.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. DAVIES: We have it in the Treasurer's Financial Statement that the capacity of the State to keep pace with the rapid growth of the University is exhausted and that our inability to cover the full matching grant of the Commonwealth is a signal to the University to stop development. We would be asked would we sooner have an extension of the campaign for temperance, or our children given the opportunity to enter the University. Which would we give higher priority? Would we rob our children of their right to a University education? The same old question will be put to us as has been put by every other Minister. This clause has been inserted in the Bill as a sop to the people whose feelings have been offended by other clauses in the Bill, but the Opposition has succeeded

in exposing the hypocrisy of the Government. It would have been much better if this provision had been kept apart from the Bill altogether and we had been able to deal purely with the liquor question such as the extended hours for drinking. Then, by an Order in Council, we could have allocated so much money to be spent by the Minister for Education. We could have said, "So much money has become available through the operations of this Bill we are now going to devote £30,000 or £40,000 to an educational temperance programme for the use of the Minister for Education." For the reasons that I have given, I support the amendment.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted in Clause 23 (Mr. Duggan's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 27

Mr. Bennett	Mr. Lloyd
,, Bromley	,, Mann
,, Byrne	,, Marsden
,, Davies	,, Melloy
,, Dean	,, O'Donnell
,, Diplock	,, Sherrington
,, Donald	,, Thackeray
,, Dufficy	,, Tucker
,, Duggan	,, Wallace
,, Graham	,, Walsh
,, Gunn	
,, Hanlon	*Tellers:*
,, Hilton	Mr. Burrows
,, Houston	,, Newton
,, Inch	

NOES, 36

Mr. Beardmore	Mr. Knox
,, Camm	,, Low
,, Campbell	,, Madsen
,, Chalk	,, Morris
Dr. Delamothe	,, Munro
Mr. Dewar	,, Nicklin
,, Evans	Dr. Noble
,, Ewan	Mr. Pilbeam
,, Fletcher	,, Pizzey
,, Gaven	,, Rae
,, Gilmore	,, Ramsden
,, Harrison	,, Richter
,, Hart	,, Row
,, Herbert	,, Wharton
,, Hiley	,, Windsor
,, Hodges	
,, Hooper	*Tellers:*
,, Hughes	Mr. Sullivan
,, Jones	,, Tooth

PAIRS

Mr. Adair	Mr. Lonergan
,, Baxter	,, Carey

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. DEWAR (Wavell) (5.7 p.m.): I desire to speak at some length on this clause, which is an amendment of Section 47 of the Act, because I believe that there is a great need for the establishment of a proper educational programme in relation to the use of alcohol. I take the Opposition to task for their remarks, particularly the hon. member for Carnarvon and the hon. member for Baroona, who chided the Government for not being sincere in bringing down the amendment of the Act provided in this clause. With all the emphasis at my command, I say I believe that the Government are sincere and that the Minister is sincere in regard to the establishment of a fund to provide a proper and adequate educational programme.

The hon. member for South Brisbane went on to talk about the placation of certain interests. He said that in his opinion it was not as important to educate our young people as it was to cure alcoholics. If treating the effect, rather than the cause, is his way of doing things, it is not mine. The only way in which we can prevent people from becoming addicted to alcohol and finishing up with the respectable label of alcoholics is by educating them so that they will know beforehand what they are in for. The hon. member for South Brisbane also said that it is no use pounding into children the evils of alcohol because it is likely that the result will be the opposite of what we hope to achieve. He gave as an example the fact that we do not campaign against the use of opium, yet there is no desire for opium. That is a fantastically inaccurate statement for a man in his profession. It is obvious to everybody that one cannot just go and buy opium, and opium is no less a narcotic than alcohol is. The only difference is that we legalise the sale of alcohol, whereas the sale of opium is illegal.

Mr. Walsh: Many other drugs are sold legally.

Mr. DEWAR: Not many drugs are sold legally without a doctor's prescription. One has to get a doctor's prescription to buy certain types of drugs. No drug, and no narcotic as harmful as alcohol, can be bought as easily as alcohol.

Mr. Hanlon: Do you think it should be bought by prescription?

Mr. DEWAR: No, I do not.

Mr. Davies: Do you agree with hotels being open on Sundays?

Mr. DEWAR: I will tell the hon. member what I think about Sundays later. Is he satisfied with that?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEWAR: We have to protect the children of this generation because I am afraid that the generation of the last decade has not done a very good job. We talk about juvenile delinquency, but we have not even scratched the surface. The juvenile delinquency problem will be infinitely worse in 10 years' time; the main contributing factor will be alcohol. I am reminded of the history of America. We must tell our young people the truth about alcohol. We must not let what we tell them be coloured by what they see in brewery advertisements that refer to "Happy Days", "A happy way of life", "Social graces", and all that bunk. They have to be told the truth. It used to be half pages in the newspapers, but now they see it spewing out of television screens

every night. Through this medium the children are being educated to accept alcohol as an essential part of life.

I remind the Committee of the experience in America. I am no advocate for prohibition; I am an advocate for temperance. It is not true to say that prohibition was a dismal failure in America. Prohibition was introduced in America because the people of that country were sick to death of the sight of alcohol in the homes and streets. Prohibition came out of a sincere desire because the nation was sick unto death of what liquor had done. The prohibition period in America was not what we see in "The Untouchables" or "The Roaring Twenties" or some other souped-up television programme. It was not the story of the Al Capones and all the rest of the gangsters that were supposed to be rampant because of prohibition. That is nowhere near the story. Prohibition was kicked out of America because the millionaires saw that they were paying far too much tax. They cited the amount of revenue that came from the sale of liquor in England to support their case. They campaigned for the reintroduction of legal liquor drinking because the tax would be paid by the working man, and so their taxes would be reduced. That is the main reason prohibition was lifted in America. Some of the leading millionaires who subscribed money to the funds to kill prohibition were in themselves prohibitionists. They would not allow liquor to be consumed near their factories. Any workman seen consuming liquor in an hotel near their factories was instantly sacked. No liquor was allowed on factory premises. That is the extent to which they went with prohibition, yet they were the main contributors to the fund that was the means of kicking prohibition out of America.

An Opposition Member: What authority have you for saying that?

Mr. DEWAR: I have referred to the book —"The Repeal". I will show it to the hon. member later, if he likes.

I want the truth told to our young people. I do not want them given the souped-up versions of the newspapers of what liquor is supposed to do. I do not demand that they be told how many children are killed on the roads because of alcohol, or how many finish up in the Goodna Mental Hospital or Ward 16. I do not demand that, but I demand that the truth about liquor be told.

Mr. O'Donnell: It is being told.

Mr. DEWAR: It is not being told.

Mr. O'Donnell: Ask the Minister for Education.

Mr. DEWAR: There is an attempt being made through the schools, yes, but Clause 23 is going to provide additional money from the proper source.

Mr. Lloyd: How much?

Mr. DEWAR: I do not know any more than the hon. member does, but I say again that the Minister is sincere and the Government are sincere. I could not care less whether the hon. member understands what sincerity is. I am telling him that this Government are sincere and if they tell this Committee they are going to provide money for this reason I believe them.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. DEWAR: I believe that hon. members opposite were failures as a Government. I intend quoting from a book which I had sent from America. It is entitled, "Planning for Alcohol Education." It is completely up to date. It contains the proceedings of a conference held in February last year in California, sponsored by the Californian State Department of Public Health and Education and Mental Hygiene. The extracts I shall quote come from highly qualified persons in that State which has done so much, in concert with other States of America, to get to the bottom of the mis-use of and psychological effects of alcohol.

I shall quote these cases to support my contention that alcohol is a narcotic, a drug, and never has been and cannot be a stimulant. If a Gallup Poll were taken in the streets of every city in Australia and the question was asked of every person who drinks, "Is alcohol a narcotic?", 99 per cent. would say, "No." If one asked, "Is alcohol a stimulant?" 99 per cent. would say, "Yes", and they would both be wrong.

Dr. David Zappella, a medical man, says—

> "These studies demonstrate that alcohol is a drug which belongs to the category known as general anaesthetics; that is, alcohol affects the central nervous system in a manner which results in a descending depression. With gradually increasing doses, alcohol tends to interfere, first, with cortical functions; then with subcortical functions; and finally, with the most essential functions of the nervous system, such as the maintenance of temperature, pulse, respiration, and blood pressure. These findings have invalidated the widely-held notion that alcohol is a central nervous system stimulant. Except for the abolition of superficial anxiety, ethyl alcohol is a depressant of all neuro-physiological and all psychological activities. It is well known that even small doses of alcohol impair visual acuity and binocular co-ordination; more recently, even such basic responses as the deep tendon reflexes and the sexual reflexes have been shown to be impaired by moderate to large doses of alcohol."

Turning to a further article on this question Dr. Nello Pace says—

> "Subjectively, it is obvious that alcohol has marked and extensive effects on the function of the central nervous system; the brain in particular. At the outset it may

be stated unequivocally that alcohol acts physiologically to depress nerve function, and can be considered a narcotic. In low concentration the highest levels of brain function are impaired first. Since it is at the cortical level that the complex psychic activities such as social inhibitions, shyness and judgment are manifested, it is small wonder that the common impression exists that alcohol is a stimulant. Actually, all narcotics, alcohol included, in low dosage can give rise to excited behavior, owing to the depression of function of the highest brain centres. With the increased dosage the depressant action becomes more obvious and widespread. There is no question that alcohol at any level interferes with nervous function."

Those statements are the truth about alcohol and the message we have to get over to our young people is to disabuse their minds of the gullible parents' impression of alcohol, the impression gained from advertisements about alcohol, and to show them the facts. That is all that is needed. That is all I ask, that they be told truthfully what alcohol is. Not one person in 100, possibly not one person in 1,000 who drink liquor, is aware of the fact that he is using a narcotic and that he is getting no stimulation whatever from it, that it is a depressant. Young people are being wrongly taught by parents, teachers and others who do not know the facts about alcohol.

Mr. Diplock: How do you know?

Mr. DEWAR: It is no use being smug. The hon. member was formerly Minister for Education and he did nothing about education in this field. To my knowledge this is the first official step to be taken by any Government.

Mr. Tucker: Why didn't you say all this in your Caucus?

Mr. DEWAR: The hon. member does not know what I said at our Party meetings.

Mr. Davies: This is the party that says its members can get up and speak their mind.

Mr. DEWAR: That is what I am doing. We do that.

Mr. Davies: No.

Mr. DEWAR: The hon. member does not think that I am speaking his mind.

I refer hon. members to this further statement on the matter—

"The Misuse of Alcohol and its Resultant Community Problems
Disease or Symptom

Is alcoholism a disease? Most psychiatrists would prefer to call it a symptom of an underlying personality disorder, or a treatable condition. The term disease does help to remove the stigma of alcoholism, but it might obscure the underlying personality problems so that after cessation of drinking, treatment would not be seen as necessary."

I do not hold that alcoholism is a disease. With my limited knowledge of the subject, I agree it is a symptom of an underlying personality disorder. When the person with an underlying personality disorder is sufficiently affected by alcohol he becomes what we respectably call an alcoholic—in other words, a chronic drunk. The same thing would happen if the person with an underlying personality disorder took opium, heroin or any other drug. He would become a drug addict. If alcoholism is a disease, it is the only self-induced disease that I know of.

Mr. Lloyd: Nonsense!

Mr. DEWAR: Then name another self-induced disease. I repeat that it is the only self-induced disease I know, and it is the only disease of which a person can cure himself without going to a doctor. The cure is simply to stop drinking.

Those are the essential things that must be taught in an educational programme. We must tell our young people the truth. I am sick to death of hearing statements that "the majority of people want this" and "the majority of people want that." I said at an earlier stage of the debate that a survey conducted in America revealed that one-third of the people do not drink at all, one-third drink less than once a month and one-third drink more than once a month. It is reasonable on that result to say that virtually two-thirds of the people are non-drinkers. The great majority of the American people really do not drink at all. What is the position in Australia? We find in an article written by W. A. Scharffenberg that in a poll taken in every capital city of Australia quite recently it was found that 59.38 per cent. of the people are drinkers and 40.62 per cent. are non-drinkers. If individuals took an occasional drink, even as little as once a year, they were classified as drinkers, and these are the results. Roughly, 60 per cent. of Australians drink and 40 per cent. do not. It is interesting to find that in the breakdown, 73 per cent. of men drink and 27 per cent. do not, and with women, who are a little more discriminating, 40 per cent. drink, and 60 per cent. still maintain their femininity.

I am concerned with the education programme. I think it should concern any person of moderate thought that, in a recent analysis of 17,000 students in 27 colleges in America, 74 per cent. had already taken alcohol. It is startling to find that 10 per cent. of them were between the ages of 11 and 15, 36 per cent. of the men and 47 per cent. of the women between 16 and 17 years of age had taken alcohol, and 53 per cent. of the men,

and 44 per cent. of the women at 18 years of age drank alcohol. Seventy-four per cent. of students in 27 colleges in America had started drinking between the ages of 11 and 18. America's problem is supposed to be bad, but the consumption of alcohol in America is far below ours. They are eighth on the world list and we are fourth.

Mr. Lloyd: They drink torpedo juice.

Mr. DEWAR: Maybe they would but I have seen men in Ann Street drinking metho. Whether that is worse than torpedo juice I will have to leave to the expert opinion of the hon. member.

We have been told that more study of alcoholism is being undertaken in the western countries. That is true because it is a sad commentary that alcohol is mainly used in Christian countries. The Moslems have banned it entirely and the King of Saudi Arabia made a statement recently in which he thanked God that wine and narcotics were banned in his country. However, in the western countries it has been accepted as an essential part of living. Had God intended man to run away from problems He would have built us like ostriches, with long necks, so as to hide our heads in the sand and pretend that problems do not exist.

God gave every man the ability to be the master of his fate and if we have just the right spark we can face up to these things. In one year in America they spent 10,000,000,000 dollars on alcohol and 7,500,000,000 dollars on education. In Queensland the drink bill is £43,800,000 and our education vote for this year will be £24,000,000. We are spending more money in Queensland to create misery, poverty and death than we are for the education of our young people. Any corrective measure, no matter how small, makes me happy that the Government are imbued with the necessity of providing funds to make an educational programme possible. If ever our young people deserved to be told the truth about anything, they need to be told the truth about alcohol. I believe that from the age of 12 onwards our young people should have a proper programme developed through the Department of Education. It should be carried out on the same basis as in America, with a seminar, in a painstaking manner, so that all the problems may be ironed out and a proper programme undertaken by qualified people who need not necessarily talk prohibition or spread the idea that we want to drink sanely. I should hate that. I just want them taught so that they will know for themselves the truth about alcohol. That is all that I personally think is necessary. The average youngster today has a better standard of education than we had in our day, and than our fathers had, and he has enough brains to realise that if he is taught the truth about it, there is a greater chance that he will make up his mind in a way that will not have any detrimental effect on his future.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (5.31 p.m.): Earlier the Minister said that the Bill was the product of the collective thinking of the Country Party and the Liberal Party. While the hon. member for Wavell was speaking I thought to myself what a pity it was that we could not have arranged to have a tape recording made of the speech of the hon. member for Wavell, and the hon. member for Balonne, Mr. Beardmore, or for that matter, the hon. member for Gregory, Mr. Wally Rae. Then we should have some idea of how the Minister arrived at the statement that the Bill was the result of collective thinking of the two parties.

From time to time we have heard some very interesting lectures and addresses, or whatever you like to call them, from the hon. member for Wavell. I do not doubt his sincerity in the matter; but he proceeded to tell us of the effects of alcohol on the state of mind of the average person and how he sometimes became worked up to agitation, even violence. I wondered what had been stinging the hon. member because he showed every evidence of having been stimulated by something; I do not know what.

Mr. Morris: As he is a teetotaller you can be very sure it is not alcohol.

Mr. WALSH: I would not for a moment say that it was, but I have known black tea to have an effect on some people. I may say that a man who obviously had a good case could have put it over in a more temperate way. I do not know whether it is in the air, whether the effects of Khrushchev's explosion have reached as far as this, but even the Minister showed himself to be unusually irritable at such an early hour of the debate. I can imagine what he is going to be like, what mental state he will be in, when he hears the little birds chirruping here at daybreak tomorrow.

However, we have it from the Minister, in reply to remarks I made earlier about the Trust Fund, that no special Trust Fund will be created. That confirms the statement made earlier in the debate that the suggestion of expending up to £30,000 was more or less a sop to those opposed to the liquor interests. I have no doubt the Minister led them to believe that a special Trust Fund would be created and that this was a bona-fide move by the Government to set aside a specific sum in a specific fund and that they would have the use of it. If those people were misled by the Minister, I can assure them that, if we are to judge the Government on their previous record of promises of this nature, there is no hope of that one's being fulfilled. There will not be a fund for the expenditure of £30,000 for education on the dangers of alcoholism. The Minister has now

admitted that the money will come from the Trust Fund originally provided under the principal Act, which we all know of, just as we know that last year just under £25,000 was expended from that fund. If the Minister looks under the heading "Receipts" he will see that there is a debit of £500. That will give hon. members a fairly good idea of what the Treasurer will do with the amount that is allocated, if any, and how it will be used in relation to the overall balance of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. As payments into the Liquor Fund have been used since the Government took office, it will be used for the purpose of bolstering the Consolidated Revenue, and the people who are of opinion that they will get a specific amount each year for that purpose will be disillusioned as time goes on.

I can appreciate the need for an educational programme in the consumption of alcohol, and to that extent I am not in disagreement with the hon. member for Wavell. But one of the things that I think is responsible for a very substantial increase in the consumption of alcohol is war. One of the unfortunate legacies that we have from war, whether World War I. or World War II., in this country is the encouragement it gave to young people to partake of liquor. Governments of the day—I ask the hon. member for Wavell to take cognisance of this—conceded the right to those under 21 years of age to consume liquor in hotel premises or other licensed premises simply because they were members of the navy, the army, the air force, or any other branch of the war effort.

Mr. Lloyd interjected.

Mr. WALSH: I do not accept that. If we accept that, we must give other rights to people under 21—youths of 16 or 17.

Mr. Houghton: That is 16 years ago.

Mr. WALSH: I do not care whether it is 16 years ago. I do not know whether the hon. member would say that the youth of 30 or 40 years ago was inferior to the youth of today, and protection had to be given to them.

Mr. Hughes: You do not want to perpetuate unsavoury features of the war, do you?

Mr. WALSH: I do not want to perpetuate them, but the hon. member, by supporting the Government and the Bill, is not only perpetuating them but extending the opportunities for young people to consume liquor. I could answer the hon. member for Wavell by saying, "Is alcohol a necessity?" I do not suppose it is any more a necessity than tea or milk, but drinking alcohol is a custom that has grown up over the centuries. For some reason or other—I do not know whether the hon. member for Wavell or anybody else can justify this—it has always been recognised in the navy and a ration of a good Bundaberg product has been issued to each man.

Mr. Herbert: Not in the Australian navy.

Mr. WALSH: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Herbert: I ought to know; I was in it.

Mr. WALSH: I was not in it, but I had a lad who went through the battle of Lingayen Gulf and other places in the "Australia," and I suppose he would know just as well as the hon. member.

Mr. Herbert: The Australian navy is dry.

Mr. WALSH: It is very interesting to hear that from the hon. member for Sherwood. After his extensive travels overseas, I thought his outlook would have been a bit broader on these matters. If somebody kept him away from the places where they were consuming liquor in the navy, I do not quarrel with that because I realise the effect it would have had on him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will come back to the clause.

Mr. WALSH: If it is not right for young people under 21 years of age to consume liquor the responsibility is on the Government to see that they do not consume it at any stage of their lives. I hope that the Minister for Labour and Industry will see to it that his police force give effect to that part of the law. Do not let us have the continual publicity in the newspapers about the police action that is going to be taken against teenagers. Give us some evidence that action is being taken.

Mr. Morris: Would you like me to go and get some evidence?

Mr. WALSH: If the Minister will come down to the South Coast with me one night we can determine the average age of the beer garden patrons. I have been told that the average age would be a little over 22 or 23, so it is obvious that there are many under 21. The Minister had better let his police have a look at the matter. I know that the Minister for Justice would be very desirous of having such action taken. I want the Government to do something about it, not merely make excuses because of a shortage in the police force. Even if the police force has to be used as part of the educational programme on which £30,000 is going to be spent, use it by all means. I can imagine the hon. member for South Coast being a very valuable asset in conveying to the youth of the community the dangers of alcohol.

I was a little worried at one stage, until I got the Minister's interpretation of the clause, that the Government were going to start creating new trust funds after they had been raiding them so successfully for so long.

As it stands, I am opposed to the clause unless the Minister can give some very good reason to convince the Committee that there

will be a specific sum of not less than £30,000 spent each year to educate the people, particularly the youth, of the dangers of alcohol. Unless he can give the Committee that assurance hon. members should vote against the clause.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (5.43 p.m.): The hon. member for Wavell made a remarkable speech in view of his attitude towards the introduction of the Bill and the extension of the facilities for drinking in Queensland that is to be provided by the Bill. It is the more remarkable because of his attempt to compare drinking conditions in Australia with those in America. He referred to a tremendous educational campaign in America, saying that the incidence of drinking in America was so much less than in Australia. I do not know. I have been through America and many other countries of the world. I should say that the few beers the Australian worker drinks, that might increase the percentage of alcohol consumed by Australians each year, is as nothing compared with the consumption of narcotics in America and other older countries of the world.

Mr. Walsh: Even those drugs that the doctors prescribe.

Mr. LLOYD: Exactly right—a very sane statement from the hon. member for Bundaberg. Certain drinking conditions exist in Australia. Those conditions are possibly the reason some political parties may consider that more sane drinking laws should be introduced. That is a matter for consideration by all people. But it is more a matter of the standard of living and the ordinary conditions operating in a country than a matter of whether it is right or wrong. As the Minister said, custom dictates whether a thing is right or wrong. I do not intend to support this Bill but I will say that I would much prefer a country like Australia where working men drink a few beers, than one like America, where they use marihuana and other drugs as narcotics.

The hon. member for Wavell said that alcohol was a narcotic and not a stimulant, but through the extension of drinking facilities to Sunday there will be an increase in the consumption of narcotics in the community. I believe that every hon. member in this Chamber thinks that in Australia we at least have conditions that make the beer consumed by Australian workmen not as dangerous as the narcotics consumed in other countries of the world, in the United States in particular, where the dangers are such that they need a violent campaign to oppose them.

It is not the ordinary working man who is concerned with alcoholism, which is a mental disease. It is not the man who has a couple of beers before going home in the afternoon with whom we have to be concerned; it is the man who cannot stop himself from drinking who needs correction.

Let us consider the clause as a whole. To do that we should, first of all, consider some of the taxes imposed by the Government on the people of this State. Taking as an example taxes imposed on the motorist, is any member on the Government side going to tell me that because a man offends against the traffic laws of the State and is fined, some proportion of the revenue received by the Government from motorists should be used to provide a School of Driving? Is any analogy possible there, in the minds of hon. members opposite? If the argument is carried to its logical conclusion, because people breach the traffic laws and the Government collect revenue from this source, should not portion of it be used on corrective education? There are drivers who drive recklessly, dangerously, and there are drunken drivers on the road who are a danger to life and limb. Because a man might have a few glasses of beer in a hotel, the licensee of which pays fees that go into a Government fund, is there any more reason why money from this fund should be utilised on education in relation to drinking than that money collected from motorists should be used to educate traffic offenders?

Another case in point would be the tax on betting. Should a portion of the revenue received from this source be used to educate people against the evils of betting? Is the Minister going to tell us that the man who spends a few bob on beer is more dangerous than the man who spends a few pounds on bets on the races that he has no hope of winning? One has to be consistent in this matter and, if the Government are sincere in their desire to launch an educational campaign against alcohol it should be a Government-controlled campaign, and not one financed by people with some sectional interest. That is all that will happen under this Bill. The clause says—

> "All sums allocated for a purpose specified in paragraph (a) of this subsection shall be under the direction of the Minister for Education and all sums allocated for a purpose specified in paragraph (b) of this subsection shall be under the direction of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs who may direct the payment of such part (if any) thereof to such bodies or institutions carrying out work for the prevention of alcoholism and for the care and rehabilitation of alcoholics, as he deems fit."

Where will the largest portion of the money be spent, if any, by the Department of Health and Home Affairs? If the Government said that from increased revenue they were going to allocate £30,000 to a fund to be used for the treatment of alcoholics, I would be in complete agreement with them, because such a step would mean improved facilities for the treatment of alcoholics in Government institutions. Those are the only places in which treatment can be given. The

Government instead have adopted a hypocritical attitude. They have attempted to buy off those who resist the passage of the legislation, merely so that they can get out of the bungle into which they have got themselves. A person who goes into a hotel and has a few drinks is not an alcoholic. Alcoholism is a mental disorder. A person suffering from it has no resistance and must keep on drinking. I agree with the hon. member for Wavell that such a person is a danger and a menace in the community, but very few persons comparatively speaking become alcoholics. The inclusion of Clause 23 is nothing more or less than an attempt to bribe those who are opposed to the introduction of the Bill. It is a most shameful act. The Government, if they were sincere, would have accepted the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. The maximum amount mentioned in the clause is £30,000. The amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition set a minimum of £25,000. The fact that they did not accept the amendment proves that nothing—10s. or £1—can be paid into the Trust Fund. The Department of Education is to receive portion of the maximum sum of £30,000. For what purpose? Is it going to conduct an educational campaign against the drinking of alcohol? The Government, under the Bill, are encouraging greater drinking by allowing Sunday trading. They are hypocritical in the extreme. Their attitude is the greatest paradox of all time. On the one hand they are encouraging people to drink on Sunday, and on the other they are saying that from increased revenue they will conduct a campaign against the consumption of alcohol.

Dr. Delamothe interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Bowen and I have agreed on a number of occasions. He was a medical officer in the Royal Australian Air Force and I have heard his opinion on a number of occasions about the use of alcohol. He commented on the fact that "lack of moral fibre" cases in the Royal Australian Air Force were frequently found among men who did not drink. That was one of his reports as a medical officer in the R.A.A.F. Now he has the impertinence to come in here and support what the Government are doing. The inconsistency of some hon. members opposite is such that we must question their sincerity. I have yet to learn that the hon. member for Gregory was accused of lack of moral fibre in his flying activities.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to get back to the clause.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Wavell on a number of occasions during the debate has been savage in his attacks, yet we find on each division that he has voted in favour of the Government's proposal to expand and extend the opportunities for drinking. Whether we are right or wrong, we must be consistent in our attitude. If the Opposition say that the Bill is wrong and bad, we vote against it, but if hon. members on the Government benches say the Bill is bad, and then vote for it, we must doubt their sincerity.

This clause provides a sum of money, as it states, to combat alcoholism, but while the Government refuse to place a minimum amount in the Trust Fund there must be some suspicion in our minds that they have no intention of placing any sum in the Trust Fund. The Government have tried to silence outside opposition with 30 pieces of silver, with this £30,000 that they promised to place in the Trust Fund. Immediately the Minister said that it would be made available to combat alcoholism the opposition to the legislation died. Is it because these people who were supposedly sincere in their opposition were bought off by the Government? I suggest that may be the answer. In the first place there was a protest meeting at the City Hall which was attended by many people who were opposed to the introduction of the legislation. However, even at that meeting some of the spokesmen said they had received every courtesy and every consideration from the Minister. Immediately following the meeting the Minister announced he would give £30,000 from revenue to combat alcoholism, but we find that although there is a limitation in the clause on the method of expenditure, strangely enough, after the announcement, there was no longer any opposition to the legislation. Why?

A Government Member: It is sensible legislation.

Mr. LLOYD: This is a rather strange fact that needs clarification: it seems plain that the Government have had no intention of policing many pieces of legislation during the past four years. It has become obvious that the Government have had no intention of policing the legislation on the books. The Minister has introduced this legislation regardless of his personal ideas and opinions, but at the same time he has had to salve his conscience by making this offer of £30,000 to be divided between the Minister for Education and Migration and the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. The Minister has yet to tell us exactly how it is to be spent, and I now challenge him to do so. Who will get the £30,000 that may be paid into the Trust Fund? So far as I know, there is only one institution for the combating of alcoholism, and it is Government-controlled. I would agree if we were to place £30,000 into the Trust Fund for that institution because I believe that it can be improved. Perhaps the Minister would be better advised if he were to place any money from this fund in a fund to be used by the Government. We only know that the Minister intends to make provision for money to be spent from revenue received from the introduction of this Bill, and to place it to the credit of

some mythical organisation about which we know very little at present. If we do it under this Bill, we must do it under the Racing and Betting Bill, and if we do it under the Racing and Betting Bill we must do it in all similar cases. Entertainment tax has been introduced in New South Wales and Victoria. Is it to be suggested that a fund should be created to combat racing and betting? We must be consistent and apply it in all cases. The Minister has given us no indication of how the money is to be advanced, how much is to be allocated and to what extent it is to be spent. As he has refused to accept the amendment to the effect that £25,000 be placed to the credit of the Trust Fund, we must doubt his sincerity in the matter.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (7.15 p.m.): Quite frankly, I do not think there is need for much further discussion on the clause as the Opposition stated its case on the amendment. Lest there be some misunderstanding on the matter I think I should indicate that we will support the clause now that the amendment has been defeated. It would be foolish to argue that, because the Minister rejected our amendment to specify an expenditure of not less than £25,000, we should vote against the clause, because to do so would mean that no funds at all would be available for temperance education work. It would place us in a very invidious position to oppose the clause.

We could, of course, engage in discussion on the merits and demerits of what might be done about a temperance campaign but, as I indicated a few moments ago, the subject was fairly adequately canvassed in the debate on the amendment. Whatever our views might be on whether the funds that might accrue to the Government from the operation of the clause could be more appropriately used by agencies other than those controlled by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs and the Minister for Education and Migration is another matter. If we had felt they could be better used, we should have moved a further appropriate amendment that the funds be dealt with in a manner different from that provided in the clause. I do not think we could very usefully do that because the two principal agencies available to the Crown are obviously those that would be nominated by the Minister—the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Home Affairs.

If we were concerned with the correction of the inebriates we should remember that provision is already made for the alcoholics in the Institution for Inebriates at Marburg. Frankly, I do not think any education programme is likely to achieve very much as far as the Institution for Inebriates is concerned. It is rather a matter of corrective treatment there. I have no doubt that in some cases the actions of the superintendent and the staff have been responsible for getting people away from the habit of drinking. Indeed, there have been some voluntary admissions to Marburg. But this is hardly the type of clause to deal with the subject of the administration of the inebriates home at Marburg.

I indicate these matters to the Committee, and particularly to the Minister, to save some further debate on the clause because, much as we may disapprove—and we still do—of the fact that the clause specifies no minimum amount, nevertheless, echoing the sentiments I expressed an hour or two ago, half a loaf is better than no bread. If £25,000 is not to be expended, at least we have the assurance of the Minister that something will be done. He characterised as absurd the statement that the sum could be as low as £400. All we can hope for is that when the Bill goes through the Minister will be committed by the clause to something in excess of £400, though not in excess of £30,000. We leave that to the Minister's discretion and to his sense of responsibility. If he fails to give practical expression to the contents of the clause, he will stand indicted before the bar of public opinion. When he comes back on some future occasion with an amendment, I feel sure he will have in mind the words that have been expressed in this debate, and he would not wish to spend other than a considerable sum of money in order to vindicate himself and the attitude he has taken.

I thought that, in fairness to the Minister and to the Committee, I should make those general observations on the clause at this stage.

Clause 23, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 33, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 34—New s. 60A; Beer gardens on licensed premises—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (7.20 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 24, line 42, after the word 'licensee', insert the words—
>
> 'or to any professional entertainer attending for the purpose of fulfilling an engagement as such an entertainer'."

The reason for this amendment is that, much as we might deplore the fact that there are a number of people under 21 years of age who, as professional entertainers, may come in contact with people in beer gardens, we have to accept that there are a great number of professional entertainers under 21 years of age. In view of the provision that the Minister has made in the Bill for the relatives of the licensee and employees under 21 years of age who may be engaged in the work of supplying the needs of customers in a hotel, it seems to me to be an unreasonable restriction to debar a professional entertainer from working there. I have taken

the opportunity of discussing this matter with the secretary of the Musicians' Union. He indicated to me that there are a number of people under 21 years of age who have graduated from the Conservatorium of Music and who play in the symphony orchestra, and that there are other people who have graduated from the Conservatorium of Music and who have received professional engagements despite the fact that they are under 21 years of age. We must remember that this does not enable these people to partake of alcoholic liquor. It is still an offence for persons under 21 to consume alcoholic liquor. The present provision in the Act makes a person under 21 liable to a minimum fine of £10 and a maximum fine not exceeding £20. Under the Bill, the minimum has been removed. If we wish to deal with——

Mr. Munro: We are going to accept this amendment.

Mr. DUGGAN: In that case, I will not canvass the general principle very much further. I have in mind what happened on one occasion when some people went to see a former Minister.

Mr. Nicklin: If you talk too much you might change the Minister's mind.

Mr. DUGGAN: Yes. I prefer to accept the Minister's assurance. In that case, the Minister for Lands, Mr. McCormack, received a deputation from the Longreach area in relation to some major submissions about land tenures generally. He indicated to the deputation that, since receiving their written submissions, he had agreed to accede to their request. The leader of the deputation then said, "I have come down here some hundreds of miles. I want to state my case." I do not want to overstate my proposal, so I shall not develop my arguments any further. I accept the Minister's assurance that the amendment will be accepted.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (7.23 p.m.): After all the futile beating of the air this afternoon, I am very happy to commence proceedings this evening by saying that I think the amendment suggested by the Leader of the Opposition is a very sensible one. He has explained the reasons for it, and I agree with them. This is a small matter that had not been considered particularly. Now that it has been brought under notice, I am very happy to correct it.

Amendment (Mr. Duggan) agreed to.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (7.24 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 25, line 2, after the word 'licensee', insert the words—

'or any professional entertainer attending for the purpose of fulfilling an engagement as such an entertainer'."

I take it that the Minister is prepared to accept the amendment. I hope that the nod of his head is accepted by "Hansard" as an assurance that he is, because I should hate to forfeit my right to 15 minutes to develop my argument.

Amendment (Mr. Duggan) agreed to.

Mr. DEWAR (Wavell) (7.25 p.m.): I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee unnecessarily except to say that I am extremely happy that the Government have taken steps to prohibit minors in beer gardens. For a long time I have considered it a matter that needed attention. A great deal of publicity has been given to the presence of minors in beer gardens following the Youth Inquiry that we conducted. I, and my colleagues who served on that committee, are more than happy that the Government have taken this action, for which I congratulate the Minister and the Government.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (7.27 p.m.): When he was moving his amendment the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that the Government were breaking fresh ground in this clause inasmuch as it excludes minors from beer gardens but it provides no minimum penalty for a person under 21 years of age so offending. The same principle carries over to the next clause that deals with minors in a bar. I am not saying that we are necessarily opposed to the omission of a minimum penalty but I think the Minister should indicate briefly the reason for omitting a minimum penalty to be imposed on a minor found in a prohibited part of licensed premises. I think the Minister's action is significant enough to indicate what led the Government to frame the legislation in that way. A person under 21 might perhaps be innocently on prohibited parts of licensed premises.

Whilst we agree with the general prohibition of people under 21 years of age in beer gardens, with the exception of employees of licensees and entertainers, there are some hardships that could arise. Perhaps the Minister could keep his eye on it to see how it works out. We know that many people marry under the age of 21. On the South Coast or in other tourist areas the anomaly could arise that a young man over 21 might be prevented from taking his wife who is 20 or nearly 21 into a beer garden. Of course, that sort of difficulty arises whenever age limits are set. It is interesting to note that Bulletin 46 of 1961 issued by the Government Statistician shows that during the March quarter of this year 1,052 of the females who married were minors. In other words minors constituted 41.7 per cent. of all brides during that quarter. The Queensland Year Book for 1960 showed that of the 10,581 marriages contracted in 1959 4,258 brides were minors. I am not saying that those figures should stop the Committee from agreeing to prohibit minors in beer gardens, because the overall position must be considered. But it is a matter on which the

Government should keep an eye to see its effect. That could be done to see, at a later stage, whether some alteration might be made without in any way conflicting with the principle of protecting young people. The same thing applies in relation to a man, his wife and a couple of children, say, 18 to 20 years of age, on the South Coast or somewhere else on holidays, not being able reasonably to partake of the facilities of a beer garden because of this overall prohibition.

I draw the Minister's attention to it merely to suggest that it is something that could be looked at after it has been in practice for some time. Another question that has been raised, not in this debate but previously, is that, by preventing children under 21 years from entering a beer garden we might create the danger of the completely irresponsible parent who leaves children locked in a car in the street or sends them off with a couple of shillings at 6 or 7 o'clock at night to roam the streets of Southport or Surfers Paradise or wherever it may be, while they stay in a beer garden. It poses the question of whether the children may not be better off with their parents in the beer garden than being thrown on their own resources in the street at night. It is one of those matters on which one would go round in circles arguing what is the best thing to do, but there seems to be evidence from both sides of the Chamber that it would be a good idea to give the overall prohibition a trial and watch the results. Perhaps the police could keep an eye open outside beer gardens to see if any young children are running loose on the streets at night. If so they could find their parents and remind them of their responsibilities. That is another matter that could be looked at in the light of practical experience.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (7.32 p.m.): Commenting quickly on the points raised, I should like, in the first place, to support the remarks of the hon. member for Wavell in drawing attention to the fact that we regard this clause as a very important one although it involves the imposition of certain restrictions that may cause some inconvenience. I might also pay tribute to the hon. member for Wavell and the members of his Committee on Youth Problems because it was on the views of Mr. Dewar as chairman, and the other members of the Youth Committee, that we gave particular consideration to this problem of young children in beer gardens.

It is true, as the hon. member for Baroona pointed out, that this could cause a certain amount of inconvenience in some cases. Nevertheless, we have to take a broad view of such things and, as we were faced with a growing practice which could become a very grave menace to our young people, we felt that there was ample justification for the clause.

On the question of penalties, the hon. member for Baroona has to a certain extent answered his own question when he pointed out that there might be circumstances when a person under the age of 21 years may be found in either a bar or a beer garden in completely extenuating circumstances. Actually, the primary objective of the exclusion of young people from bars and beer gardens is to ensure that they will not be there for the purpose of drinking, because it is so difficult to establish that a person is there and actually drinking. The actual exclusion is something that is only incidental to that. I have had brought under my notice one or two cases of the prosecution of a young person for being in a bar. In those instances there have been quite extenuating circumstances. I would say that they have been such that it would be an injustice to impose a minimum penalty. It is my experience generally, except in the case of very serious offences, that it is not wise to have minimum penalties; it is better to leave the imposition of a punishment to fit the crime in the hands of the magistrate who hears all the evidence and is able to arrive at a proper determination.

The hon. member for Baroona has brought under notice an important point. As he said, the matter of young children who may to an extent be neglected is not limited to the problem of young children in licensed premises. We realise that that is so and I know the Minister for Health and Home Affairs has given some consideration to the problem. However, it is outside the scope of the clause and the legislation.

Clause 34, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 35—Amendment of s. 60; Person under twenty-one not allowed in bar—as read, agreed to.

Clause 36—Amendment of s. 62; Bars and adjoining rooms—

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (7.37 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 25, line 31, after the word 'wine-seller' add the words—
>
> ', and by adding to subsection (8) at the end thereof the following words:—"or otherwise pursuant to section sixty-nine of this Act".' "

This is a very minor amendment which really is more in the nature of a drafting correction. Clause 41 of the Bill provides for the sale, supply and consumption of liquor in parts of hotels other than the bar in the permitted area during permitted hours on Sunday and for the sale and supply of liquor on Sundays and other days for consumption in the dining-room of hotels and clubs with a bona-fide meal. Section 62 (7) of the Act prohibits the unlocking or opening of any door, entrance or aperture by which entrance can be gained to the bar during prohibited

hours and Section 62 (8) allows entrance to the bar during prohibited hours for the purpose of cleaning the bar or for the purpose of obtaining liquor for sale or supply to any bona-fide lodger or bona-fide traveller. As the only place available in many hotels for the storage and refrigeration of liquor is the bar itself, the amendment would have the effect of authorising entrance to the bar for the purpose of obtaining liquor for sale and supply to, and consumption by patrons in other parts of the hotel. It does not authorise sale or consumption of liquor in the bar on Sundays.

While it is rather a technical amendment, it is moved merely for the purpose of removing what otherwise would be an anomaly.

Amendment (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 37—Amendment of s.65; No debts for liquor recoverable—as read, agreed to.

Clause 38—New ss. 67A, 67B, 67C; Holder of license to sell liquor to stock and supply aerated waters, etc.—

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (7.40 p.m.): I am rather interested in this clause because it provides for a new section to be inserted in the Principal Act. I am particularly interested in the proposal set out in subsection 67A, which seeks to compel a licensee to keep in stock on the licensed premises and have available for sale or supply in any part of those premises set apart for the sale or supply of liquor for immediate consumption upon the premises, aerated waters and fruit drinks in reasonable quantities. I am at a loss to understand why this section should be included in the Act, having regard to the history of liquor laws in Queensland. Everyone knows that in past years there has never been any question about any hotelkeeper keeping a supply of aerated waters on his premises.

A Government Member: Did you ever order a sarsaparilla?

Mr. Duggan: They always have tomato juices and fruit juices.

Mr. WALSH: Exactly. Somebody asked me if I had ever ordered a sarsaparilla.

A Government Member: Most unlikely.

Mr. WALSH: Strangely enough, I have. I am inclined to think that this amendment comes from a certain pressure group and the Premier would know something about it.

Mr. Houghton: The C.O.D.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member for Redcliffe has named it—the C.O.D. We have here another example of the Government's claiming to encourage expansion of private enterprise on the one hand and providing ways and means whereby it can be foisted upon publicans even if they do not want it, that they have to take these particular juices or aerated waters from the C.O.D. I am interested in this matter because over the years Labour Governments have guaranteed the finances of the C.O.D. for the specific purpose of marketing fruits and fruit products, such as fruit juices. It is a near Socialistic enterprise, like Ansett which operates under Federal Government legislation, with Government guarantees. In other words, if they cannot succeed on finance available to them through normal channels they fall back on the Government for their requirements and then go to the bank and say, "We have a Government guarantee." That is quite a sensible policy so long as the C.O.D. confines its activities to marketing fruit and fruit juices, but once they engage in a normal commercial undertaking in competition with say Helidon, Gardiners, Tristrams, Cosgroves or Perkins, I think it is a little unreasonable that the Government should encourage it with Government finance to embark upon this competition with the other firms in the production of aerated waters.

Mr. Hughes interjected.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member would not know what he is talking about on this. I ask him to keep his babbling mouth closed because he is an annoyance to everyone, including the Chairman. He knows how to deal with him, but unfortunately I do not.

Mr. Nicklin: Have you ever seen any C.O.D. products on licensed premises?

Mr. WALSH: That is not the question. I am taking this opportunity of registering my protest at the Government's giving an organisation a guarantee of Government finance to enter into the production of aerated waters against the established firms in this city, and that is the main reason for the amending provision.

Mr. Nicklin: What nonsense!

Mr. WALSH: There is no justification for the C.O.D.'s embarking on the production of aerated waters. They have got to the position now that they can dictate to the other established companies according to the quantity of juices that might be made available to them. At least I have drawn the Premier out sufficiently for him to agree that that is the reason for the provision.

Mr. Nicklin: Rot!

Mr. WALSH: That is the reason. The Minister for Labour and Industry knows that the Brisbane firms have protested to him, and what has he done to assist them?

Mr. Nicklin: Protested to him about supplying hotels?

Mr. WALSH: Protested at the C.O.D.'s cutting across the activities of these bona-fide established firms in free enterprise.

Mr. Nicklin: Supplying hotels?

Mr. WALSH: No, not supplying hotels.

Mr. Nicklin: What are you talking about? The clause deals with supplying hotels; that is all.

Mr. WALSH: I am not going to elaborate on what I have said about the Minister for Labour and Industry. He knows it to be true. It all comes to this: the Government have gone round the corner to boost the activities of the C.O.D. It is all very well for the Premier to shake his head, but there it is.

Mr. Morris: That is not true and you know it.

Mr. WALSH: The battle has been going on with the established firms in Brisbane for a number of years and this great octopus is now building up around here into a normal commercial undertaking with the backing of Government finance—one of the socialistic enterprises that hon. members opposite have so roundly condemned in the past. It is clear enough now that the provision has been introduced at the behest of the C.O.D.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (7.47 p.m.): I am sure that if we had the opportunity of referring to the hon. member for Bundaberg by an apt name we should refer to him as Don Quixote because I have never, since I became a member of this Assembly, seen another who engages so frequently in the little pastime of tilting at windmills.

The first point I want to make clear is that nothing in the clause refers to the C.O.D. The clause deals with three matters. First of all it inserts in the principal Act a new section, which has the effect of requiring the holder of a licence to stock and supply aerated waters and fruit drinks. Then it inserts a section dealing with foods other than specified foods which are not to be sold in bars on licensed premises of a licensed victualler. That is purely for hygienic reasons. Thirdly, the licensee is required to stock and supply certain foodstuffs, which are quite a minimum.

The broad basis of the provisions is eminently sound. First of all, if I may take them in the inverse order, the desirability of the partaking of food with liquor as compared with the consumption of alcohol alone is well supported by medical opinion and it is felt that from that point of view it is desirable that it be mandatory that licensed victuallers have some minimum types of foodstuffs available in bars. It was complementary to that that we thought it desirable also that licensed victuallers should stock and supply aerated waters and fruit drinks to persons who asked for them.

Mr. Walsh: They have always done that.

Mr. MUNRO: There has been no requirement that they should. This really, in a small way, is linked with our educational campaign in relation to alcohol. As the hon. member knows, very often a group of men, perhaps for social reasons, goes into a hotel to have a drink. We want to make it abundantly clear that each of those men will have freedom of choice. If one or two of them want to have a glass of beer, they know it is available in the hotel. If one or two of them wish to ask for a glass of ginger ale, or a glass of pineapple juice, they will know that there will be something available in each of those categories. I think this will be accepted as quite a good amendment, although I do not regard it as being of outstanding importance.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Taylor, I wish to move a very short amendment to the clause to deal with an incidental matter arising in connection with our new provisions relating to a lounge bar. I move the following amendment:—

> "On page 26, after line 37, insert the following new sub-clause:—
>
> '(3) Subsection (1) of this section does not apply to food sold or supplied for consumption by persons seated at a table in a lounge bar or in any room having direct access to such a bar.' "

Referring to the Bill, it will be noted that that particular part of Clause 38 relates to the prohibition on the selling of certain foods. That prohibition is right and necessary as applicable to an ordinary hotel bar. But with the new provision for a lounge bar, which specifically will be a bar in or associated with a lounge, and a lounge being a place where there are chairs and tables, it is quite obvious that it would not be reasonable to have that provision against the consumption of foods, other than a very limited number of foods, applying to that part of the bar that is associated with the lounge.

Mr. Walsh: Will they have tablecloths and serviettes, too?

Mr. MUNRO: We do not provide for them by legislation, but there is no objection to their having tablecloths if they wish to do so. This is a very simple amendment that I think will be accepted.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (7.54 p.m.): We have no objection to the proposed amendment, but apropos of the general observations made by the hon. member for Bundaberg and the Minister's reply to them, I should like to point out that we raised this matter at the introductory stage and on the second reading and characterised the provision as being an attempt to placate the anger of the temperance people outside and to show them that there was embodied in the legislation provision for the compulsory stocking by the hotelier of the various goods enumerated here. As the hon. member for Bundaberg pointed out, it has been the custom for many years for most licensees to have fruit-juices on

their premises as well as aerated waters. I do not suppose there will be one hotel in Queensland that would not have aerated waters of some kind, although it may be true to say that not all licensees would carry fruit-juices. At the same time most of the packing firms put up very attractive packs of tomato-juice in about 4-oz. or 5-oz. tins. It is quite usual to see the punctured tins thrown out at the rear of licensed premises. However, the clause seems to push the point to absurdity. There is no reason why some general power should not be given to the Licensing Commission to insist that a general standard might be observed in the provision of foodstuffs, but the Minister sets out in the clause to specify cocktails, liqueurs, Bonox, beef-tea, coffee, milk, etc. I have not been in many hotels at night-time during the winter months but I have seen signs outside hotels advertising that Bonox is available. The finest malted-milk drink I have ever had was at the Grand Hotel, Coolangatta.

Mr. O'Donnell: You must have been very thirsty.

Mr. DUGGAN: No, I have gone out of my way to have a malted-milk dispensed by the proprietor, Mr. Gollan; without doubt it is a very fine drink. Many cafes would be well advised to mix malted-milks to the standard dispensed by Mr. Gollan of the Grand Hotel.

The next provision mentions gherkins, olives, cherries, pickled onions, and chewing gum. I think it is carrying it a little too far. Can anyone imagine that the effects of drinking would be mitigated by having large quantities of gherkins, olives, cherries, and pickled onions to be followed by chewing gum? Then, of course, we have the anti-climax because "medicinal foods" is specified. I assume that after the stomach has been upset to such an extent by the intake of gherkins, olives, cherries, and pickled onions the drinker requires amphogel, De Witt's antacid powder, Andrew's Liver Salts, and the like. I suppose the next thing the Minister will insist that they have sweet gherkins, sour gherkins, and all the various brands. I should imagine that if I were a drinker the sight of a cherry would be very nauseating. When drinking beer or whisky the sight of red cherries with their sickly-sweet flavour would be very upsetting. If some of the drinkers in the Chamber were offered red cherries they would need an extra couple of brandies to get themselves back on to what they would class a balanced ration. It is nothing more or less than a window-dressing provision.

Apropos of the point made by the hon. member for Bundaberg, the Premier has denied any influence at work on the part of the C.O.D. Nevertheless, complaints have been made from time to time that it is possible for the C.O.D. under this Government to get transport permits to carry drinks from the C.O.D., which are denied their competitors. Whether that position has been corrected I do not know.

Mr. Nicklin interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am not prepared to be dogmatic about it at the moment. I am not attacking the Government on that matter. I think the C.O.D. generally is doing a pretty good job. I should like to see them further develop the production of fruit-juices. Sometimes you can get too much of a good thing. I remember in the Army that when we first saw the gallon or ½-gallon cans of tomato juice and pineapple juice we thought it was not so bad being in the Army at all. When one gets this sort of stuff day after day, particularly when it is not refrigerated, there is a tendency to lose one's enthusiasm for it. I thought, when there was a large dispensing of fruit juices in the Army, that we might have followed the American pattern somewhat in the use of these commodities but that certainly was not the case. There was a falling-off in fruit juice sales after the war.

Seeing that the Minister seems to be using this provision for propaganda purposes I suggest that temperance people in particular should use their influence with the manufacturers of these commodities to use more attractive labels on them. There has been an improvement, particularly by the C.O.D., but they still cannot compare with Libby's fruit juices and Malayan pineapple juice on sale at Allan & Stark's and other places that cater particularly for the American, Californian and Malayan juices. The quality of our products is quite comparable with the imported lines but our package design is not as good.

The clause is quite innocuous. It does not mean anything at all. The Licensing Commission should decide and specify what should be provided, without its being specified in the clause. Hotels that should provide full meals might shy clear of the obligation by saying that luncheon is obtainable at the hotel and compromise with these items, gherkins, olives, cherries, pickled onions, and chewing gum. Whether the chewing gum would be of a certain quality to lock their teeth together and prevent them from drinking, I do not know. What is envisaged by the provision of chewing gum I do not know.

My objections to the clause are that it is completely unnecessary and has been inserted not for the purpose indicated by the Minister, but merely as a sort of throwout again to the temperance people outside. They are so incensed in their general attitude that the Government thought, "If we can only show here and there in the Bill that these things are provided, it will allay their anger." I can appreciate the hon. member for Wavell going to a temperance committee and saying, "Look at page 27, look at page 29, look at page 33. There is a concerted attempt,

with all the resources of the Government behind it, to cut down alcoholism throughout the State of Queensland."

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (8.3 p.m.): At this stage, when I suppose one might say we are approximately in the middle of a somewhat tiring day, we should feel grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for making a speech that has a much greater value as entertainment than education. I thought we had explained the new parts of this clause which deal with making it compulsory for certain foods and aerated waters and fruit drinks to be stocked in bars. I will confess it sounded very good, I am sure it was great entertainment, not only to hon. members, but to the people in the gallery, to hear read this section referring to the mixing of cocktails, Bonox, beef tea and so on, but there are two points that the Leader of the Opposition has not made clear. He may not have known, but if he did, he did not make them clear. If he did know them he should have made them clear. So far as those things he read out are concerned, it is merely incorporating in the Act certain provisions that are already in the regulations.

Mr. Duggan: Why bring them into the Bill if they are already there?

Mr. MUNRO: I should like to say to the Leader of the Opposition what he sometimes says—"You cannot have it both ways." On many occasions he criticises this Government because we leave too many matters to be determined by regulation. Here is a matter which quite some time ago was put into the regulations, but as we are now going through the law and making a fairly thorough job of it, we, in effect, have put the provisions of Regulation 53B into the Bill, so that they will be known to Members of this Parliament. I suppose quite naturally many hon. members would not have known they were there. By putting them in the Bill we disclose them and make known the present law, which has been the law for quite some time. Is there anything wrong with it?

Apart from the fact that it has been the law for quite some time, this particular part of the law deals with the prohibition on certain types of food, which are not to be stocked in bars for hygienic reasons. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that these things are not important. All we are saying is that the prohibition does not apply to these particular things which in the ordinary course would be stocked in bars.

Here we have another example—we have had several of them today—of an hon. member's taking up time not in discussing important principles in the Bill but in quoting something that has a considerable entertainment value but does not help us to improve the Bill.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (8.6 p.m.): I do not know whether I am becoming egotistical, and I hope I am not, but the Minister seems to be delivering himself into my hands a bit more than usual, because the very point I made is confirmed by him. He says we are taking up time on trivial things of no consequence. If they are, then why put them into the Bill, particularly if on his own admission they are already covered by the regulations? Why place them in the Bill, except to focus public attention on them? The only reason for transferring these things from the regulations to the Bill is his hope that he will get some attendant publicity from the step.

Mr. Munro: Nonsense!

Mr. DUGGAN: That is what the Minister said.

Mr. Munro: Can you not understand it is a simple matter to put these things in the Bill, but it is a waste of time discussing them at length when they are unimportant and so trivial?

Mr. DUGGAN: If they are inconsequential and of no importance why waste the time of the draftsman in putting them in the Bill?

Mr. Munro: For clarification of the law.

Mr. DUGGAN: In what way was the regulation deficient?

Mr. Munro: It is not important, but we are tidying up the law.

Mr. DUGGAN: I cannot follow this at all.

Mr. Nicklin: The hon. member has often introduced legislation that incorporated regulations.

Mr. DUGGAN: I agree. If the Minister had said that this was an important principle or an important provision of the law, I would go along with him, but he says it is of no value, that it is only something put in there to focus attention on them. Whose attention does the Minister want to focus on them?

Mr. Munro: We are dealing with similar matters. We are dealing with other basic foods and we are just tidying up the law by putting in these odds and ends. However, carry on and talk about it.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am not going to waste time, but I think the Minister has proved my point that this is purely a window-dressing provision—nothing more nor less. The regulation has the full force of law and has been operative for some time. Apart from the tidying-up effect, the Minister has said there is no need for it except to focus attention on it. That is what I said. It is included for the purpose of focusing attention. It is a window-dressing provision so that someone can go outside and say, "Look at what this section says." I could get the hon. member for Baroona to go along and say, "Yes, you can look at this section, but look at the regulation of the Labour Government and you see exactly the same thing." That is what will happen. The Government are going

to pick out what they think are the attractive sections of the regulations and include them in a Bill merely because they want to abate criticism levelled against the Government.

At the risk of taking up time, being called a professional entertainer, and being classified as facetious, I think my point was well taken. The Minister has not come out of this matter as well as he would like.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (8.9 p.m.): I want to draw the Minister's attention to the specified foods. I am not conversant with what the regulations say about them at present but as they are now stipulated in the Bill I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that biscuits and sandwiches can be sold only in sealed packages. I know that some hotels, particularly in country areas supply sandwiches unwrapped, but it will be illegal for them to do that now because they will not be supplying them in sealed packages. It is obvious that facilities will not be available for putting them in sealed packets in country areas. People often ask hotel-keepers to supply sandwiches between mealtimes, particularly when they are travelling, and I do not wish to have them placed in the ridiculous position of breaking the law by selling sandwiches that are not in sealed packets. I am making my suggestion in all good faith.

Mr. Nicklin: The hon. member is making a different point. The ones referred to in the Bill are kept in the bar for sale.

Mr. Munro: Let us make it clear that there is no requirement for sandwiches. It is merely that if they have sandwiches they are required to be in sealed packages.

Mr. Burrows: They have not to be hermetically sealed?

Mr. Munro: It is not compulsory; it is only permissible.

Mr. HILTON: If they supply them in other than sealed packages what is the position then?

Mr. Munro: There is no change in the law.

Mr. HILTON: This is being incorporated in the Act.

Mr. Munro: They could meet the requirements by having biscuits.

Mr. HILTON: If a person has travelled 20 or 30 miles and arrives at 10.30, and there is no cafe, and he asks for sandwiches an officious policeman could raise an objection if the hotel-keeper did not supply them in a sealed packet.

Mr. Nicklin: If he is in the bar at 10.30 p.m. that would be a moot point.

Mr. HILTON: I mean 10.30 in the daytime. If this provision were left in the regulation it could be readily amended, but if we write it into the Act that no hotel-keeper can supply sandwiches to travellers or anyone else unless they are in a sealed packet, I think we are reducing it to an absurdity.

Mr. Munro: He can supply them in the lounge or the dining room.

Mr. HILTON: Has the hotel-keeper to open up the dining room at 10.30 or 11 o'clock in the morning for any traveller who wants a little snack? Take a place like Talwood where there may not be a cafe. It will be illegal if sandwiches are supplied that are not in a sealed packet. I draw the Minister's attention to it and suggest that a very simple amendment would meet the case.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (8.14 p.m.): The Minister said that this part of the Bill is an attempt to tidy up the existing law. There is no doubt that we accept his assurance, although it surprises me. He has not made very clear the reason for his further amendment of the provision relating to the sale of food for consumption by persons seated at a table in a lounge bar. As the Bill stood prior to the amendment a complete meal could not be had in the ordinary sense, except in the dining room. In other portions of the licensed premises you could have liquor, cordials and the prescribed foods which are specifically defined in Section 67B, subsection (2). It seems manifestly obvious now, according to the proposed amendment, that it will be possible to have all types of food in a lounge bar, whether it has dining room facilities or not.

The Minister should advise us of his real reason for the amendment. Metropolitan hotels have various facilities for serving complete meals that would normally not be readily available in a lounge or lounge bar. In country hotels, where the flies are bad and there are other inconveniences associated with country living, diners are usually catered for in the dining room, with screens and fans specially provided. Those dining-room facilities are not usually found in lounge bars, yet, according to my reading, the amendment will allow the serving of all food—not merely the prescribed food but for that matter even a full meal—in the lounge bar. It seems to me that there will be some attendant difficulties.

The only explanation the Minister gives is that in the lounge bar there are tables and chairs. Very often the tables have been smeared heavily with liquor. They are rubbed over but not properly washed for the reception of food. They are not scalded. They are not disinfected. They are just rubbed over with a towel as each set of customers goes out. There are cigarette butts around and usually a popular lounge bar with plenty of clients has a thick haze of smoke.

I can assure the Committee that I am not for a moment averse to drinking with meals but a lounge bar is not the ideal place for a meal or for any general food other than perhaps the prescribed foods. Apparently the Minister has some reason for moving the amendment and it is incumbent on him to give us a full explanation.

According to him, in any case, a lounge bar is a bar determined or approved by the Licensing Commission on inspection under Section 59A of the Act. It means that almost any bar room in which there are tables and chairs could be prescribed as a lounge bar and could therefore become eligible for the serving of food. The Leader of the Opposition has pointed out that the fundamental purpose of the clause is to palliate certain critics by suggesting food will be made available. I submit that is absolutely correct. However that may be, in so window-dressing the Bill the Minister should be careful not to introduce undesirable practices. If food is to be served with liquor it should be served in proper conditions, and lounge bars, however good, are not ideal places in which to have a three-course meal. From the reading of the amendment I do not know that that could be prevented.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (8.19 p.m.): After listening to the debate on the clause, I think it is apparent that the proposed Sections 67A and 67B could have been left out of the Act in their entirety. I agree with the Minister that there is nothing obligatory on the licensee to serve the prescribed foods. According to him, the power to nominate the prescribed foods has already been exercised by way of regulation. Why would it not have been sufficient to incorporate the principles contained in Section 67C, and then provide for such other prescribed foods as may be determined from time to time? Surely the Minister is not going to bring down an amendment of the Act every time he wants to add something. I could suggest many things that might be added. The futility of it is obvious when one has had some experience in bars from time to time. I am rather sorry that I did not arrange to take the Minister on a pub-crawl before he proceeded to develop the principles contained in the Bill, because he would have found as he went round the city that hundreds of people go to cafes near hotels and buy pies and all sorts of things and bring them back into the bars in bags and eat them there. Without any provision being made for that in any law, the individual has the right to go out of a bar and bring back a meringue pie, a kangaroo-tail pie, or anything that he likes. The Minister has sought to include all these things in the Act, and if any time has been wasted in discussing the clause he has only himself to blame. How many of us over the years have seen Bonox, beef-tea, and coffee royals, served in bars long before they were included in any regulations? I do not know whether the Minister is trying to impose a limit on what the hoteliers might want to do in their own right in determining the type of food that will be supplied in a bar. If he includes such things as medicinal foods and somebody says that that could be interpreted as meaning castor-oil, epsom salts and so on, do not blame us, because the Minister has used the term "medicinal foods". More particularly since I have got a near admission from the Premier that Section 67A has been brought in to benefit the C.O.D.——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is expected to deal with the amendment to the clause, not the clause itself. The Committee is now dealing with the amendment.

Mr. WALSH: I have said all I want to say. I realise the futility of discussing it in its amended form or its original form because the Government will put it through in any case.

Amendment (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Clause 38, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 39 and 40, as read, agreed to.

Clause 41—Amendment of s. 69; Hours of selling on licensed victualler's or wine-seller's premises—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (8.23 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 28, lines 9 to 21, omit the paragraphs—

'(8A.) The provisions of subsections (4), (5), (6), (8) and the proviso to paragraph (b) of subsection (10) of this section shall apply within that part of the State which is comprised within a radius of forty miles from the General Post Office in Queen Street in the City of Brisbane, and shall not apply in any other part of the State.

(8B.) For the purposes of this section the term "permitted area" in respect of the licensed premises of a licensed victualler means all that part of the State which is not comprised within a radius of forty miles from the General Post Office in Queen Street in the City of Brisbane.'

and insert in lieu thereof the following paragraph:—

'(8A.) For the purposes of this section the term "permitted area" in respect of the licensed premises of a licensed victualler means the whole of the State of Queensland.' "

We discussed this matter with the Parliamentary Draftsman and he thought that this was the simplest way of dealing with it. Unquestionably this is one of the most important provisions of the Bill because it is upon the principle of Sunday drinking that justification lies in the eyes of the Government for introducing the measure.

Let us have a look at some of the reasons that were advanced by the Minister in trying to defend this provision. The Minister has been a little crochety today. Although he is invariably, in his own quiet way, logical and consistent in his arguments, today he seems to me to be moving around. On almost every occasion on which he has been challenged he seems to have changed his ground, and it was most noticeable this morning when he exercised his right of reply on the second reading. He stated that there were several things revolving round the clause that needed to be emphasised. The first one was that the provisions of the clause would be enforced in their entirety without fear or favour. He then went on to say that the reason why differentiation was made in the clause was that conditions varied so widely throughout the State. In support of that argument, he mentioned the creation of States within the Commonwealth of Australia, but forgot, of course, that the States preceded the formation of the Commonwealth. He went on to talk about the variation of the speed limit throughout the State. There is no variation of the speed limit throughout the State.

Mr. Munro: Is it the same in country areas as it is in the built-up areas in the centre of the city?

Mr. DUGGAN: No, but they are common. The speed limit on the highway in any part of the State is a speed not exceeding 60 miles an hour.

Mr. Munro: They are not uniform throughout the State.

Mr. DUGGAN: They are in that regard. In any case, the Police Department lays down the speed limits in the various areas. It is because of the danger to other traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, that the limitations are imposed, but they are uniform limitations. The Minister for Labour and Industry pointed out that where a maximum of 50 miles an hour was provided the maximum speed was to be increased to 60 miles an hour; where the restriction was 30, it was to be increased to 40 miles an hour, but with authority to the police to cut down that speed of 40 miles an hour, if necessary.

In answering the hon. member for Baroona this morning the Minister said that he had great sympathy for the hon. member for Redcliffe. He appeared to go out of his way to try to placate the hon. member for Redcliffe. He said he realised that Redcliffe was a very salubrious place, that it was only a question of time when perhaps it would be one of the nicest places in Queensland in which to live as an ordinary citizen, free from Sunday drinking and so on. He suggested that the hon. member for Redcliffe would be well advised to use his vote in favour of the 40-mile radius in the interests of the citizens of Redcliffe. The Minister further pointed out that whatever merit there may have been in the hon. member's suggestions, it was negatived by the fact that it was difficult to apply uniform conditions throughout the State. He said that you could not have conditions in Redcliffe that would apply in the Far North or Far West. In actual practice the clause does not deal with the Far North or the Far West; it deals with all of the areas outside of a limit of 40 miles from the Brisbane G.P.O. I find great difficulty in accepting the Minister's assurance that it is possible to enforce certain conditions in Toowoomba but not possible to enforce similar conditions in Ipswich, where there are comparable populations, bitumen streets, the same Sunday sports played—football, cricket and all the other sports—the same relative number of playing fields and approximately the same composition of population (working people engaged in the railway workshops), the only difference, of course, being the greater number of mine workers at Ipswich. If there is any validity in taking cognisance of the wishes of the people I should imagine that because of the laborious nature of their work the miners would have a greater need for a drink than the white-collar workers or bacon factory workers in Toowoomba. But the Minister arbitrarily lays down a 40-mile radius. He said that the reason we had to alter the Sunday trading arrangement was that outside the metropolitan area the law was not enforced because it was not capable of enforcement.

Mr. Munro: I said in some parts of the State.

Mr. DUGGAN: The Minister did not specify what parts of the State. I think the Committee is entitled to have his views. He has pointed out that there has been close collaboration on this matter with the various Ministers, including the Minister for Labour and Industry, that there have been six Caucus meetings and a number of Cabinet meetings. There must have been some evidence put before Cabinet as to the extent of this non-enforcement of the law. Not only is there the admission of the Minister of the inability to enforce the law in certain parts of the State, but there is his further point that because the majority of people in those areas require drinking facilities—and it was an unreasonable law that prevented them from having them—the law should be amended so that they would have some respect for the law. That is the force of his argument. If there are sufficient people at any given point who, by their action in breaking the law, demonstrate that they feel that the law is unjust, harsh and unreasonable, and if they are not breaking the law in a moral sense, they are entitled to have the law amended. We can apply the principle in so many directions, but the point we make here is that we made a plea to the Minister on the second reading stage to consider some of the reasons why we voted against this measure as a discriminating one. He rejected our plea, so we were left with no alternative but to move an amendment to provide that what

is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. If it is good for Toowoomba, Gatton, Maryborough, Gympie and other outlying places to have the opportunity of engaging in Sunday trading in whatever hours are prescribed by the Government—and I have indicated that they should be of four hours' duration in a day—and if we are to have respect for the law, it should apply generally.

How can anyone say that at least 50 per cent. of the population of Queensland should be denied the opportunity of Sunday trading? The population of Brisbane in relation to the rest of the State is something of the order of 40 per cent. If we take to the outside perimeter of Greater Brisbane, to possibly the 40-mile limit, it gets very close to 50 per cent. of the population excluded from the proposed provision. Why should they be excluded? Being realistic in these matters I can understand its operating in the western parts of the State in towns like Winton, Cloncurry, Charleville, Quilpie and Adavale, where men have been working in the shearing sheds or on the cattle stations under very blistering conditions for the greater part of the week. They have no homes. They are virtually nomads in the sense that their home is the station property. They have none of the amenities of people who go home every night to their T.V.s, their refrigerators, wirelesses, and other comforts available in the capital city and other cities of the State. When they go to town on Friday night they virtually make the hotel, or some similar accommodation in the towns, their home for the week-end, and unquestionably there is a case for those people to be catered for. Consequently, I agree that it would be undesirable to break that practice. So, if that is the case, why did not the Minister lay down that west of a certain line and north of a certain line——

Mr. Munro: Where would you draw the line?

Mr. DUGGAN: It is not my responsibility to draw the line. Let the Minister draw the line.

Mr. Munro: We have drawn the line and you say to me, "Why would you draw the line there?

Mr. DUGGAN: I am asking you why did you draw the line at the perimeter 40 miles from the G.P.O.?

Mr. Munro: I have explained why.

Mr. DUGGAN: I do not think the Minister has and he knows full well that there is a good deal of perturbation on the part of Liberal Members representing metropolitan constituencies because they find it extremely difficult to explain it to their constituents. Surely the Minister will not say that the only people who drink would be Labour supporters.

Mr. Munro: You are not trying to bring this provision onto a political basis, are you? Why not discuss it reasonably?

Mr. DUGGAN: I have seen the Minister introduce many Bills in this Chamber: I paid him a tribute some days ago for being perhaps the hardest working Minister in the Cabinet, in relation to the legislative programme. He has, on many Bills, presented his views with clarity and with consistency throughout. I do not know whether the Minister is tired or has a lot of responsibility but I have never seen him chop and change in his arguments as much as he has at the introductory and second reading stages and the Committee stages of this Bill.

Mr. Munro: I made it clear very early that we were prepared to consider your suggested amendments. I will tell you now that you are not making any progress by making these political speeches.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: Earlier in the evening I met the Minister's wishes by saying that if he indicated by a nod of the head that he was going to accept our proposition we would be satisfied. He said, "Yes". In order to save time I therefore abandoned my intention of giving arguments why the amendment should be accepted. Apparently, now the Minister says, "Well, if you like to treat me as one of the great political men in the State, if you like to be just a menial servant to come along and plead with me in some direction, we might consider these proposals." How can the Minister say, on the submission I make at half past 8 at night, on 31 October, that he will consider these matters, when they have had six weeks to consider whether a particular requirement will be served at a table, whether they will allow a professional entertainer, whether beer will be served at 11 o'clock at night or whether dancing will be permitted? They have had six or seven weeks to consider these things and still cannot make up their minds.

Mr. Munro: Would you like me to answer your question?

Mr. DUGGAN: Yes.

Mr. Munro: The answer is that every one of these points that you have raised has been considered by Government Party members, and I not only know what I feel about them but I also know the views of the Government Party members.

Mr. DUGGAN: The Minister says all these things have been considered?

Mr. Munro: Substantially all of them.

Mr. DUGGAN: Substantially, and the Minister has accepted the present proposal. If he would not accept some constructive suggestions from within his own party, is he likely to accept them from this side of

the Chamber? He has already considered the arguments we are putting forward and has rejected them.

Mr. Munro: Not necessarily.

Mr. DUGGAN: The Minister said that substantially the arguments put forward here have been raised by members of his own party.

Mr. Munro: I said I know the views of Government Party members. And I know they wish me to listen very sympathetically to some of the things you are raising.

Mr. DUGGAN: I know the position, without betraying any party secrets. Some hon. members opposite have told me they believe in the removal of this discrimination. They have mentioned to me and to other Opposition members that they have expressed that view. The Minister has said that the submissions we are making are substantially of the type that he has heard in the Caucus room of the Government parties.

Mr. Munro: I am trying to help you in making your speech.

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. gentleman is not trying to help me.

Mr. Munro: By saying that you would make out a much better case if you talked about the Bill and not talked so much about Liberal politicians.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am inclined to put forward a proposition if the Minister can tell me why it is possible to enforce the law in Ipswich and not in Toowoomba, places with comparable population and a similar working-class characteristic among the people.

Mr. Munro: You would know a lot more about that if you read my introductory speech and my second reading speech. But when you have finished I will explain it.

Mr. DUGGAN: No evidence satisfactory to the Opposition has been given to show why the police in Toowoomba cannot enforce the law and the police in Ipswich can enforce it. That is the effect of this provision.

Mr. Munro: It is not the same.

Mr. DUGGAN: Of course it is. The position would be different if the clause applied to parts of the State where the population is small, pastoral areas and so on where the people have no opportunity of taking a drink to their own homes. In Brisbane if I were a drinker and I am not, I think I would prefer to take home a bottle of beer, put it in my refrigerator, and have it with my wife, not that I would not like the opportunity of having a drink with male friends. But in accordance with Australian custom men in the main would rather drink in hotel bars than their own homes. In America and other countries of the world the reverse is the case. In America a greater percentage of people drink in their homes. They like a sherry, whisky, or a glass of beer before or during dinner, but in Australia the custom is the reverse. But people in the outback parts of the State cannot do it. We cannot expect every boundary rider or shearer to have his own refrigerator where he can store a quantity of liquor. It would be impossible to deliver supplies to them. If the Minister argued the problem on that basis, I could agree with him. It would not be unreasonable to say that people in those parts when they go to town once a week should be able to spend a reasonable period in the bar. But the Bill covers all places outside the 40-mile radius from Brisbane. I cannot imagine why a person in Toowoomba should be able to get a drink when a person living in Brisbane cannot get a drink, even in summer. What justification can there be for that arrangement? Are there to be differential tax rates or some different educational standard in Toowoomba compared with Brisbane? The Minister has had much to say about the four D's, decency, decentralisation, and so on, the freedom of the individual, his liberties and his rights as an individual, provided they are exercised with a sense of responsibility, having regard to the rest of the community. I ask the Minister to reply and tell me if he can justify this discrimination between saying it is lawful for me to have a drink in Toowoomba and not expose myself to police surveillance and yet I cannot do precisely the same thing in Brisbane. I cannot have one solitary drink if I live in Brisbane without subjecting myself to a fine, but I can guzzle for two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon in Toowoomba. It is perfectly lawful and legal to do so. However, a person in Brisbane which has a population of over 600,000 people cannot have one single drink, unless he is a member of a golf club or a bowls club. As the Act stands at present he has the opportunity to go from club to club on Sunday and drink for four hours. There is the distinct possibility that on this question of Sunday trading the Minister may say, "Provided you have a meal, it will be legal." I have been informed already that the matter has been discussed but just how far it will be developed, I do not know. Some hotels are talking about putting on a cheap smorgasbord on Sunday, at a nominal cost of 3s. or 4s. so that the hotels will be able to sell liquor during the two-hour period from 12 noon to 2 p.m., and 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. If this is permitted by the Licensing Commission, and I see no reason why it should not be, if the Government are not to hamstring these people altogether, what will be the position? Fundamentally it is a question of discrimination. I do not care how much the Minister talks, or how often he accuses us. There is no gainsaying the fact that this is a discriminatory measure involving more

than 40 per cent. of the total population of the State. The only reason for moving the amendment is that the Minister indicated during the second reading stage that he would not accept our amendment, and now he comes forward and pleads with us to make constructive suggestions and he will consider them. I have had sufficient experience to regard myself as a materialist and to know that whatever we suggest will be rejected by the Minister. The hon. member for Redcliffe, whom they are trying to enmesh in their political way of life, has a very strong case for his area, but they have rejected his plea for the people of Redcliffe. He is the man they are doing everything possible to get back into their party, and if they reject his pleas they will not give the Opposition any credit by saying that we dictated the legislative pattern on a major principle. I have been here for 25 years and I have never seen a Government so weak that it abdicated its principles so that its policy on a fundamental principle was dictated by the Opposition. I have not seen it in this Parliament, or in any other Parliament. If we were successful, in accordance with constitutional custom, they would have to resign and go to the people because it would constitute a motion of no confidence. If it happened with a small inconsequential amendment the Minister would say they did not regard it as a matter of importance. If I were Premier, and this amendment was carried, I would do the right thing and resign. I know the Premier will not permit the Minister to accept a detailed statement as to where this line may be. However, if the Minister would care to offer us the same facilities as are available to the Government through the officers of his department the Opposition will accept his invitation to say where the line should be. If the Minister wants to cater for the legitimate needs of the State and feels that no moral principle is violated because usage determines that it is moral to do certain things in certain parts of the State, and not in others, would he say that if trading went on Sunday after Sunday that that would constitute justification for amending the law?

Under the law at present the police may come into a hotel at any hour of the day. They know that any person in the bar is breaking the law, but under this legislation, outside the 40-mile radius they will have to visit the hotels at least twice a day if they are to enforce the law rigorously. In country districts, particularly those with a one-man or two-men police stations, I do not think the Government will be prepared to incur overtime on Sunday just to check up on the hotels and, human beings being what they are, the practice will continue.

I want to correct a statement that appeared in the Press the other day when I attributed to a Government member a statement about graft which he said went on because of collusion between some sections of the Police Force and the licensed victuallers. I attributed it to a Government member, the hon. member for Rockhampton South, Mr. Pilbeam, but the "Telegraph" report said I attributed it to the hon. member for Rockhampton North, Mr. Thackeray. I want to make it clear that I said it was a Government member. I am sure the Press made the error unwittingly, not deliberately. I had no doubt that the statement came from the Government benches because it came from the hon. member for Rockhampton South. He said there was collusion.

No-one can tell me, being a realist, that if licensed victuallers in Queensland want to trade beyond the two-hour period and if the local policeman is still prepared to play ball, even without monetary consideration, because he does not think the restriction is fair, the practice will go on despite the promise of the Minister that the law will be rigidly enforced. It has never been my principle to be unduly narrow and one of the greatest misfortunes I ever had was, many years ago, to be found drinking one sarsaparilla at a hotel one night. I had to hide under the cupboard with my back almost bent for about three hours because having even a glass of sarsaparilla in those conditions in those days attracted a very heavy penalty. The hotel was raided by the police that night when I was having my sarsaparilla on one of the very rare occasions I was in a hotel. Apparently because I was not a regular drinker I did not know the right time to go in.

The main point on this matter is that I do not think there is any justification for the discrimination, and that is the Opposition's view. We have no quarrel with the Minister's attitude of making legal a practice that has operated in the remote parts of the State but, as he has elected on behalf of the Government to broaden the field and to extend it from the Far North and the Far West to within 40 miles of the Brisbane G.P.O., we think he is guilty of discriminatory action that cannot be supported. Because of that discrimination I respectfully move the amendment to the clause.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (8.49 p.m.): I think it will assist the discussion if I make clear at an early stage the attitude of the Government to the amendment. The Leader of the Opposition has made a very interesting contribution to the consideration of the clause. I repeat that it deals with one of the most difficult problems we had to consider in the course of the preparation of the Bill.

Mr. Walsh: A problem created by yourself.

Mr. MUNRO: No. The problem was created by previous Governments and it remained with us.

If we excise from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition the digressions he saw

fit to make no doubt for political purposes, we find a very fair consideration of the problem and I am prepared to follow some of his remarks and indicate that his conclusions are not so very greatly different from those of the Government.

He gave us very good illustrations in support of his first argument. He pointed out that conditions in some parts of the State—he instanced the Far North and the Far West—are very different from those in the city of Brisbane, and he pointed out the disabilities of transient workers in those parts of the State.

Mr. Davies: Don't forget Ipswich.

Mr. MUNRO: I shall come back to that. He mentioned that people in some parts of the State are living under conditions completely dissimilar from the conditions in the capital city. That was one of the points that I made clear in my introductory speech. We have to take these things in stages, and I made the point that there is need for some modification of the law in some parts of the State as compared with other parts of the State. At the moment, that is all I am asking the Committee to accept. There are two reasons for that. One is that the Leader of the Opposition has made it very clear tonight that conditions in some parts of the State are materially different from those in other parts.

Mr. Walsh: The strange thing is that you have not found it necessary to discriminate between the golf clubs and the bowling clubs throughout the State.

Mr. MUNRO: Let us take one point at a time. The second reason is that experience over very many years—I should say approximately 20 years, possibly longer—has shown that under the conditions in some parts of the State the present laws are not capable of effective enforcement. That should be just as obvious to the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bundaberg as it is to me.

Mr. Duffey: That is a shocking admission.

Mr. MUNRO: That is so. It is not an admission; it is a charge.

Mr. Duffey: It is a charge against you.

Mr. MUNRO: It is a charge against the people who were in Government in Queensland for 25 years. This law has been in operation for the past 20 years and it is such a weak law and such an imperfect law that it is not capable of enforcement under the conditions existing in some parts of the State. We have considered the problem. We have been in power for four years, but for almost the whole of that time the legal powers of the Government have been in jeopardy. There was a case pending before the Supreme Court, the High Court, and ultimately the Privy Council, so we could not tackle this full problem.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MUNRO: We did not want to do it in bits and pieces, so we deferred a full review of the Liquor Act until we were reasonably certain of our constitutional powers. We have that decision now.

Up to that stage the Leader of the Opposition and I are on common ground in what we have placed before the Committee—that there are differences between some parts of the State and other parts of the State. From that it is established that there is a case for some differentiation in the law. Let me point out at this stage that the differentiation in terms of the proposed law is not nearly so great as some hon. members ask the Committee to believe.

Mr. Walsh: You must be very innocent.

Mr. MUNRO: The difference is that in a permitted area a person is entitled to have a drink at licensed premises within the permitted hours without establishing his status as a traveller. Within the 40-mile radius the same facilities are available, except that it is necessary for each person availing himself of those facilities to establish that he is a traveller.

Mr. Davies: We are not talking about travellers now.

Mr. MUNRO: We have a reasonably open mind. Possibly before we conclude our consideration of the Bill there may be a variation in the permitted hours. I am awaiting with great interest to hear what the Leader of the Opposition has to say on that. I and members of the Government realise that hon. members on this side do not represent the whole of the State. We are anxious to know the views of hon. members opposite who represent some of the Far Western areas.

The degree of differentiation in the Bill is not so great; it certainly does not justify the use of the word "discrimination". I freely concede that it is a very difficult problem. If you accept that there is this great difference in the requirements of the Western and Far Northern areas and the requirements of the City of Brisbane, where do you draw the line?

Before the Government parties came to the conclusion that the best place to draw the line would be at a 40-mile radius from the Brisbane General Post Office, we examined a very considerable number of alternative proposals. We considered, for instance, proposals that we should be guided to some extent by local authority boundaries, that we should take in one group, perhaps the City of Brisbane, and some of the larger provincial cities; we considered distinguishing tourist areas and other areas. It must be remembered that you have to examine any proposal of this kind in detail, considering

the licensed premises existing in the State. It has to be a very fair examination. We found that certain anomalies were inherent in drawing a line in any particular place. It was only after examining a large number of alternatives, and discussing the matter at Wednesday afternoon meetings, and on quite a few occasions apart from the more specialised consideration in other places, that we came to the conclusion that the most practical place to draw the line was a 40-mile radius from the Brisbane General Post Office.

Mr. Davies: Will you explain what action you intend to take to enable you to enforce the law in Brisbane and Ipswich when you claim you have not been able to enforce the law for five years?

Mr. MUNRO: The hon. member misquotes me. I have never claimed that the law is not enforceable. I pointed out that it is not capable of enforcement in some parts of the State.

Mr. Davies: Has it been enforced in Brisbane and Ipswich?

Mr. MUNRO: I should say so.

Mr. Burrows: Toowoomba?

Mr. MUNRO: Possibly in Toowoomba as well.

Mr. Burrows: Why is Toowoomba not included?

Mr. MUNRO: Is the suggestion that we alter the boundary line and also include the area of the City of Toowoomba? If we include Toowoomba as being in the capital city category, why not include Rockhampton, Bundaberg, Maryborough, Townsville, Cairns, Longreach and Cloncurry? I asked the Leader of the Opposition to suggest where he would draw the line.

Mr. Hanlon: We just don't want you to make fish of one and fowl of another.

Mr. MUNRO: We have already established the case that there is a need for some differentiation. Wherever one draws the line one will have difficulty.

Now, let me outline to hon. members the broad boundaries of the line we have drawn. Among other things we had to consider the boundaries of the city of Brisbane, but we discarded them for the very good reason that, first of all, in some places, the boundaries of the city of Brisbane run through closely settled areas and it would create anomalies if we had this line of differentiation in closely settled areas.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. MUNRO: In regard to between Brisbane and Ipswich, every hon. member knows that with the residential development now going on it is virtually a continuous residential area. For that reason there would be considerable anomalies if one attempted to draw a boundary line between Brisbane and Ipswich. It is completely different with Toowoomba.

Therefore, we found that, broadly, the area where there was a clear case to retain substantially the existing law, with the right for lodgers and their guests to have liquor on Sundays, with the right for other people to have liquor with their meals on Sundays, and with the right for travellers to have liquor on Sundays within the permitted hours—where the existing law was substantially satisfactory—was what one might call Brisbane and the immediately surrounding areas. That was the broad principle that emerged.

We then had to draw a dividing line and there was a certain amount of merit, perhaps, in a 30-mile radius, a 35-mile radius, a 40-mile radius and a 45-mile radius, but we found that the 40-mile radius, from the practical point of view, worked out very satisfactorily. It does not run through any town.

Mr. Houston: Are there any outside hotels just inside the 40-mile boundary?

Mr. MUNRO: No, there are not any very close.

Mr. Houston: What about the one on the way to Beaudesert?

Mr. MUNRO: The 40-mile radius line does not run very close to any hotel. Then, one of the advantages is that there is a certain amount of consistency in keeping this new permitted area away from the city of Brisbane. The 40-mile radius does have the appeal of coinciding approximately with the 40-mile travelling limit that we already have in the law. Obviously, it would be a little inconsistent if, for the purpose of the travellers' law we had a 40-mile limit, and a 35-mile or 45-mile limit for the other purpose. It has the merit of consistency and it worked out very well.

For those reasons I think I can freely concede that it is a very difficult problem. I submit that the solution we have found, although it may have some slight anomalies in it, has less anomalies than would be found in any other boundary, and, whatever faults it might have, it is the most practical.

Mr. Davies: It may be purely coincidental, nevertheless the majority of Liberal seats are within the 40-mile radius?

Mr. MUNRO: I can assure the hon. member that that has nothing to do with it. We do not consider these matters on the basis of the Liberal Party, the Country Party, the A.L.P. or the Q.L.P. Those things do not enter into our consideration. We decide on the best living conditions, and for those reasons——

Mr. Marsden: On what is the 40-mile limit based, travel by road, rail or air?

Mr. MUNRO: I think I can answer that by saying that it is a 40-mile radius. If

the hon. member cares to look at it, I have already laid on the table of the House a map showing the 40-mile radius. It does not matter whether you go by air or rail or whether you ride on a donkey.

Mr. DUFFICY (Warrego) (9.6 p.m.): I do not want to delay the Committee unduly, but I point out that no responsibility rests on the Opposition to justify the radius of 40 miles. The Minister asked the Leader of the Opposition, "What radius would you suggest?" Approximately half the population of Queensland is to be denied the privilege of Sunday drinking enjoyed by the remainder of the people, and the Minister has not yet advanced any sound reason why the clause should be implemented. I admit that in the West, Sunday sessions have been held, at least in the last few years. Under the Bill certain sections of the State will have legal sessions on Sunday. How can sectional legislation be justified under any circumstances? Under existing conditions a person can drive to Southport, which is more than 40 miles from Brisbane, and get a drink. However, if he drives 40 miles into Brisbane, I do not know how he can get a drink. To me that appears to be completely ridiculous. Why should a person be entitled to a drink if he drives 40 miles one way and not be entitled to one if he drives 40 miles the other way? The situation is absurd. Further, why should a member of a bowling or golf club in Brisbane be entitled to a drink when a man who has just finished work on the wharf or railways, probably after eight hours' solid work, is not entitled to one? Having regard to the area I represent, I want to know why the member of a golf or bowling club in Charleville, Mitchell or Cunnamulla should be entitled to a drink when a member of a Rugby League club, tennis club or other sporting club is not entitled to one? If I am wrong I ask the Minister to correct me now because I do not wish to expand it if I am wrong. As I look at the Bill it appears to me that the only clubs that are entitled to serve drink on Sunday are bowling clubs and golf clubs. I want to know why there should be such discrimination. Let me take the town of Ipswich as an example. It is within the 40-mile limit. There are golf clubs and bowling clubs there, and the members of those clubs, of course, can get a drink. I think that any hon. member in the Chamber will admit that soccer, rugby league and tennis are popular sports in Ipswich, but anyone engaging in those sports on Sunday cannot get a drink in a hotel because Ipswich is within the 40-mile radius. Why is there this discrimination between the various sporting clubs? Why are the Government introducing a Bill giving privileges to members of bowling clubs and golf clubs, and denying them to other sporting clubs? The principle is definitely wrong. Why are 50 per cent. of the people in Queensland to be denied the privilege, and the other 50 per cent. outside the 40-mile radius to be allowed to enjoy it? It cannot be justified in any way. In my opinion sectional legislation is always wrong.

The Government have declared certain tourist areas in the State. In the declared areas there is no need for a poll concerning the granting of licences. I think I am correct in saying that Redcliffe is a declared tourist area. Although it is a declared tourist area it lies within the 40-mile radius and does not enjoy the privilege available to people in Charleville, Tambo and Longreach.

The Minister told us that a relaxation of the liquor laws would encourage tourism. When the Government framed the Bill they paid no attention whatever to tourism, but just drew an arbitrary line 40 miles from the post office in Brisbane. They were not even slightly concerned with whether the 40-mile radius included tourist areas. That is completely wrong and illogical.

I am all in favour of Sunday sessions, not only in the western areas I represent, where we have had them for at least the last two or three years since this Government took office, because they admitted that that was the logical thing to do in the West. To that extent I completely agree. But I cannot possibly agree that half the people in the State should be denied the privilege.

I cannot agree with compelling the man in Brisbane who is fortunate enough to have a car—I have not one because I cannot afford it—to drive out 40 miles from the G.P.O. to get a drink and then, after having two or three drinks, to run the risk of being accused of being drunk in charge of his car.

On the one hand the Minister for Labour and Industry, who is the Minister in charge of Police, advocates heavier penalties for people who are drunk in charge of a vehicle—and I am not complaining about that—but on the other hand the Minister for Justice introduces a Bill that makes it necessary for the people of Brisbane to have a car to drive 40 miles out to get a drink. There appears to be a complete contradiction in that.

Mr. Bennett: Trying to get business for the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Mr. DUFFICY: There could be more revenue from drunken drivers. Apart from that, I am in favour of sessions throughout Queensland outside the 40-mile radius but I believe the principle should be extended to cover the whole of the State. I cannot see any justification for the argument that the geographical location of where a person lives should determine whether he is entitled to a drink.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (9.19 p.m.): I rise to resist most vigorously the statements that have been made by the hon. member for Warrego and in particular the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Davies: Yours is one of the Liberal seats we were talking about.

Mr. HUGHES: And it will be held for a long time by the present holder.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: Listening to the babble from the rabble on my right I am reminded of Oscar Wilde's reference to the English country gentleman galloping after a fox as being the unspeakable in pursuit of the uneatable. To adapt it to the babble on my right and to coin a comparable phrase, they are the unthinkable in search of the undrinkable. I have listened attentively to the debate today and I have heard members of the Opposition virtuously parading opposition to the Bill in general and certain clauses in particular. I wonder how sincere they are. If they are sincere, there is no doubt that they would not be moving an amendment to widen the sale of liquor on Sundays and ignoring possible detrimental repercussions to the youth of the State and particularly as they say it will mean greater revenue to the coffers of the Treasurer. If they are consistent in their view, I wonder why the amendment did not provide that there should be no sale of liquor on Sundays, why Sundays should not be kept dry instead of opening public houses. The arguments that have been put forward are irreconcilable, particularly those of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat.

Mr. Bennett: Do you agree with Sunday trading?

Mr. HUGHES: No.

Mr. Houston: Why did you not vote against the second reading of the Bill?

Mr. HUGHES: Because the principles of good government lay down that we must legislate for the general will and the common good, and I think this Bill does that. Convincing proof will be afforded at the ballot boxes in 1963 when the Government will undoubtedly be returned in greater strength.

The Bill, in the main, provides for a reconciling of the Act and democratic government under those principles. There are one or two clauses in the Bill on which hon. members on both sides of the Chamber might find reason for a personal difference of opinion, but I should like to commend the Minister who introduced it for his honesty and integrity and for the research he has conducted. Broadly speaking, I have supported the Bill and will continue to do so because there is so much in it that is worthwhile and because liquor legislation was long overdue for an overhaul in Queensland. That is obvious to anyone who has a reasonable degree of intelligence. I pay tribute also to Mrs. Gordon and Dr. Gibbs for their worthwhile contributions.

I am opposed to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I have conducted an intensive and widespread survey over quite a long period, not just the last few days or the last few weeks, and as a result of that I voice my disagreement with the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition and, as I indicated in reply to an interjection from the hon. member for South Brisbane, with Sunday drinking in its entirety.

Mr. Hanlon: Are you going to vote against the clause?

Mr. HUGHES: I am voting against the amendment without any qualification. All hon. members may not agree with the opinion that I express, but undoubtedly it should be the right of all hon. members to say what they think even if other hon. members do not agree with their opinions. I am here presenting not only my own views but also the consensus of opinion of the people whom I represent. If the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition were carried by the Committee, it could lead to a general Sunday-swill form of drinking. I believe it would have an unsavoury influence on youth in particular and on the community in general. There can be little doubt about that.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: Hon. members opposite want to talk about the sessions on the South Coast. Part of the law is being held in complete disrespect there, and I say that there should be a dry Sabbath. I believe that some aspects of drinking on the South Coast and at other resorts have been unsavoury, particularly amongst teenagers.

Mr. Houghton: Do you think this will improve the position?

Mr. HUGHES: If the amendment is carried, it certainly will not. It has been admitted by the hon. member for Warrego that he knows that Sunday drinking sessions have been taking place for a long time in his electorate. Let us be honest. Almost every hon. member knows of some hotel in Brisbane or outside of Brisbane that has been holding illegal drinking sessions. How many times on the Gold Coast have false names been entered in the travellers' book? How many times have the names of Nicklin, Morris and Munro appeared?

Mr. Gaven: Why go to the Gold Coast? That is done everywhere!

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Books everywhere are probably full of their names and other fictitious names and addresses. If carried the amendment would lead to scramble Sunday swill sessions. I am speaking to the amendment, not on the Bill as a whole. I have already commended the Bill as necessary and in the main, good legislation. We must give thought to young people. Much has been said about them already. Teenage drinking is known to be somewhat rife, particularly in parts of the Gold Coast and North Coast. I carried out a survey recently at one hotel. Obviously 80 per cent. of the drinkers were teenagers.

Mr. Graham: Did you look at their birth certificates?

Mr. HUGHES: I have a degree of common sense that does not apply to the hon. member. The hon. member must have a very wonderful wife because even the silliest woman can manage a very clever man but it takes a very clever woman to manage a fool.

We all remember the Beachcomber case and also others that could be mentioned.

Mr. Houston: The amendment does not cover the South Coast.

Mr. HUGHES: It does, and I am talking about the Opposition's amendment to open Sunday drinking throughout Queensland. I can visualise sessional drinking in some places adding to the toll on the highways. Much has been said by you, Mr. Dewar, about drink-driving and teenage drinking. It is known that you champion the cause of keeping children out of beer gardens to which I have been a vociferous supporter with you. The sessional type of drinking would not be conducive to more disciplined, well-ordered and dignified drinking. I am not a teetotaller. I believe I may be termed a social drinker. In fact I drink so little liquor that there has been a bottle of beer in my refrigerator at home since Christmas. I do not think young people without the experience of years, or the wisdom that comes with age, are in a position to recognise the dangers as you and I as mature adults are. The acceptance of the amendment would lead to the conversion of the Pacific and Bruce Highways into trails of terror.

Mr. Gaven: There is more teenage drinking in Maryborough than anywhere.

Mr. HUGHES: That should silence the hon. member from that area. If the whole of Queensland were to be embraced in the provision for Sunday drinking we would be worsening the ever-present drink-driving problem. If Sunday swill session drinking is to be confined to certain hours, irrespective of what they are, so many people will be on the road home after these drinking sessions that probably the Pacific Highway and the Bruce Highway will become known as the terror trails of tipsy teenagers. The 40-mile limit in terms of its original meaning would have been an appropriate provision for country travellers. Probably in the days that it was introduced it was thought it suited the occasion but in these days I do not think it does entirely because of high-powered motor-cars and light aeroplanes. We have, of course, recently increased the speed limit on our roads and this means that the distance aspect has not the same relationship to time as it had when it was originally written into the Act.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: If we had a helicopter we could drop the hon. member for Maryborough and do the greatest service of all time to the community.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dewar): I ask the hon. member to deal with the clause.

Mr. HUGHES: I could deal with the hon. member for Maryborough. The 40-mile limit as it applied over the whole of the State has lost its relationship of distance to time, as I indicated, because of the high-powered motor vehicles and other modern forms of travel. Much has been said about tourists. Even the hon. member for Warrego said that it was all right to drive from Brisbane outwards to get a drink beyond the 40-mile limit but one could not drive from outside into Brisbane and obtain a drink. Nothing could be further from the truth. I do not think he deliberately misled the Chamber but a person is certainly entitled to come into the city from outside and partake of alcoholic beverage whilst having a meal in a hotel.

If the hon. member does not agree with that provision to give a traveller an opportunity to drink with his meal after travelling 40 miles he must be considered as regarding it through the eyes of a man who simply wants facilities for drinking without eating rather than for drinking with a meal. Nothing could be worse than a law based on such a principle.

I oppose the principle outlined in the amendment, and, in fact, this section of the Act, because I do not agree with the open-house type of hotel trading on a Sunday. Does any hon. member think that anyone would be any the worse for not partaking of alcoholic beverage on a Sunday?

Mr. Davies: It is not for you to say.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not the judge. It is more a matter for individual discipline imposed on one's own conduct. With the trend in society in recent years I do not think we have seen a betterment in the standard of values but rather a worsening. In many ways we have seen a decline in the standard of values. In fact only recently I drew the attention of Parliament to the sale of salacious literature. Do not hon. members think that it is our duty as responsible legislators to deal with these problems and do all we possibly can not only to retain our standard of values but to raise them? Then we cannot only search our consciences——

Mr. Bennett: You would find nothing.

Mr. HUGHES: It would not worry the hon. member for South Brisbane who has no conscience, but I know I have, and I voice this opinion because I believe I am doing something worthwhile and sincere.

In conclusion, I believe that the majority of hotel-keepers do not prefer this move.

I have spoken to quite a number and although they have the right under the Bill not to open, I think that they prefer that there should be no right to open at all for trade. Many will open because the opposition hotel will do so and it will widen the matter considerably.

I think the Leader of the Opposition is misinformed when he says that every publican wants to trade. I do not think they do. I have spoken to a number who are against it. I have spoken to people in other sections of the community and I think I am echoing their views. It is probable that some people who drink alcoholic beverages on Sunday do so merely because it is available. Many of us have been to the Gold Coast and have witnessed the undesirable type of Sunday swill sessions that take place there. Surely that is not the standard we want generally throughout the community.

Mr. Houston: I take it you are going to vote against the amendment and the clause.

Mr. HUGHES: I have indicated my views. The hon. member for Bulimba reminds me of the person who walks about balancing his family tree on his nose. If he would come down to a common level and approach matters in a proper way, I am sure he would agree with me.

I commend the sincerity of the Minister. I am definitely against the amendment as I think most people in Queensland would not regret the closure of hotels on Sunday, and I was hopefult that hon. members opposite would agree with my submissions.

Mr. Davies: Have you ever been out on sheep stations and in the shearing sheds?

Mr. HUGHES: I have. I worked for two years in the shearing sheds and I travelled extensively throughout Queensland. I am no bloated capitalist and I could give the hon. member a lesson in shearing.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dewar): Order! There is nothing about shearing in the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I repeat that most people would not regret the closure of hotels on Sunday. Such a move may lead to an improvement in the sense of values and the outlook of the community generally, particularly the young people in whom I am very interested. Legislation should have the respect of the people and should be capable of enforcement. The Act as it stands is a farce. It is not being enforced by the police. I am more than hopeful that after the passage of the Bill the law will be rigorously enforced. The people will then have respect for the law and for good government.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (9.38 p.m.): I have listened with great interest to the speeches of all hon. members particularly the hon. member for Kurilpa. Government members have emphasised their concern for the youth of the community and have spoken a great deal about child delinquency. They seek the co-operation of youth organisations on ceremonial occasions, but since I have been a member of Parliament they have given very little, if any, financial assistance to youth clubs with a view to combating child delinquency. I approached the Minister for Public Lands in an effort to obtain a block of land for a youth organisation.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dewar): Order! There is nothing about land in the amendment. I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. NEWTON: I cannot understand why the Government have not taken into account in framing the legislation the tourist routes and scenic drives through and outside the metropolitan area. The Minister referred to built-up or residential areas. I could take him on a drive through Belmont. Six and a half miles from the G.P.O. he would find himself right out in the bush. The drive extends through Redland Bay and through a back route to Beenleigh. It is more than 40 miles, and not through a built-up area. A similar scenic route goes through Grovely and the crossings on the North and South Pine Rivers. People can go for scenic drives in those areas. I do not think the Government have studied the various drives that the R.A.C.Q. recommend people to take on Sunday. If people take these scenic drives why should they not have the same right as other people? It seems that if you do not go down to the South Coast, or up to the North Coast, there is no allowance made for drinking. The same principle applies when travelling from Cleveland through to the metropolitan area or down to Redcliffe. I do not go out on Sunday looking for a drink for I can find plenty of places through the week if I want a drink, but I have taken notice of what happens. The same principle applies to a journey from Ipswich to Brisbane. I am certain that Government members were thinking of putting a curfew in the metropolitan area, but they thought it would be a bit too hard to carry it into effect so they extended the boundary to some of the close local authority areas. However, the hotels in those areas do not have the same trade as metropolitan hotels but they have been forced by the Licensing Commission to make many improvements. I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition because I believe that people in the outer metropolitan area are entitled to the same privileges as those beyond the 40-mile limit. In my electorate, I have many small farmers and some of them work six and seven days a week. If they want to get into their cars and go for a drive on Sunday afternoon I believe they are entitled to have a drink if they want one.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (9.43 p.m.): When one listens to the Minister and the hon. member for Kurilpa one would think it was the A.L.P. who had brought before the people in Brisbane the question of whether or not they should have a drink on Sunday in the 40-mile area. This Bill has been brought before us by the Government after four years of doddering and, generally speaking, as the Minister has said, waiting for a decision from the High Court on the validity of licensing fees. The Opposition say that that decision is the basis of the Bill, that all other things are just camouflage. For some time it was speculated in the Press, and rumoured in Parliamentary circles that the Government would introduce Sunday drinking almost to the verge of the boundary of Brisbane, but they introduced the provision about the 40-mile radius and brought it to the attention of the public. Apart from those hotels serving liquor with meals there may have been isolated hotels also serving liquor and before this Bill was introduced some people may have known where to get a drink but generally speaking, the average person in Brisbane did not think very much about having a drink on Sunday. The only time that it was drawn to his attention was when isolated raids were carried out by the licensing police on golf clubs and bowling clubs. Under this Government there seems to have been a prearranged pattern and no prosecutions followed as a consequence. The Government have now brought to the notice of the people the "carrot" of having a drink on Sunday because they have given their blessing to the principle of Sunday drinking in the major portion of the State. As the hon. member for Warrego and the Leader of the Opposition said, in the sparsely populated areas in the Far West, Sunday drinking sessions have been the rule for some time. Very few people, except those with the most extreme temperance views, would say that there is not some cause for a relaxed attitude on Sunday drinking in those areas. It is when you start to bring this more-or-less permitted practice of Sunday drinking in those areas, where there is a general case for it, because of geographical conditions, to the doorstep of the metropolitan area, to the south-eastern corner of the State, that you immediately transform the question. It is possibly for that reason that the Labour Government, far from not having the political courage to deal with the matter, as the Minister alleges, thought they had better let it continue as it had been for a number of years.

What have this Government achieved in supposedly bringing a commonsense approach to bear on the problem? They are making the position more anomalous than ever by extending Sunday drinking from the Far West and Far North of the State to the doorstep of Brisbane and then slamming the brakes on and saying, "It must stop here." Anybody can see that what has made them stop is the fact that the great political opposition to Sunday drinking is concentrated in and about the metropolitan area.

Mr. Ramsden: Do you really believe that? Then why are you moving that it be thrown open to the whole of Brisbane?

Mr. HANLON: Apparently the hon. member does not realise the point. I am suggesting that the great opposition politically—and I am not saying this in any way disparagingly—the head centres of great activity in the temperance movement are in the metropolitan area and nearby. The Government realise that, while in the Far North and Far West in particular people who have over the years more or less accepted Sunday drinking sessions as being something that was legally illegal, even if they have temperance convictions, do not feel any sense of shock at this proposal to amend the law, when it comes to the metropolitan area there would be a great deal more political opposition. This Government, who claim to have the courage to deal with the matter, have only made a greater anomaly than ever.

All we are doing in the amendment is again testing the sincerity of the Government. Whether they like it or not, they have said they think there is nothing wrong in principle with Sunday drinking. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, if they bring the area down to just outside Caboolture or to Beerwah on the Bruce Highway, to Southport, and to Gatton or wherever it might be on the Western Highway, and if they relax the Sunday drinking laws within specified hours as close as that to Brisbane, it is no good saying they are not introducing the principle of Sunday drinking.

The hon. member for Kurilpa rose to oppose the amendment but made a very strong attack on the clause itself. He said he believes in a dry Sunday, whether it is in Camooweal, or Coolangatta, or anywhere else, and I challenge him to deny it. In other words, he is against the Government on the clause and it will be interesting to see how he stands by his convictions. He has said he is against Sunday drinking in any part of the State.

All we are doing is saying to the Government that if they approve of Sunday drinking they should make it uniform. If they do not approve of it, they should not have introduced the clause providing for Sunday drinking up to a 40-mile radius of the Brisbane G.P.O.

The Minister spoke of the needs of sparsely-populated areas and nobody on this side of the Chamber has denied the case for them, but it is interesting to note that when this Government were redistributing electoral boundaries they gave an extra four seats to the metropolitan area and took one from the country areas. I do not want to go into a discussion of boundaries of one description or another but the same principle

comes into the subdivision of the State into electorates as comes into Sunday drinking. When it came to the question of boundaries, the Liberal Party demanded that Brisbane should have four more seats. But when it comes to provisions under the Liquor Act they say there is no need for facilities in Brisbane, they are needed only in the sparsely populated areas. We do not think the Government can have it both ways.

Hon. members opposite will endeavour to say that the Labour Party is opening up the whole State to Sunday drinking. All we are saying is that there should be uniformity on this matter. I ask hon. members opposite not to forget that we opposed the second reading of the Bill and said that it was more or less a mess that would not solve the problem. Having failed to prevent the second reading, we are now trying at this late stage to force the Government to face up to matters of principle—their own making—that are contained in the Bill. We say it is quite wrong in principle to introduce the clause in this form. If the Government had not the courage to adopt a uniform policy, they would have been better advised to leave the law alone. In giving their blessing to Sunday drinking, they are making people in Brisbane think about drinking on Sunday. I should not be surprised if there were quite an exodus of people who have not even thought of it, apart from those who are now being encouraged to drive 40 miles to get it. It will be brought home to them because people in other parts of the State will be able to get a drink.

Mr. Ramsden: You are very naive.

Mr. HANLON: I may be very naive, but I hope I shall never be as naive as the hon. member for Merthyr. I hope that that is one fate I escape before I pass on. I think it is only common sense that a person does not miss something he has not had. But if he is driving a 1957 Holden, what makes him want to buy a 1960 Holden, which is virtually the same car, although his own car is running well? It is because he sees the man next door with the 1960 model or because he passes them in the street. He knows that they are being sold. If the news comes out——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is extending his analogy a little too far.

Mr. HANLON: With due respect to you, Mr. Taylor, I am only pointing out that a person wants something only because he sees it around him or close to him, or because his neighbour has it. The same principle applies to Sunday drinking. People who have not thought of drinking on Sundays previously will have the matter drawn to their attention. I am not saying that there will be a mass evacuation of people from Brisbane on Sundays to look for a drink, but there will be an inclination to say, "Well, we can get a drink at Beerwah or somewhere else. Let us hop in the car and go for a drive and take advantage of the facilities for drinking." As the hon. member for Warrego pointed out, if a person living four miles outside the 40-mile radius drives 10 miles inside, he cannot get a drink. For instance, somebody living four miles on the other side of Beerwah who drives 44 miles to Brisbane will not be able to get a drink unless he has a meal. On the other hand, somebody who lives at Caboolture will be able to drive eight miles out and have a drink without having a meal or anything else. The whole situation is full of anomalies.

Apart from those who may be encouraged to drive and get a drink outside the 40-mile radius, I would not be surprised to see an influx of non-playing members into golf and bowling clubs. Anybody who has been to golf clubs knows that there are many people who play very little golf. I am not saying that that applies to the majority of members of golf clubs, but anybody who plays golf can go out and play 18 holes, and come back, and see the same people still drinking there who were drinking when he went out.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think we deal with that question later.

Mr. HANLON: I am linking it up, Mr. Taylor. I am not dealing specifically with the provisions relating to golf clubs and bowling clubs, but if somebody living in Brisbane is the guest of a member of a bowling club or a golf club he will be able to drink for 4 hours between 12 and 7. On the other hand, if he is not a member or has no member to take him there as a guest, that facility will not be available to him. I do not blame the golf clubs and bowling clubs. They want additional revenue for better greens and various facilities.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have explained to the hon. member that that matter will be dealt with later.

Mr. HANLON: It is linked up with this clause. If I am living next door to you, Mr. Taylor, and I know Mr. Houston, a member of a golf club, he can take me to his golf club on Sunday where I can drink for four hours, without ever hitting a golf ball. Because I am his guest he can leave me drinking while he plays his 18 holes. If I were so affected by the four hours' drinking I could go home sozzled. On the other hand, not being a member of a golf club (I do not know whether you are or not), and not having a friend in a golf club, you could not have a drink at all.

As the hon. member for Warrego pointed out, we are not opposed to people having a drink on Sundays after they have played hard sport. On the other hand, the man

who knocks off after eight hours' hard work should be just as much entitled to a drink as the man who plays golf. Again the member of a golf club does not even have to play a game to give him the right to drink in the club. If I were the secretary of a golf club and trying to obtain the finance for a new clubhouse I would encourage my members to bring friends along on Sundays, even though they might not play golf. The Bill encourages that. The Government have given their blessing to Sunday drinking, therefore people are going to be encouraged to drink more. Golf and bowling clubs will take advantage of that fact in the areas that are not permitted areas for the ordinary citizen. They will encourage members to bring friends with them. A member of this House could invite three or four other hon. members, who were not members of a golf club, to accompany him to such-and-such a golf club. "If you want a drink get in the car and come with me. You can drink for four hours while I am playing my game, and then I will drive you back to Parliament House." Unless they are members of a golf club or bowling club there is no provision for those hon. members to drink at all. Whichever way you look at it there are anomalies. It is no use the Government's trying to put the responsibility on to the Australian Labour Party to say where any particular line should be drawn. We have moved the amendment purely and simply on the Government's own action in the pattern they have set for Sunday drinking. We challenge them to face up to the consequences of their own legislation. We ask them not to bring in such anomalous provisions as they are suggesting in Clause 41.

You have already reminded me that I was wandering on to other matters, Mr. Taylor but let me point out that I consider that Clause 41 is much too big. Any number of different principles is involved. For the convenience of the Committee, to enable the various matters to be discussed separately, apart from the amendment, it would have been much more preferable had it been split into various clauses dealing with different principles.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barrambah) (10 p.m.): Many and varied views have, and no doubt will, be expressed about the amendment before the Committee. Whatever may be said no-one can deny that the whole subject of Sunday drinking is a contentious one that must be approached by any responsible Government with very serious thought and consideration. This amendment seeks to extend the opportunities for Sunday drinking to everybody. In some respects, on the surface of it, that appears to be a logical argument. The hon. member for Warrego stressed the question, "How can we justify sectional legislation?" Not only does sectional legislation apply in this Bill but, in some respects, in other legislation. It applies in regard to the State Transport tax, for instance. I am sure that hon. members who argue this way would not say that State transport fees should apply in Brisbane and other towns as they do in country districts. The metropolitan and other municipal areas have special advantages and privileges that do not apply in country areas so that we have not, at any time, uniform legislation affecting everyone in the State equally.

Should the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition be carried it still would not satisfy many people. I have had it said to me by many, "Why should we not be free to drink when and where we want to? We are living in a democracy. Why all the legislation and laws contained in this Bill?" Admittedly, we recognise the fact that the individual is free to drink within limits when he so desires. On the other hand, as a Government, we have our responsibility to protect the people from themselves as far as possible.

That principle applies not only with drinking with which this amendment deals, but in many other ways of life. We protect people with our traffic laws; we protect them in relation to hygiene throughout the State. There are protective restrictions in relation to how one flies in and out of an airport. I know only too well that the individual cannot please himself how he approaches an airport or flies over a built-up area. So, we must have various clauses in a Bill such as this, in an endeavour to protect people from themselves.

Mr. Houston: Why should the people of Brisbane require more protection than those in the rest of the State?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: In built-up areas there is greatly increased traffic on Sundays and, if the results of drinking are added in those areas there will certainly be more tragedies and a greater accident rate.

Mr. Houston: Are you trying to persuade this Chamber that there is more traffic in Brisbane on Sunday than on the South Coast?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The traffic on the South Coast comes from various towns and most of it from Brisbane. Not only am I against the amendment, but I, personally, am against trading on Sunday generally. I know that does not concern some hon. members, but I say it in passing.

Mr. Houston: You are against the clause, too.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is O.K.; I know that and so does the hon. member. I believe that hon. members generally have not considered Sunday trading in all its aspects. Its effect could be to change the whole character of our Sundays.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want the hon. member to develop a speech on the clause generally. He must speak to the amendment. He can speak to the clause later.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The amendment purports to satisfy a desire by people

in the city and other municipal areas for the same facilities to drink as are being extended to country residents. In the face of the arguments and statements advanced by previous speakers in justification of it or otherwise, I should point out the moral aspect of drinking on Sundays in particular areas. The Rev. Keith Braithwaite dealt specifically and realistically with Sunday drinking in the following article that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" yesterday:—

> "The whole character of Sunday is threatened.
>
> "This is a serious matter with inevitable and far reaching consequences affecting the moral fibre of the people generally and the lives of each one of us.
>
> "Sunday, as a day with a difference, is a valuable part of the life of the State especially where the emphasis, alongside the need to worship, is on the strengthening of the family unit and the welfare of human society, generally.
>
> "Unfortunately, it cannot be claimed that, as a people, we have recognised this and utilised Sunday for the common good. Rather the evidence is to the contrary in that it seems as though Sunday is becoming more and more a replica of Saturday."

He went on to say—

> "The treachery lies in the threat to the wholesome character of Sunday with the accompanying detriment to society."

The amendment seeks to extend drinking facilities within the 40-mile radius. We often say that Communists are trying to destroy our way of life. The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition would have a tendency to destroy the sanctity of Sunday and to break down the invisible barrier that we have through the teachings of Christianity. In that respect the amendment seeks to destroy our way of life.

I could dwell at length on the subject. I appreciate the opportunity of emphasising the spiritual aspect. It must be taken into account in any proposal for an extension of drinking facilities on Sunday within the confines of the city and surrounding districts.

Governments over the years have been concerned about how far they should go in extending facilities for Sunday drinking. The present Government were confronted with the same problem when they assumed office. Something had to be done about it.

Mr. Tucker: What brought you to that position?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: A former Labour Government of which no doubt the hon. member was a supporter, as a member of the A.L.P., introduced legislation and said in effect, "You can go so far and no further." The hon. member for Warrego tried to tell us that Sunday drinking sessions have taken place only in the last few years. In fact for years while the previous Government were in office, little by little, and here and there, the law at that time was ignored and Sunday drinking became the custom. Some people say we are becoming accustomed to civilised drinking, but it cannot be denied that drink is one of the greatest instruments of self-harm and destruction. I doubt whether we are doing the right thing in regard to the problem. On Sundays the volume of road traffic increases greatly, particularly in the metropolitan area and surrounding districts. We, as legislators, should do as much as possible to limit the effects of drinking. No-one can deny the serious consequences, particularly at the week-end, when people get together more than at other times. Many of us could speak at length on the tragedies that occur at week-ends on our roads because of the facilities and opportunities available for drinking in spite of the law. The present tragedies caused by drink are terrible enough, and as legislators we shoulder a very grave responsibility in extending the facilities. A much more important effect of extending these facilities—if it is carried out as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters—will be the breaking down of the value of what Sunday means in our community, and making it more like any other day, thus destroying one of the Christian principles on which society has been built and is maintained. For those reasons, I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) (10.12 p.m.): I rise to support the amendment. When one listens to some of the speakers on the Government side it appears that they are very concerned with the possible deterioration in the quality of the people within the 40-mile radius. We do not believe that at all. We believe that the people of Queensland, from the North to the South and from the East to the West, are of equal quality. That is our reason for moving the amendment.

The Minister said that the main reason for introducing this provision was that the Act was not capable of being enforced. The members of the Country Party-Liberal Government are far from being unanimous on this clause. The people of Queensland know that there has been a movement among members of the Government parties to adopt the amendment moved by the Australian Labour Party. Members of the Police Force in Queensland would disagree entirely with the suggestion that they are unable to enforce the Act. I believe that they could enforce it. Whether the line of demarcation is 40 miles, or 60 miles the principle is the same. We will hurt or injure some people whether we have a 60-, a 40-, or a 10-mile radius. I believe that all the people in Queensland are entitled to the same treatment. If the Minister says that it is not possible now for the Act to be

policed in the metropolitan area, or beyond the 40-mile radius, how will this law be policed?

Mr. Hughes: You must give your name and address now. You will not have to do that under the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE: I fail to see how the Bill can be policed while the Act cannot.

In the metropolitan area of Brisbane we will see a great deal more plonk and metho. drinking than ever before in the history of Brisbane. There will be many more people lining up on Monday morning and many more people's names appearing in the Press as those forfeiting their bail. Legislation of this sort will not appeal to the drinking community or the hotel-keepers whose trade is at present being restricted as compared with other sections of the community.

It seems to me that a heavy restriction is being placed on people within the prescribed radius because it will be possible under the Bill to drive 79 miles on a Sunday and still not get a drink. On my interpretation the 40-mile radius from the General Post Office means an 80-mile round trip and I think that is very inconsiderate and unfair.

Mr. Pizzey: You could go in reverse for a mile and get a drink.

Mr. WALLACE: You might be at the post office and have to drive 40 miles to get a drink and 40 miles back, whereas under the present law you can drive 20 miles from wherever you are and drive the 20 miles back and then be legally entitled to a drink. I think that is stupid and unreasonable.

I am strongly reminded of the law as it affects people in the Torres Strait islands. When hon. members opposite hear this they might alter their opinion and be inclined to vote with the Opposition. Under the Bill people in every section of the State except within the 40-mile radius will be able to get a drink during four hours on any Sunday. They will be able to drink quite openly and without interference in hotels. In Brisbane people will dive in the back door somewhere and will regard themselves as lucky if they do not get caught. A similar position applies to the people of the Torres Strait islands. Under the present set-up the inhabitants of two of the islands are permitted to drink liquor of any type and to drink it in the hotels on Thursday Island, or in any other part of Queensland for that matter, because they are considered under the Act to be free people. In my view all the people of Queensland are entitled to be regarded as free and those in any one section of the State are entitled to the same amenities as those in any other section. The same applies to those people in the Torres Strait islands.

Mr. Hughes: You mean the natives from the islands?

Mr. WALLACE: Those who are not free cannot drink in the hotels and they cannot take liquor to their islands. But they defy the law. They take liquor to their islands and they drink in the hotels. It is not possible to enforce the Act. After all, if they come to the mainland who can say which island they came from? They could tell you they came from Hammond or from any other island and you would not know. So they drink in hotels in Queensland wherever they go.

I take strong exception to this very retrograde provision in the Bill. It puts free people in the same category as declared people.

Mr. Hughes: Are you in favour of permitting aboriginals from Yarrabah mission to drink?

Mr. WALLACE: I will have plenty to say about Yarrabah later but just now I am drawing a comparison between people in the State who come under the same law. All are entitled to be treated as free people.

Everybody knows that I support liquor reform, and most hon. members know that I spoke very strongly on the Liquor Bill that was introduced in 1958. I spoke then on many of the matters that are contained in this Bill and perhaps at a later stage in the debate I may have an opportunity to refer to them. Instead of there having been a decline in the standards of the people of Brisbane, as charged by some Government members, to my mind there has been a very great decline in the thinking of the Government about this part of the Bill. By bringing in this provision they are depriving certain people of their inherent rights as free citizens of the State. That is one of the principal reasons why hon. members on this side of the Chamber support the amendment.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (10.21 p.m.): In rising to speak against the amendment I may say that never since I have been in the House have I seen so much twisting and turning and squirming as we have seen on this issue. I remind you, Mr. Taylor, that at the introductory stage hon. members opposite voted for the introduction of the Bill and that on the second reading they voted against it. Now, in the Committee stage, they have brought out amendment after amendment.

The hon. member for Baroona spoke in no uncertain terms of challenging the sincerity of the Government in this matter, and I shall come back to that in a moment. I believe that every member of the Government feels a great deal of sympathy for the outlook expressed by the hon. member for Barambah, because we realise that this is a controversial and touchy subject and that whatever is done will not satisfy everybody. For 25 years the Opposition, now two parties instead of one, closed their eyes and said that Sunday trading did not exist.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are dealing with an amendment to a clause, not with the second reading.

Mr. RAMSDEN: No, but I want to link my remarks with what hon. members opposite did in the past. I think I am in order in speaking on Sunday trading.

On page 1634 of Vol. 210 of "Hansard", 1954-1955, the then Minister, Mr. Power, who was the hon. member for Baroona, speaking on the Liquor Acts Amendment Bill, said—

> "Many remote parts of the State are entitled to special consideration. I do not think we should be justified in telling hotel proprietors to remain open to 10 p.m. in remote parts of the State, where perhaps the greatest part of the business is done at the week-end, or rather on Saturday. I correct myself there because I have no knowledge of its going on at the week-end."

Mr. Sparkes, who was then member for Aubigny, said, "You have a good idea." The Minister replied, "I will accept the word of the hon. member for Aubigny that it does take place." I submit that that shows that the Opposition, who were then in government, knew that it was going on but did not have the courage to tackle it. In spite of the allegation of the hon. member for Baroona about their insincerity the Government have had the courage to tackle the problem. I do not believe that the Opposition is at all sincere.

Mr. Bennett: Do you agree with the Bill?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Of course I agree with the Bill. The Opposition is not at all sincere. On the one hand hon. members opposite tell us they are against the Bill, yet when we come to this amendment they want to extend further the facilities for Sunday drinking.

Mr. Davies: We told you that the delineation was one of the reasons why we voted against the Bill.

Mr. RAMSDEN: As the Minister has said repeatedly in the course of the debate, hon. members opposite are now playing politics, and they are playing a very cagey game and walking a very tight rope.

Mr. Davies: You said we had congratulated you on the Bill. That is not true, and it appears in "Hansard".

Mr. RAMSDEN: I do not know whether the hon. member is correct in saying it is recorded in "Hansard". If it is there, it is not true. Despite all the interjections from the hon. member for Maryborough, the Opposition are quite insincere in their amendment. If they thought they had the slightest chance of having it accepted they would not have moved it.

Mr. Houston: What makes you think that?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Because the hon. member for Baroona has already said it would be politically unpopular to open the city to full Sunday trading. They are his words, not mine. He asks the Committee to believe that he is sincere in trying to get support for an amendment that he himself said was the most unpopular amendment politically that could have been brought before the Committee. The Opposition are not sincere. They moved it only because they knew it would not be acceptable to the Government, and, indeed, it would not be acceptable even to the people in the city of Brisbane.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (10.27 p.m.): We have had the misfortune to be in Opposition over the years but whatever we have done we have always been sincere. I assure the hon. member for Merthyr that if he were as sincere in his approach to these matters as we are, the State would be a lot better for it.

There are many features of the Bill with which we were not at all happy. Having failed in our main opposition to the Bill it is now our duty to do the best we can for the people we represent. Some clauses have already been passed, some of them sectional in their effect. We are opposed to sectional legislation.

Mr. Hughes: You are in favour of Sunday swills.

Mr. HOUSTON: I shall deal with that later. Had the Government brought down legislation giving special consideration to the Far Northern and Western parts of the State because of the type of work that the people are engaged in, and the conditions under which they work, our action may have been entirely different. But the Minister has not been able to convince us that that was the reason for it. It has become very obvious that the reason for this clause is to curry favour with all sections but no Government can be on side with every section with legislation of this kind. The clause was brought in to favour some of their rebels. The hon. member for South Coast is one of them——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member not to bring in personalities.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not bringing in personalities. Why favour the South Coast? By no stretch of the imagination could it be said that on the South Coast men are working under the same conditions as men in the West and North. Nor can it be said that the South Coast is very greatly different from Redcliffe as a tourist attraction. Certainly there is surf on the South Coast but Redcliffe has calm water. Many people with young children prefer calm water. In justice to Redcliffe it must be remembered that even the Minister said that Redcliffe would blossom into a great township in the future. We might agree. Therefore, there is no great difference between Redcliffe and the South Coast except in representation.

The hon. member for Barambah said he opposed the amendment because he wishes to protect people against themselves. I do not see any reason why the people of Brisbane should need more protection against themselves than do the people of South Coast or Toowoomba, or any other part of the State. I suggest it is completely wrong to argue such a principle.

Mr. Hughes: He was speaking for the people throughout Queensland generally.

Mr. HOUSTON: Therefore he should oppose the clause, but he has not said that he opposes anything but the amendment.

I can assure him and other hon. members that the Opposition does not seek to destroy the Christian Sunday. However, we believe there are practices that will emerge from this provision that will break the Christian Sunday and force many more people to travel long distances to partake of strong drink and come home in a condition that will tend to increase accidents. We want to discourage such things as much as possible. If we could see that this legislation was not discriminatory we would not have moved this amendment. The hon. member for Barambah was completely wrong in suggesting that as a reason for our moving it.

What will happen, in fact, if this amendment is not carried? I and my family, for instance, might visit a friend in Southport, and quite properly under this legislation, my friend and I might go to a hotel to have a drink if we both so desire. On another Sunday, he might visit me in Brisbane and what will happen? He can go to a hotel and have a drink provided he has some lunch with it, and I cannot. How ridiculous can we get?

Mr. Hughes: You can have it with your meals.

Mr. HOUSTON: This Government are telling the people of Brisbane that because we live in Brisbane we have that Brisbane temperament, if you like, and are not capable of having a drink unless we have a meal. How will that affect persons outside of Brisbane? According to the hon. member for Kurilpa's argument, if they live outside of Brisbane they do not require food with their drink in order to keep them sober. This is definitely sectional legislation, proved by the example I gave. My friend can come to Brisbane and I cannot offer him similar hospitality to what I received when I visit him.

In Brisbane there are many people working shift work. It is necessary for people to work on Sunday to keep our industries such as wharves, meatworks and others, and our transport systems, going. The court, admittedly, treats it as a special day by awarding extra remuneration for it, but those workmen get just as hot and just as tired as workmen do on any other day and they would be more entitled to a drink on a Sunday than a person who plays golf or bowls.

By those remarks I am not suggesting that I personally am or am not in favour of any particular provision. I am simply pointing out the anomalies we are trying to overcome, one of which arises in relation to different sports. Are those who play golf or bowls to be allowed by later clauses in the Bill to have a drink whilst those who play football are not?

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. HOUSTON: Very well, I will not persist with that. I understand that in Brisbane after the passage of certain by-laws certain sporting meetings may be conducted legally on Sundays. Brisbane will be the only part of the State where that state of affairs will operate.

Mr. Evans: You are quite wrong when you say that.

Mr. HOUSTON: I may be. The hon. gentleman may know more about it than I do. My point is that sport on Sunday will be legal.

Mr. Hughes: Mostly sport played by minors in public parks.

Mr. HOUSTON: I thought the hon. member would come in on that point, but I point out that many minors play golf on Sundays. I cannot see why there should be differentiation between those who play one sport and those who play another.

I asked the Minister at the introductory stage to explain the reason for the 40-mile limit. He said that was the provision in the existing legislation for Sunday drinking for travellers. During the Second Reading he gave a different reason, and at the commencement of the present stage a further reason. I still do not know why the 40-mile limit should be selected. The Government have selected the 40-mile limit in order to bring in the South Coast. That is the crux of the position. Hon. members may say that if the amendment is carried Sunday drinking will apply throughout the State. That will be the position if the Bill is passed, except in a very small part of the south-east corner of Queensland. This is only a small dot on the map.

Mr. Gaven: The most valuable part of the State.

Mr. HOUSTON: That may be so, but how is that relevant to the amendment?

Mr. Gaven: The workers who could not get a drink down there under your legislation will now be able to get a drink.

Mr. HOUSTON: The working class has made the State what it is. The legislation is

not designed to cater for the wishes of Queenslanders; it is put forward purely in the interests of visitors who patronise the South Coast.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (10.38 p.m.): In rising to support the amendment I am tempted to comment on the Minister's reference to time-wasting by Opposition members. His remark could be applied to two Government members who spoke a short time ago, because the basis of their argument was that the amendment, if carried, would lead to desecration of the Sabbath. They tried to distort the truth by putting the blame for desecration of the Sabbath on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. On their argument the clause as it stands will lead to desecration of the Sabbath in country areas. The claim of the hon. member for Barambah was completely without foundation. The hon. member for Merthyr criticised the Opposition for moving amendment after amendment after opposing the Second Reading of the Bill. Why should we not oppose the Second Reading of it and then during the present stage introduce amendments? There is so much wrong with the Bill that we must do the best we can with the opportunities available to us. It is admitted that people in country areas live and work under different conditions from people in the city areas, but there is no just cause for discrimination between people living in different parts of the State. If a line was drawn well away from the metropolitan area it is possible we would have no complaint about it, but it is very difficult to conceive that persons living 40 miles from Brisbane are working under conditions comparable with those in the far-flung parts of the State. Indeed, this provision can only lead one to conclude that by this legislation the Government are trying to have two bob each way. The Minister said that he was merely making lawful what had been practised for years. In my opinion, he was backing those sections of the State which enjoyed illegal trading, and, at the same time, as the hon. member for Baroona pointed out, he was also backing the temperance people in the metropolitan area where most of the opposition to the Bill could come from. It is quite evident that the Government are having two bob each way. That is why we believe in all sincerity, that we should move this amendment. If the Government were genuinely interested in liquor reform they would know it is not a question of discriminating between persons in different areas, but a question of whether it is morally right to drink on a Sunday or not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is not the subject of the amendment. The amendment deals with permitted areas and I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to that subject.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am trying to tie it up.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the hon. member that many of the arguments he is using have been used already. I ask him to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that organised parties will not leave the city because of the proximity of permitted areas to indulge in these sessions, and then return in heavy traffic with genuine Sunday travellers coming home from the Coast. The Minister admitted that the existing law cannot be policed, but this Bill will create a greater hazard. It will necessitate greater policing of the traffic laws. By moving the amendment we believe that we will remove the temptation for people to go into the country to indulge in swill sessions and return under the influence, in charge of a motor car. It is anomalous that it may be morally right to drink in the country, and yet not morally right to drink in the city area. We should not discriminate between persons living in different parts of the State. We are sincere in our desire to bring about liquor reform and by moving the amendment we believe we will stop many improper practices.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (10.45 p.m.): I support the amendment moved by my leader. Although Townsville is one of the areas fortunate enough to be permitted Sunday drinking—and I have no argument with that except perhaps on the subject of hours, which I shall deal with later—we do not regard ourselves for one moment as being prevented from feeling that the Bill discriminates against those people within the 40-mile radius of the Brisbane G.P.O. and from voicing our protest at the discrimination. If it is good enough for the people of Townsville to have a drink on Sunday it should be good enough for the people of this area. If the argument holds good in one direction it must hold good in another. It is a case of one for all and all for one.

In speaking of the 40-mile limit the hon. member for Kurilpa advanced the interests of teenagers as one of the reasons in support of his argument. Does he think that Townsville, a city of 50,000 people, has no teenagers? Does he think they could not be contaminated?

Mr. HUGHES: I rise to a point of order. I am being misquoted by the hon. member. I did not advance the suggestions as outlined by him. I spoke against Sunday swill sessions and teenage drinking on Sunday throughout the whole of Queensland and advanced suggestions for a dry Sabbath.

Mr. TUCKER: As I heard the hon. member, he was speaking about teenagers in this area; but I do not advance that argument against Townsville. I am in agreement with what is going on up there.

Mr. Hughes: Do you allow teenage drinking in Townsville on Sunday?

Mr. TUCKER: The hon. member is trying to entice me into saying something he can use against me in the future, and which he knows to be particularly stupid. No person of correct thinking would favour it, but he introduced the subject.

The hon. member for Merthyr spoke of what he alleged the A.L.P. had done in the past. I do not agree with him but, irrespective of what we did——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Townsville North will observe that the hon. member for Merthyr was checked in referring to the previous Government in those terms and I do not think it is necessary for him to pursue that argument.

Mr. TUCKER: All I want to say about it is that even if he could fairly advance that argument against us—and I do not accept that for a moment—I cannot see that two wrongs would make a right.

The Minister said the Act could not be enforced. The present Government have had four years now to prove——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Again I must remind the hon. member that we are not dealing with the question of enforcing the Act. We are dealing with permitted areas.

Mr. TUCKER: I believe it was part and parcel of the argument put forward by the Minister when speaking of the provision. If the Minister claims that the Act could not be policed previously, the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will certainly help him in that direction. Discriminatory practices will undoubtedly take place under the provisions of the Bill, because certain sessions will be allowed in certain parts of the State—a session in the morning and a session in the afternoon—and in the Brisbane area no sessions will be allowed. If it is hard to police the provisions of the Act, how much harder will it be to police the provisions contained in the Bill that allow certain things to happen in some places and not in others. If the Minister is sincere in his statements, the amendment must make it easier because it provides for a blanket cover for the whole State. I believe that the police think that this clause and other clauses of the Bill will make the Act difficult to police. In the area within the 40-mile radius of the G.P.O. people in charge of hotels and in other places will rise up and say, "We have been discriminated against." There will be no way of telling them otherwise, because in moving round the State one hears talk like that everywhere. I say to the Minister through you, Mr. Taylor, that no Act will ever work if the people think it is unjust and discriminates against them. Eventually in the area of the 40-mile radius opposition will grow and people will say, "If people on the South Coast and outside the 40-mile radius are able to drink on Sundays, we will test it by opening our hotels." I think the Minister is creating a Frankenstein monster that will eventually gobble up the Government. Unless the people think the Act is just, they will rise up and make a test of this 40-mile radius and the whole Act will fall down. If the Minister pushes this clause through, as I believe he will, by weight of numbers, how will he police it? Will he police the 40-mile radius to the strict letter of the law or with common sense?

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (10.54 p.m.): You have been faced with some very interesting situations in the Chair from time to time, Mr. Taylor, and you have been called upon to give some very interesting rulings, and I expect that as the debate proceeds and the division is taken on this clause, a very interesting situation could emerge, because two hon. members on the Government benches have spoken not only against the amendment but also against the clause. I know, as you know, Mr. Taylor, that Standing Order No. 155 provides that if they call "Yea" or "Nay," as the case may be, in a division, they must vote accordingly. So I shall be interested to see whether the hon. member for Kurilpa and the hon. member for Barambah call "Yea" or "Nay" when the amendment is submitted and when the clause is submitted. I ask hon. members on this side of the Committee to watch that particularly, because I will be expecting them to vote against the clause.

There is no question that, as it stands, the clause does provide for discrimination between the citizens of Queensland. The amendment seeks to rectify that in some way by, in effect, creating the whole of the State as the permitted area. I cannot see anything unusual in that request. After all, it is hard for anyone here to arrive at a conclusion as to how the Government are able to sustain the discrimination provided by the clause. The Minister gave as one of the reasons for the clause the fact that there was a travellers' section in the Act; he is extending that principle so that it will be applicable to the area provided in the clause. As the Minister considers that the travellers' section is no longer useful there is no reason why he should not do away with it altogether. The obvious way to do away with it is to create the whole of the State as the permitted area, not to be fiddling about with the clause as he is. He is laying down a principle that could create many difficulties in Queensland in the future. He is dividing the State into zones or areas, saying that you can drink in this part of the State and not in that part. Eventually the Minister may find that he is responsible for the creation of such an anomalous position in the State that the matter has to be referred to the United Nations. We know about the Congo and Katanga.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to restrict his remarks to permitted areas.

Mr. WALSH: I am. You know as well as I do that the situation in Africa arose because of the division of the territories over there. The Government here seek to divide the State according to the rights of the individual to consume liquor in this or that part. The hon. member for Barcoo interjects that it is something along the lines of the New State movement. I think it could be appropriately connected with the famous Brisbane Line.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Brisbane Line is not remotely connected with the permitted area.

Mr. WALSH: To be frank, I do not know where the line is. I do not know that any other hon. member knows where it is. All I can say is that it is within a radius of 40 miles from the General Post Office in Queen Street in the city of Brisbane. According to the position as outlined by the hon. member for Cairns you would have to travel 79 miles. On somebody else's mathematical calculation that would not be so at all, but if you travelled from point X it might be less or more. To do away with all this discrimination I think the Minister might give favourable consideration to the amendment submitted by the Leader of the Opposition. It is a fair proposal. I should not be surprised if the hon. member for Redcliffe moves an amendment. In anticipation of what the hon. member for Redcliffe may move, to beat him I suggest that the Minister might agree to the present amendment.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (11 p.m.): I think we must seriously look at the implications of this provision of a 40-mile limit. I think the Government have given very little consideration to its effect. As has been pointed out by some members of the Government, there are areas in the country in Queensland that, because of their remoteness, are entitled to some consideration in relation to drinking on Sundays. We cannot apply those conditions to cities like Townsville, Rockhampton, Toowoomba and Cairns.

There has been an attempt made to compare the positions in Brisbane with the rest of Queensland and the position as between cities like Townsville and Rockhampton and the rest of Queensland, but I should say that cities like Rockhampton and Townsville are comparable with Brisbane and I do not see any reason why Brisbane should be singled out for differential treatment under this provision.

We have to consider the effect of this Bill on the drinking habits in Brisbane. As far as I can see, we will have week-end parties leaving Brisbane for places outside the 40-mile limit to engage in drinking between 12 noon and 2 p.m. and between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. It is rather amazing to hear the attitude of some Government members who are particularly concerned with the drinking problem today, supporting this move by the Government to provide extra facilities for drinking on Sundays.

The Opposition feel that that is not a very desirable situation. We realise at the same time that the Government will push the measure through, and the object of our amendment is to make it more reasonable, if possible. We feel that the hours of 12 noon to 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. are inimical to the family life of the State.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is anticipating future amendments.

Mr. MELLOY: I am not, actually, because we feel that even under the amendment——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The amendment deals with the permitted area, and if the hon. member can add anything to the many arguments I have heard already, I shall be pleased to hear him. If he is going to repeat those arguments, I ask him to cease.

Mr. MELLOY: I accept your ruling, Mr. Taylor, but I feel that I am entitled on this occasion to express my opinion on the matter even though it may coincide with opinions already expressed here. However, in view of your ruling, I content myself with supporting the amendment.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (11.3 p.m.): I do not wish to cast a silent vote on this amendment, therefore I rise to express my support for it. I do not wish to cover all the ground that has been covered by various speakers, but I want to say that the Bill is peculiar in many ways. The political idiosyncracies that have emanated from the Government side over the years are particularly emphasised in this extraordinary provision which the amendment seeks to eliminate.

I wish to congratulate the Minister—I use that word—on the excellence he achieved this evening in sophistry, when he tried to argue on entirely false premises why the amendment should not be carried. I have always regarded the Minister as being sincere and honest, but this evening, in support of this ridiculous provision that we are trying to eliminate, he argued that there are different citizens of Queensland outside the 40-mile limit. I think he is prepared to argue in any way. I do not agree with the submissions that have been made, even by some members on this side of the Chamber as well as those on the Government side, that conditions vary so much throughout Queensland or, should I say, that the difference outside the 40-mile radius warrants this great discrimination that we are seeking to eliminate. Some people in the city of Brisbane are in the same position as workers on stations in the West, North-west and elsewhere. What about the men on shift work at week-ends, men who reside in guesthouses or boarding houses? Are they not entitled to the same consideration as a station worker in the West or anybody outside the 40-mile radius? It is absurd to argue that because of a climatic or geographical difference we must have different local liquor laws. I have not had an opportunity to examine minutely the map showing

the 40-mile limit. If the country in one direction from Brisbane is flat country a person could travel 40 miles and reach the perimeter and so have the right to drink at a hotel. On the other hand a person who was travelling over a mountainous road could drive for more than 40 miles and still be within the radius of 40 miles. That position is ridiculous and should be examined.

We read recently that the Licensing Commission is going to grant a licence at Point Lookout. The Commission is giving encouragement to the building of a hotel at Point Lookout, yet the licensee will be debarred from trading on Sunday. The provision is a most foolish one. Even at this late hour I ask the Minister to abandon all the illogical arguments he advanced earlier and to exercise common sense. He can make a name for himself and pull his Government out of the mire by accepting the amendment, thus overcoming the ridiculous position envisaged under the Bill.

Question—That the words proposed be omitted from Clause 41 (Mr. Duggan's amendment) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 36

Mr. Anderson	Mr. Low
,, Beardmore	,, Madsen
,, Camm	,, Munro
,, Campbell	,, Nicklin
,, Chalk	Dr. Noble
Dr. Delamothe	Mr. Pilbeam
Mr. Dewar	,, Pizzey
,, Evans	,, Rae
,, Ewan	,, Ramsden
,, Fletcher	,, Richter
,, Gaven	,, Row
,, Gilmore	,, Sullivan
,, Harrison	,, Tooth
,, Hart	,, Wharton
,, Herbert	,, Windsor
,, Hiley	
,, Hooper	*Tellers:*
,, Jones	Mr. Hodges
,, Knox	,, Hughes

NOES, 27

Mr. Bromley	Mr. Lloyd
,, Burrows	,, Mann
,, Byrne	,, Marsden
,, Davies	,, Melloy
,, Dean	,, Newton
,, Donald	,, O'Donnell
,, Dufficy	,, Sherrington
,, Duggan	,, Tucker
,, Graham	,, Wallace
,, Gunn	,, Walsh
,, Hanlon	
,, Hilton	*Tellers:*
,, Houghton	Mr. Bennett
,, Houston	,, Thackeray
,, Inch	

PAIRS

Mr. Lonergan	Mr. Adair
,, Carey	,, Baxter
,, Morris	,, Diplock

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. HOUGHTON (Redcliffe) (11.14 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 28, line 21, after the word 'Brisbane', insert the words—

'and any part of the State within that radius which is declared by the Governor in Council by Order in Council published in the "Government Gazette" to be a tourist area.' "

This part of the tourist area extending from Clontarf Point to Toorbul Point that has been Gazetted by Order in Council is a substantial area. Let us look closely at the gazettal of tourist areas. It was this Government that introduced tourist areas into the liquor legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will hon. members please keep their conversations down. I cannot hear the hon. member who is speaking.

Mr. HOUGHTON: I am firmly of opinion that, for various reasons best known to themselves, this Government could be described as the Queensland Air Force. Never have I seen anybody do more loops, more dives or more tail-spins than they have done in the introduction of this amending liquor legislation. I firmly believe they will finish up either pranging or having a forced landing, or else the Bill will eventually be improved.

It behoves the Government to see that uniform treatment is given to all tourist areas. They have seen fit to foster the tourist industry and to encourage people from other States and from distant lands to visit the tourist resorts of Queensland. Take the case of a person who decides to holiday in Queensland. He calls at the Gold Coast and remains there for a couple of days, then moves to Brisbane, say, on Saturday night. He goes to Redcliffe under the illusion that he is still within a tourist area. Undoubtedly he would expect the same concession as those applying in other tourist areas.

I must voice my displeasure and objection to the discrimination shown by the Government against this gazetted tourist area, namely, Clontarf to Toorbul Point. The Order in Council was dated as recently as 8 August, 1960, which will give some idea of the Government's somersault in being dissatisfied with their previous Order in so short a time.

I do not want to recapitulate the submissions that have already been made. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out very conclusively the discrimination in the Bill and there is no need for me to enlarge on it. The other submissions support my case for the amendment. I submit it with the sincere hope that the Minister will look at it in the light of the interest of the tourist areas. I ask him to extend to this declared area the same concessions as will be applied to other parts of the State.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.19 p.m.): The amendment is not acceptable to the Government.

Opposition Members: Why?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MUNRO: I think the reasons for that will be very evident from the course of the debate in the last two hours. Only a few minutes ago the Committee decided against differentiation between the permitted area and the area within a 40-mile radius of the Brisbane G.P.O. If this amendment were incorporated in the Bill, one possible result would be that the Government would have power to declare the whole of the 40-mile radius area a tourist area, which would obviously defeat the decision of the Committee taken a few minutes ago. Apart from that, another approach to it could be that the Government might take certain small localities within the 40-mile radius area and declare them as tourist areas. Obviously, any action of that kind would be objected to by the Opposition very much more strenuously than they have objected to the 40-mile radius area, because that area is at least soundly based. I have given the reasons for it at considerable length. It is something that is certain, and it is clear to anybody which hotels are within the area and which are not. If the Government decided to have a variegated pattern of tourist areas within the 40-mile radius, that would obviously tend to cause confusion. No doubt the hon. member for Redcliffe does believe that he has a particular problem in his area, and I am sure that if there were any practical way in which the Government could solve that problem we should be very happy to do so. But the plain fact is that a particular local problem, if there is one, cannot be met without introducing complexities that in many ways would not be desirable.

Again, if the hon. member for Redcliffe regards this amendment as being an intricate way of endeavouring to ensure that the Redcliffe Peninsula could be treated in the same way as the areas outside the 40-mile radius, I suggest to him that I am doubtful whether it really would be in the best interests of the residents of the Redcliffe Peninsula to do that. I know that the people in the well-developed suburbs and the outer suburbs of the city of Brisbane do not want these additional facilities that are designed particularly for the northern and western districts of the State, and I believe that the delightful little suburb of Redcliffe would be better off without them.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.24 p.m.): The Opposition does not accept the responsibility for originating this amendment because, again, it is somewhat sectional in character. Notwithstanding that, we are prepared to support the hon. member for Redcliffe because his amendment is at least an improvement on the present position. I think it would be rather difficult for the Minister to justify to the Committee the statement that it is impossible to apportion the various tourist areas of the State to enable Sunday trading to take place when he has already done it in relation to provincial cities. What is the difficulty in differentiating between the North Coast and the South Coast and Redcliffe? The Minister has differentiated between Toowoomba and Ipswich and he makes no apology for doing it.

As I said, although the Opposition thinks that the amendment is sectional in character and does not accept the responsibility for originating it, it at least extends the area from the Government's proposal to midway between what the Government are prepared to do and what the Opposition wants them to do. Therefore, I feel that the hon. member will receive the support of the Opposition on this matter. I would remind him, however, that unfortunately he is paying the penalty and being ostracised because of the fact that he has not been permitted to enter the holy Caucus——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member's remarks hardly apply to the amendment.

Mr. DUGGAN: Had he been fortunate enough to be there he would probably have got Redcliffe in the same way as the hon. member for South Coast got the South Coast in.

Mr. Houghton: The Speaker couldn't get it in——

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DUGGAN: The Speaker, of course, adopts the role that he does not take part in the debates, but from what——

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must not make those personal references.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am sorry. The amendment is still sectional but at least it embraces a larger area than what the Government have been prepared to permit. The Minister has not been able to explain satisfactorily the reason for the differentiation. Quite frankly, I do not see very much difference in the tourist areas. The Minister acknowledged earlier that there was justification to deal with the person in the Far West and Far North. Had he kept the legislation confined to servicing people in those areas we could understand the logic of his remarks. But he brings the South Coast into it, obviously for the reason that it is a declared tourist area. But in 1958 when the amendment to the Liquor Act was before Parliament and the subject of the granting of licences in tourist areas was raised, Redcliffe was specifically included as a tourist area. Therefore, if there is justification for the South Coast because it is a defined tourist area—I acknowledge it should be included as a tourist area—and the Government having accepted the responsibility for saying that Redcliffe should be regarded in the same category, I see no

reason why the Minister at this late stage should differentiate between tourist areas determined by the Government on a previous occasion, and which he now says have comparable claims for the consideration of the Government. Quite frankly, I think that if the South Coast has it, Redcliffe must have it also. Consequently I think he should accept the amendment.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (11.28 p.m.): We have heard some remarkable statements from the Minister at all stages of the Bill. His latest excuse is that the legislation having been designed to meet the requirements of the more remote parts of the State, and having determined that Redcliffe is not one of the remote parts of the State, the 40-mile radius should remain. Apparently that is his main excuse for not accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Redcliffe. The Minister really disappoints me. I thought at least he was going to hold out the olive branch to the hon. member for Redcliffe in some way. Having regard to the Government's policy to encourage tourism in Queensland, the amendment is not an unreasonable one. The legislation referred to by the Leader of the Opposition specifically excluded areas declared as tourist areas from being areas where it was necessary to have a poll on the question of whether a new licence should be granted. Even though it meant the exclusion of places like Mt. Isa, one of the remote parts of the State the Minister now says he is so interested in, even though he took the right away from the people in Mt. Isa and similar areas to have a new licence granted without a ballot, they were still prepared to concede that concession to an area that had been declared a tourist area. I am surprised that the Minister for Labour and Industry is not here tonight to lend support to the hon. member for Redcliffe, since he has given him a good deal of support on other problems with which he has been confronted. The remarkable thing is that he is not here now to back up the hon. member for Redcliffe's advocacy of matters that should be extended to tourist areas in the State. I cannot see how the Minister or any member of the Cabinet can argue that the rights of a tourist who goes to Redcliffe are any different from those who may go to the South Coast which is represented by the hon. member for South Coast.

Mr. Gaven: Good representation.

Mr. WALSH: I do not doubt that for a moment, but that does not come into the consideration of a Bill discriminating not only between citizens in general throughout the State but also between tourists who might come from other parts of the world or Australia. I do not know where this discrimination will finish, and the Minister might find, as I said earlier, that he has to send it to the United Nations for attention.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.32 p.m.): The hon. member for Merthyr has very little appreciation of the important task of government. He makes interjections completely irrelevant to the matter before the Committee but, as the hon. member for Bundaberg said, in 1958 when the Minister introduced an amendment to the Liquor Act he very conscientiously stated that it was essential to have declared tourist areas in the State in which there should be some differentiation in regard to the granting of liquor licences. In every other part of Queensland not declared a tourist area, there should be a referendum on the establishment of a new hotel. In other words, in those areas the Minister was happy that control should not be in the hands of a few people, but, where the area was declared a tourist area there should be extenuating circumstances and therefore no referendum.

The Government's excuse for being unable to encourage the growth of secondary industries in this State has been their concentration on encouraging tourism in Queensland, and, in order to do that, it was necessary to licence hotels in certain areas without holding a referendum.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Redcliffe is one that the Government should consider. The idea of having declared tourist areas does not emanate from the hon. member for Redcliffe or from the Opposition benches. It emanated from members of the Government and from the Minister himself who previously introduced legislation to declare certain areas of Queensland tourist areas.

If the Government are sincere, why was this legislation introduced? If the machinery they themselves introduced has had the result of opening up more liberal drinking habits in tourist areas, why is this legislation necessary? They now declare open, areas outside a radius of 40 miles from the General Post Office in Brisbane and extend it to the South Coast. The hon. member for South Coast is a great exponent of tourism in that area. In the matter of the 40-mile radius the Government are not prepared to apply the principle of their earlier legislation on the declaration of tourist areas. We opposed the declaration of tourist areas where a referendum would not be required for the establishment of a new hotel. We argued that it was sectional legislation. The amendment of the hon. member for Redcliffe is sectional, but not to the same extent as the 40-mile radius provision.

A Government Member: You are going to support it.

Mr. LLOYD: Of course. Under earlier legislation introduced by the Minister for Justice certain areas could be declared to be tourist areas. In dealing with the present provision they could have taken advantage of the earlier principle by saying that in declared tourist areas there should be some

relinquishing of ordinary control and greater sanity in drinking conditions. The limit has been set at 40 miles because the city of Southport is 42 miles from the Brisbane G.P.O. The city of Redcliffe is within the 40-mile radius. The legislation is sectional, particularly in view of the principle established by the Government, not by the Opposition, of declaring areas to be tourist areas. The Government in their legislation favour one section of the community outside the 40-mile radius and discriminate against another section in an area declared to be a tourist area. I think all members of the public will agree with me that the actions of the Government in providing for the declaration of certain areas to be tourist areas and in rejecting the amendment of the hon. member for Redcliffe are inconsistent. They have in fact declared certain districts to be tourist areas. Their rejection of the amendment is completely inconsistent with the intention of the earlier legislation.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.38 p.m.): I do not wish to take up further time and I have abstained from replying on a number of occasions even when manifestly incorrect statements have been made by Opposition members, but I think I must say a word or two on tourist areas, otherwise anyone reading "Hansard" and the speeches of Opposition members would get a completely wrong impression. Let me make clear my first point that the tourist areas of the State very substantially, with few exceptions, are already in the permitted area, so that the linking of this provision with tourist areas would not lead to a wide application of it. The only effect would be within the 40-mile radius of Brisbane. There is absolutely no force in the suggestion that because we have tourist areas throughout Queensland, for a completely different purpose, we should make provision for tourist areas within the 40-mile radius for the present purpose.

Mr. Lloyd: You declared it a tourist area, we didn't.

Mr. MUNRO: Exactly. That is a very good provision, too.

Mr. Lloyd: The area of Redcliffe is a tourist centre.

Mr. MUNRO: Let us consider the principle and not a locality.

The principle of tourist areas determining whether or not there is a right for a local option poll is a very good one. Let me point out that it does not cause any anomalies or inconsistencies. Other than the right of the local option poll, the question of granting or transferring a hotel licence in a tourist area is not dealt with any differently from an application for a hotel licence in a non-tourist area.

Mr. Walsh: It will be under your clause.

Mr. MUNRO: There would be a difference if we accepted the amendment.

Mr. Walsh: There would be a difference under your clause.

Mr. MUNRO: No, there is no distinction at all between tourist areas and non-tourist areas. I explained that at considerable length, and I am not going to waste my breath by repeating it. I thought it necessary to make it clear that there is no logic in the analogy that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition attempted to draw between tourist areas with a completely different purpose, and some illogical idea that by this amendment we should provide for certain little tourist areas within the 40-mile radius.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted in Clause 41 (Mr. Houghton's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 27

Mr. Bennett	Mr. Inch
,, Bromley	,, Lloyd
,, Burrows	,, Mann
,, Byrne	,, Marsden
,, Davies	,, Melloy
,, Dean	,, Newton
,, Donald	,, O'Donnell
,, Duffey	,, Thackeray
,, Duggan	,, Tucker
,, Graham	,, Walsh
,, Gunn	*Tellers:*
,, Hanlon	
,, Hilton	Mr. Sherrington
,, Houghton	,, Wallace
,, Houston	

NOES, 36

Mr. Anderson	Mr. Jones
,, Beardmore	,, Low
,, Camm	,, Madsen
,, Campbell	,, Munro
,, Chalk	,, Nicklin
Dr. Delamothe	Dr. Noble
Mr. Dewar	Mr. Pilbeam
,, Evans	,, Pizzey
,, Ewan	,, Rae
,, Fletcher	,, Ramsden
,, Gaven	,, Richter
,, Gilmore	,, Row
,, Harrison	,, Tooth
,, Hart	,, Wharton
,, Herbert	,, Windsor
,, Hiley	
,, Hodges	*Tellers:*
,, Hooper	Mr. Knox
,, Hughes	,, Sullivan

PAIRS

Mr. Adair	Mr. Lonergan
,, Baxter	,, Carey
,, Diplock	,, Morris

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.48 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 28, lines 26 to 28, omit the words—

'the periods between the hours of twelve o'clock noon and two o'clock in the afternoon and between the hours of five o'clock and seven o'clock in the evening.'

and insert in lieu thereof the words—

'the periods between the hours of eleven o'clock in the morning and

one o'clock in the afternoon and between the hours of four o'clock and six o'clock in the evening.' "

The amendment has been designed to make what we believe to be more sensible Sunday trading hours than those the Government have proposed. They have accepted the responsibility for determining that the hours shall be two periods of two hours each, namely, between 12 o'clock and 2 o'clock and between 5 o'clock and 7 o'clock. Those hours are not acceptable for several reasons.

The first reason is that we think the licensed victualler is entitled to time with his family, or to the privilege of having his main meals on Sunday—that is, lunch and dinner—with his family. That is virtually impossible with the prescribed hours of 12 o'clock to 2 o'clock and 5 o'clock to 7 o'clock. In addition to that, it cuts fairly seriously into the available recreation time of the licensed victualler, quite apart from any consideration of the public that he is serving. By the time he clears the bar, straightens up various things in it, provides for certain matters of hygiene and cleanliness and other things associated with the control of the bar, the afternoon is virtually gone. I think it is unfair to the licensed victualler that seven days a week, including Sundays, he should be forced to forgo the privilege of being with his family.

I do not think it is altogether desirable from the point of view of the general public, either, because it takes the ordinary drinker away from his family. If a person is in a hotel from 12 noon till 2 p.m. to take part in a drinking session, obviously he cannot be at home with his family, and it is undesirable that he should be away for both the luncheon period and the evening meal. I do not know why the Government should have chosen these particular times. On the ground of convenience, even if the hours are satisfactory to the ordinary drinker they are not fair to his family. In the case of the licensed victualler, only one family is involved; but in the case of his customers there may be dozens of families involved.

The next point that I think is undesirable is that, under the clause, people coming home from the 11 o'clock church service will meet people going into the bars, and in the evening, if the session concludes at 7 p.m., people who have taken too much in the evening session will spill out onto the footpath when people are going to church services.

Many other arguments could be advanced against the proposal. The Minister has indicated that the only reason for introducing Sunday trading is that in various isolated parts of the State people have indicated that they definitely think they are entitled to a drink and that we must recognise the majority opinion in those areas. Where there is an unofficial arrangement for a session to be held, it is held between the hours of 11 o'clock and 1 o'clock, not between 12 o'clock and 2 o'clock, so I do not know why the Minister should have chosen those hours. I think the Minister is aware that whilst the Licensed Victuallers' Association does not want to determine the hours in particular towns and arbitrate on the hours in particular parts of the State, it is opposed to the hours being 12 till 2. From representations that have been made to me, particularly in the south-western part of the State, there is a very strong feeling in favour of a session from 11 till 1.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that he has used up all his time in moving amendments to this clause and that his time has now expired.

(Time expired.)

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.54 p.m.): We are prepared to accept this amendment. When speaking on the particular clause at the Second Reading, I indicated that this was a matter on which there could be room for very great differences of opinion. It was with this and one or two consequential amendments in mind that I particularly stated that I should be interested to hear the views not only of the Leader of the Opposition but also of the various members on both sides of the House representing areas in the more sparsely settled parts of the State where, somewhat regrettably, perhaps, we have these established local customs. There were very sound reasons for adopting the 12 noon-2 p.m. and 5 p.m.-7 p.m. periods. It was not in any way an innovation; we were simply accepting the permitted hours at present under the travellers' section. At that stage we did not propose to alter them. They are in fact the normal meal hours. They are the most suitable hours for persons to partake of liquor with food. Those were very sound reasons. However, as I have indicated on a number of occasions the Government are prepared to consider matters of this kind on the basis of all the evidence available. Within the past fortnight evidence has accumulated, not only from what has been said tonight, but from what country members of the Government parties have said, that indicates that the alteration in the hours now suggested by the Leader of the Opposition probably would be much more convenient in the sparsely settled areas of the State.

Mr. Hanlon: It would necessarily apply to the routine travellers' clause.

Mr. MUNRO: I shall deal with that in a moment.

I do not regard it as a matter in which there is any vital principle involved. There is still a four-hour period. It simply means that in each case the period commences one hour earlier and finishes one hour earlier. In view of the interjection by the hon.

member for Baroona, it is perhaps better to mention now that in accepting the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition I think a corresponding alteration should be made in the travellers' clause or we will have an anomaly. I am prepared to move that as a consequential amendment. If we adhered to the 12 noon-2 p.m. and 5 p.m.-7 p.m. periods they would coincide with the periods of operation of the travellers' clause within the 40-mile radius area. As I have pointed out already there is not very great differentiation between the positions within and outside the area. It would make a sufficiently strong reason to reject the amendment if it meant that we had one set of hours outside the 40-mile radius and another set of hours within it.

Mr. Houston: You believe in uniformity on that?

Mr. MUNRO: Yes. I believe that there should not be any more differentiation than is absolutely necessary under different conditions. There is not a need for that further differentiation. In anticipation of the moving of the amendment by the Leader of the Opposition I looked into the consequential amendment to the travellers' clause. We are quite prepared to accept the amendment. There is another one in the name of the Leader of the Opposition that is very closely related. Again at the appropriate time I propose to move a further amendment. It has not been printed but it is only a simple amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Duggan) agreed to.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (12 midnight): I move the following further amendment:—

> "On page 32, line 34, after the word 'Sunday,' insert the words—
>
> 'or by any person seated at a table in a dining room on those premises and bona fide partaking of a meal in that dining room during the hours specified in subsection (8L.) of this section on the days mentioned in that subsection.' "

This amendment is consequential on the one that has just been accepted. It was made plain in Clause 41 that the licensee was permitted, but not required, to sell liquor during the permitted hours on Sunday. It was not provided similarly that a licensee was permitted but not required to supply liquor between 12 noon and 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. to diners for consumption with a meal in his dining room between those hours.

This amendment clarifies the position in that regard, particularly in the light of the other amendments. In that connection, I might also mention that the licensee is not compelled to supply liquor with meals on Sundays, or on Christmas Day throughout the State, or on Anzac Day or Good Friday in the permitted area. The amendment, which we have had prepared will bring it into line not only with this amendment, but also with the amendment which we anticipate will be passed at a later stage. It will just bring the whole of these related clauses into conformity.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (12.3 a.m.): I cannot pick the place up in relation to this amendment, but I think I have the basis of what the Minister is moving as a consequential amendment. The only point I want to make is that we do not necessarily agree with the Minister that some of these amendments will be consequential. What we did in moving the original amendment which was accepted was to make the hours 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. so that we would provide for people to go to an hotel, have a drink, and then go away again. In other words they would be able to drink without having a meal. They could come from their homes, and one of the reasons we put forward was that their wives would expect them home for lunch or the evening meal.

On the other hand, travellers and people who go to hotels to dine would be more likely to go between the hours of 12 noon and 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. Whilst we agree that it is unfortunate to have different hours, at the same time, it seems to be more practical to maintain the difference in this case. We can only inform the Minister that if we had a uniform basis for the whole of the State we would get away from this position.

Mr. Munro: This amendment does not alter the hours between which persons may consume liquor while dining in an hotel. That will remain as at present, but this is a consequential amendment following on the fact that there would be a different time for consuming liquor while not dining, from the time when consumption of liquor is permitted while dining.

Amendment (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (12.6 a.m.): I have a further amendment to Clause 41. It has been printed, although I am not certain whether it has been circulated. I move the following further amendment—

> "On page 33, after line 24, add the following paragraphs—
>
> 'and (d) by omitting from subsection (4) the words "the hours of twelve o'clock noon and two o'clock in the afternoon and between the hours of five o'clock in the afternoon and seven o'clock in the evening" and inserting in their stead the words "the hours of eleven o'clock in the morning and one o'clock in the afternoon and between the hours of four o'clock and six o'clock in the evening"; and
>
> (e) by omitting from subsection (6) wheresoever occurring the words "the

hours of twelve o'clock noon and two o'clock in the afternoon or between the hours of five o'clock in the afternoon and seven o'clock in the evening" and inserting in their stead wheresoever omitted the words "the hours of eleven o'clock in the morning and one o'clock in the afternoon or between the hours of four o'clock and six o'clock in the evening".' "

The amendment follows quite naturally on what we have already done and on the explanation I have already given of the previous amendment. In other words it amends that portion of the travellers' clause which had reference to the hours of 12 o'clock noon to 2 o'clock in the afternoon and 5 o'clock in the afternoon to 7 o'clock in the evening. The amendment is in two paragraphs because the wording in one place is slightly different from the substantially corresponding wording in another place. The substance of it is that it amends the travellers' clause in general conformity with the amendment that has been accepted so that a person who calls at a hotel within the 40-mile radius and complies with the conditions to establish that he is a bona-fide traveller may be entitled to have a drink in those two new two-hour periods, which conform with those we have accepted for the permitted area.

Amendment (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (12.9 a.m.): It is a pity that the draftsman in framing the clause did not dissect the principles. Clause 41 seeks to amend Section 69 of the principal Act, and then it adds 21 or 22 new subsections. In all we have 29 or 30 subsections. The principles of some of them are entirely different. Apart from anything else, and we saw an example of it tonight, there is the possibility of an hon. member's being deprived of the right to discuss some of the principles, owing to the lengthy nature of the clause. The Chairman rightly drew the attention of the Leader of the Opposition to the fact that he had more or less exhausted his time limit under the Standing Orders in discussing the few matters that he had discussed in the clause. The Minister nearly ran out of letters in the alphabet because he got up to the letter "R" in Clause 41, subclause (8). All he wanted were a few more and he would have had the whole alphabet in the new subsection. In subsection (8M.) the Government are extending the right of patrons of hotels or licensed premises to consume liquor between 12 noon and 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. and 7 p.m. on any Sunday or Christmas Day where the premises are situated in the permitted area, Anzac Day or Good Friday. From time to time we have heard that these provisions represent reforms in the Liquor Act, but right through the Bill one could claim that additional facilities are being made available for people to consume liquor, and I doubt the wisdom of including in this Bill provisions that have been omitted from previous Acts.

Mr. Houston: And on Anzac Day, out of Brisbane.

Mr. WALSH: It is here, and I am sure the Minister will not make any apoligies for it. It is distinct from any clause where they are prohibited from doing those things at certain other hours, between 10 and 11, and 5 and 7. They can consume liquor on the days mentioned.

Clause 41 as amended, agreed to.

Clause 42—Amendments of s.75; Dancing, etc., prohibited on licensed premises without permission—as read, agreed to.

Clause 43—Amendments of s.75A; Exemption from ss.75 and 166A—

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (12.12 a.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 35, after line 1, insert the following paragraph—

'(a) by omitting the word "ten" and inserting in its stead the word "eleven";' "

This amendment was circulated on Friday last. It is really in the nature of a drafting correction. Under the terms of Clause 41 of the Bill, the new subsection (8) provides that consumption of liquor is to be permitted until 11 p.m. in a hotel dining-room if the liquor is purchased prior to 10 p.m. for consumption with the meal. It has been found that in terms of the existing law dancing is permitted by diners in a hotel dining-room up until 10 p.m. It would be quite anomalous if, having extended that period to 11 p.m., the corresponding period for dancing by persons dining at the hotel was limited to 10 p.m. The amendment is really consequential upon the first amendment but was not noticed at the time of drafting.

Mr. Bennett: In effect, it is extending the closing hours from 10 p.m. till 11 p.m.

Mr. MUNRO: No, it is not because that is already in the Bill. As the closing hours, for the limited purpose only of the consumption of liquor by persons partaking of a meal has been extended to 11 p.m., we must make a similar alteration in the clause dealing with dancing by persons dining there and partaking of liquor.

Amendment (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Clause 43, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 44 to 46, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 47—Amendment of s.88 (2); Record of conviction and forfeiture of license, etc.—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.16 a.m.): I should like the Minister to give some consideration to this matter. I cannot move an appropriate

amendment because the clause deals with Section 88 of the principal Act, whereas I should have liked the opportunity of dealing with Section 89, which provides fairly heavy penalties for the adulteration of liquor. Clause 47 of the Bill transfers the authority from the court to the Commission to deal with the forfeiture of a licence and such other penalties as the Commission might deem appropriate.

Section 89 of the principal Act provides—

"(1) Where a licensee is convicted of any offence against this or any other Act relating to the prevention of adulteration, and his license is not forfeited for such offence, the court shall order a placard stating such conviction to be affixed to the premises."

The section goes on to deal with the size of the placard and so on.

My attention has been drawn to the fact that there are grounds for believing that there have been some cases where the licensee has taken every possible precaution to prevent employees engaging in the adulteration of spirits served to customers. That is quite conceivable. Generally speaking, that is the ordinary defence in the court to these cases. The licensee says, "I gave those general instructions to the employees." In some cases it is entirely a subterfuge; he has not given those specific instructions at all. But it has come to my notice that there are cases where, because a licensee has taken action against an employee, either disciplining him in some way or giving him notice, the employee could retaliate and adulterate the spirits he is serving to a customer. He could do it without the knowledge of the licensee, and indeed against his expressed wishes in the matter. Notwithstanding that, the licensee has to submit to the humiliation of seeing a placard with his name on it affixed to his premises declaring that he has been guilty of adulterating liquor. There should be some opportunity for the court to declare that it is of the opinion that, if the circumstances clearly exonerate the licensee from any complicity in the matter, he should not be subjected to that humiliation. I do not ask that it be done automatically. I am merely asking the Minister to consider giving the court power in such circumstances to take action along those lines where it feels that the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the licensee. I hope the Minister will give it consideration, if not now, then at a later date.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) (12.19 a.m.): There is a problem in the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition. We gave it some consideration in the preparation of the Bill but it was thought that it would not be wise to make an alteration in the law on the general lines that he has suggested. The reason is that adulteration of liquor by a licensed victualler is a rather serious offence.

Mr. Duggan: I am not condoning it.

Mr. MUNRO: We think it would not be safe to lessen the penalty that has existed under the law for very many years. This really applies to persons carrying on all types of business. I realise that very often an employer might be subject to a penalty that appears to be somewhat harsh merely because of the wrongdoing of one of his employees. Nevertheless, licensed victuallers have an important and responsible position in our community life, and we do not think there should be any slackening of the provisions contained in the Act and which have been considered necessary in the past to ensure compliance with the law. Although, as I said, we gave some consideration to this matter when the Bill was being drafted, for those reasons it was thought that it would be unwise to make the particular alteration. It certainly would be quite out of the question to endeavour to do anything about it now. However, the matter is under my consideration from time to time, and if we see any way in which little harshnesses can be removed without impairing the necessary effective penalty to ensure compliance with the law, I am sure the Government will be prepared to give it consideration. At the moment I do not see how that can be done.

Clause 47, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 48 to 50, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 51—Amendments of s.121; Supplying liquor for consumption outside registered club—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.22 a.m.): I am not proceeding with the first amendment on page 37, lines 31 to 33. I move the following amendment:—

"On page 37, line 37, after the word 'club,' insert the words and brackets—

'(not being a licensed bowling club or licensed golf club) means the periods between the hours of eleven o'clock in the morning and one o'clock in the afternoon and between the hours of four o'clock and six o'clock in the evening and in respect of the licensed premises of a licensed bowling club or a licensed golf club'."

Mr. Munro: I think we can regard this as consequential on your former amendment. We will accept it.

Mr. DUGGAN: I thank the Minister for his assurance.

Amendment (Mr. Duggan) agreed to.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.23 a.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 39, lines 8 to 23, omit the paragraph—

'(6F.) Upon application in that behalf by a licensed bowling club or licensed bowling clubs or by a licensed golf club or licensed golf clubs the Commission

may from time to time by order vary the permitted hours on any Sunday with respect to a particular licensed bowling club or licensed golf club or the licensed bowling clubs or licensed golf clubs in a particular locality either for a specified period or until further order but so that the permitted hours as so varied shall not exceed four hours and shall not include any period before twelve o'clock noon or after seven o'clock in the evening and any reference in this section to the permitted hours on any Sunday in respect of the licensed premises of the club or clubs to which the order relates shall be read as a reference to the permitted hours on any Sunday as so varied from time to time.'

and insert in lieu thereof the following paragraph—

'(6F.) Upon application in that behalf by a licensed bowling club or licensed bowling clubs or by a licensed golf club or licensed golf clubs the Governor in Council may from time to time by Order in Council vary the permitted hours on any Sunday with respect to the whole of the licensed bowling clubs or licensed golf clubs in a particular locality either for a specified period or until further order but so that the permitted hours as so varied shall not exceed four hours and shall not include any period before twelve o'clock noon or after seven o'clock in the evening and any reference in this section to the permitted hours on any Sunday in respect of the licensed premises of the club or clubs to which the order relates shall be read as a reference to the permitted hours on any Sunday as so varied from time to time.'"

We regard this amendment as being somewhat important. An attempt has been made to secure a measure of uniformity, and the Minister has accepted some amendments that we have put forward. We think that power should not be given to the Commission to determine variable hours for golf and bowling clubs in the same area. We think there should be a specified set of hours, either a straight period of four hours, or two broken periods of two hours each. But wherever they do operate in a town or zone they should be uniform. As the clause stands it is possible that a golf club or bowling club on the east side could select hours between 12 noon and 2 p.m.; one on the north side might select between 1 p.m. and 3 p.m.; on the west side a club might select between 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. It would be possible for somebody in a car to go round the clubs and drink from 12 noon until 7 p.m. on Sunday. I think that is manifestly wrong. There should be some tightening up here. If it is not felt that the Governor in Council can deal with each town in the State, there could be a division into zones—the western zone, far northern zone, central zone and south-eastern zone. There is a great deal of merit in having a set period of time and not permitting the variable hours that the clause enables the Licensing Commission to approve. Why should we restrict hotels to periods between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. and between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. when bowling clubs and golf clubs are permitted variable hours? We do not mind their having four hours, except again we object to the discrimination between golf clubs and other sporting bodies. We consider that it is not unreasonable to recognise the right of bowling clubs and golf clubs to sell liquor to their members, but the hours should be specified so that we know exactly what they are and the possibility cannot arise that can arise under the clause as it stands. I do not think that the Licensing Commission would wish to have variable hours, but we have no guarantee or undertaking that the hours will not vary. It is quite conceivable that some persuasive person may be able to convince the Commission that there are special circumstances to entitle his club to have hours different from a club that might not be very many miles away. We know very well that most of the revenue of the clubs is derived from the sale of liquor. Therefore it can be expected that the energetic secretary of a bowling club or golf club will do all he possibly can to augment the revenue of his club by selling as much liquor as he can. As the hon. member for Baroona pointed out it is very easy for a person to take a friend along to his club. In some instances it is very easy to become an associate or honorary member of a club. In some parts of the State clubs would welcome them merely because they are prepared to spend money at the bar. The licensed victuallers are required to provide accommodation. It is not fair that other than recognised members of golf clubs or bowling clubs should be able to drink at those places in preference to the ordinary hotel where the licensee has to pay all the prescribed fees and provide meals and accommodation for the travelling public. There are other reasons I could advance but I shall not do so in view of the lateness of the hour. I think I have sufficiently indicated the wishes of the Opposition. I should like the Minister to indicate whether he can favourably consider the suggestion we have put forward.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (12.29 a.m.): I am not prepared to accept the amendment, particularly for two reasons. Firstly, in my view, it is not sound in principle; secondly, it would scarcely be administratively practicable—it certainly would not be administratively convenient. Although a fairly long amendment, in substance it does two things. First of all, by an alteration in the terms, it would have the effect of limiting the power to make these variations to a particular locality in respect of a particular club or group of clubs. I will take that one first. If there is a case for variation

it may be that it is due to particular circumstances in relation to a club. It may be that those conditions would apply to that club only and not to any particular locality. So, unless the Leader of the Opposition endeavours to overcome that problem by defining locality to include any one club, that would defeat part of the purpose. On the other hand, the defining of localities would be difficult. I would not know from this amendment precisely what would be meant by a locality, whereas, from the administrative point of view there is no difficulty at all in describing one particular club or a group of, say, four or five clubs together.

Mr. Duggan: Would the Minister indicate that, in a city like Brisbane or Toowoomba or Ipswich, there should be uniform hours in that locality?

Mr. MUNRO: I do not think this would be likely to apply either in Brisbane or Toowoomba. I think it would be much more likely to apply in some outlying part of the State. I should not like to determine myself just how it would apply. I would very much rather leave that to the good sense, experience and discretion of the Licensing Commission.

The second change that is apparent in this amendment is that instead of this matter being determined by the Licensing Commission, the Leader of the Opposition's proposal is that it should be determined by the Governor in Council by Order in Council from time to time. In answer to that, the Executive Council is not equipped to make determinations of this kind in relation to various sparsely-settled areas of the State. The Licensing Commission, as I have already mentioned, is a semi-judicial body, completely competent to deal with matters of this kind. It is particularly equipped for this purpose in that it has the legal machinery in terms of which it can hear evidence put forward in support of any application that may be made for a variation of the hours.

Having regard to those considerations, I feel that the Leader of the Opposition will not be inclined to press this amendment because I am sure that if he saw this problem from the administrative viewpoint he would agree with me that decisions of this kind are much better made by a completely impartial and competent semi-judicial body.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.33 p.m.): I will not press the matter to a division but I do not know whether I can altogether accept the Minister's statement about Cabinet being ill-equipped to determine these matters.

Mr. Munro: We cannot hear the parties or the evidence.

Mr. DUGGAN: No, but there are a hundred and one ways in which these matters can be determined on information coming before Cabinet departmentally. The method of determining such a matter would be for the Licensing Commission to make a recommendation in the form of a minute that would be accepted or rejected by Cabinet.

I do not wish to convey to the Minister that Cabinet is composed of wise men with a complete knowledge of everything on which they are adjudicating. However, these things are prepared with great care by departmental officers, and I feel that, in this case that would be so. It would not be a question of the Ministers' debating certain hours for Winton or Hughenden or certain other parts of the State, but of adjudicating on minutes put before them by the Licensing Commission.

I appreciate the Minister's point of view but I hope that the Licensing Commission will not cause difficulty and create cause for criticism by making differential hours in provincial cities and the metropolitan area. I hope it will not do that, and that whatever decisions it makes will be uniform.

Amendment (Mr. Duggan) negatived.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (12.36 a.m.): I move the following further amendment:—

> "On page 41, line 34, after the word 'Sunday', insert the words—
>
> > 'or by any person seated at a table in a dining room on those premises and bona fide partaking of a meal in that dining-room during the hours specified in subsection (6L.) of this section on the days mentioned in that subsection.' "

The amendment is somewhat difficult to follow at this stage, but it is on all fours with the one I moved earlier and which has been incorporated in the Bill. It arises from the fact that, having altered the permitted hours for drinking from the periods of 12 noon to 2 p.m. and 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. to the new periods of 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., we now have a difference in the hours for drinking in the travellers' clause and the hours during which persons who have a meal at a hotel may have liquor with their meals, and by reason of that difference the reference to permitted hours does not have the full effect it would have if the hours were the same. The amendment can be regarded as purely consequential on the other amendments that have been accepted. The substance of it is that it makes clear that the supply of liquor in the dining-room during those hours on a Sunday is not compulsory on the club. It is substantially a repetition of one we considered earlier. The other one applied to hotels and this applies to clubs.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (12.39 a.m.): I register my disapproval of the clause as a whole in that it provides for discrimination

between clubs, inside the 40-mile radius and outside the 40-mile radius. I suggest that the title of the Bill should not be the title that will be moved later but should be "A Bill to discriminate between the citizens of the State and the various licensed clubs under the Liquor Acts."

Government members, when in Opposition, some years ago were very perturbed when the Labour Government brought down legislation which they claimed interfered with the rights of club members. They are now discriminating between members of the clubs within the 40-mile radius and members of clubs outside the 40-mile radius, that is, members of clubs other than licensed bowling clubs or licensed golf clubs. That is my first point. My second point is that having applied restrictions under the previous clause against the consumption of liquor on any licensed premises within a 40-mile radius, we are extending the right to persons who are prohibited from going into hotels to go into the premises of a licensed bowling or golf club. It is beyond me how the Minister can work out that the workers in this city, or Ipswich, or in areas covered by the 40-mile radius can be debarred from going into their club—their hotel—on a Sunday, and then be conceded the right to go into a golf club or a bowling club to consume alcohol. It is strange to me that the Minister can argue in favour of members of bowling clubs or golf clubs having that right. It is pretty hard to sustain the principle that any member of the community will have the right to go into those places even though they are not members of the licensed club. I think that is carrying it a bit far. I do not know how the Minister justifies his attitude. I do not know whether the main desire is to swell the finances of bowling clubs and golf clubs so that they may undertake improvements in their amenities. These improvements are provided for in the Liquor Act, but even in those circumstances it cannot be justified because the licensee of a hotel is bound to conform with the requisitions placed on him by the Licensing Commission and to carry out the necessary improvements. Why should he be prevented from earning additional income just as the golf clubs and bowling clubs will be able to do it? If we continue in this way, sooner or later the dominating factor in this sphere will be the bowling clubs and golf clubs. No longer will the licensee running a hotel for the convenience of the travelling community, and providing meals and accommodation, and the other things he is required to do, such as tomato juice and so on from the C.O.D., be the dominating influence in the liquor trade, because he will have these restrictions on him and the clubs will not be called upon to provide the same amenities.

Amendment (Mr. Munro), agreed to.

Clause 51, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 52 and 53, as read, agreed to.

Clause 54—Insertion of new heading and ss. 125 AA, 125 AB and 125 AC; Meanings of terms—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.43 a.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 43, lines 19 to 41, and on page 44, lines 1 to 23, omit the words—

'(4.) Up to and including the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two, the aggregate of the numbers of restaurant licenses and wine-sellers' licenses in force at any one and the same time throughout the State shall not exceed thirty-two.

(5.) On and after the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two, and until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, the aggregate of the numbers of restaurant licenses and wine-sellers' licenses in force at any one and the same time throughout the State shall not exceed thirty-two or such number not less than thirty-two and not more than thirty-four as the Governor in Council, by Order in Council published in the "Government Gazette," may from time to time fix (which the Governor in Council is hereby authorised to do).

(6.) The Commission shall observe subsections (4) and (5) of this section with respect to the grant of restaurant licenses.

(7.) Subject to subsections (8) and (9) of this section, on and after the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, the Governor in Council may from time to time, by Order in Council published in the "Government Gazette," fix the maximum number of restaurant licenses which may be in force at any one time within the State.

(8.) The maximum number referred to in subsection (7) of this section shall be deemed to be fixed by the Governor in Council at and remain until some other maximum number is fixed pursuant to this section the number which comprises on the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, the aggregate pursuant to subsection (5) of this section.

(9.) The Governor in Council shall not, during the year to commence on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, or during any succeeding year increase by more than two the maximum number which comprises for the time being the maximum number of restaurant licenses which may be in force under this section.

(10.) The Governor in Council shall not reduce the maximum number of restaurant licenses fixed for the time being under this section.

(11.) The Commission shall not grant restaurant licenses in excess of the maximum number fixed for the time being under this section.' "

These matters apply to a number of restaurant licences to be granted and also to wine-sellers' licences in force throughout the State. I am not putting up a case specially for the wine-sellers, but I should like to deal with one case I mentioned rather briefly on Friday. It concerns Black Limited at Mackay who have had a wine-sellers' licence since 1911. At present 14 persons are employed. It is true that the company have a grocery business as well, but if their licence to sell wine is taken away from them I am informed by the managing director that the company may close. As I mentioned during the second reading stage the unfairness in this case is brought about by the fact that the company were forced to spend over £15,000 although they objected to the Licensing Commission about the terms of the order. It seems to me to be something less than rough justice when an instrument of the Crown is used to compel people to expend £15,000 against their will and then without notice to say that a system that has been operating since 1911 is to be abolished and all the equity these people have is lost except to the extent that provision is made for compensation. Looking back through the records I question whether the compensation would be sufficient to recoup them for their extra expenditure on the business. So I ask the Minister whether provision can be made to permit these people in certain places in the State outside Brisbane to continue to operate.

The hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Graham, assures me, and I have other information to the same effect, that the firm in question carry on a very good business of a high standard. There is nothing about them to which the police can object. Indeed, they have been complimented on the type of business they have conducted over a period of years. No doubt there are other cases unknown to me where similar circumstances operate. I think the matter has been rather hastily developed and that it imposes great hardship on some people.

The main point about Clause 54 is that it sets a limit of 32 on the licensed restaurants in the State and provision is made for the granting of two extra licences each year by Order in Council. We think the stage has been reached where there is justification for the licensing of restaurants. True, it is opposed by temperance organisations, but it is done in most countries of the world and every other State in the Commonwealth has provision for it. We cannot very well resist the tendency of modern living to provide for a number of licensed restaurants but we think it unwise legislatively to restrict the number arbitrarily to 32.

Again, the Government have attempted to secure advantage politically from the temperance people by saying, "Well, against the 32 licensed restaurants we propose to establish, we have abolished all the wine licences in the State." They seem to think one will balance out the other. Surely it should be on some basis of a standard. We have, or did have under the Licensing Commission, a grading of hotels, with five X's, four X's, three X's, two X's, and one X. They were graded as to what they might charge for bed and breakfast, whether rooms had private bathroom attached, whether they had hot and cold water, and so on. Those gradings were a great help to tourists.

There is a danger in arbitrarily limiting the number of licensed restaurants in the State to 32 because the clause does not indicate what proportion, if any, can be allotted to an area. We do not know whether they will all be distributed between Brisbane and the South Coast or whether there will be some basis of allocation.

Mr. Gaven: None on the South Coast. The lot of them will be in Toowoomba.

Mr. DUGGAN: That shows how silly the hon. member for South Coast can be. If ever he earns a reputation in this Parliament —and no doubt he will as a fighter for his area—he will go down as having made a mighty effort as a salesman to convince the Government of the wisdom of doing something for his beloved South Coast. I intimated earlier that a statue might be erected to the man who drinks and smokes in Australia because of the millions of pounds poured into the coffers of the Federal Treasury by drinkers and smokers. Probably some of the licensed restaurant people will in due course, if they do not erect a statue to the hon. member for South Coast, at least give him a guest ticket that will enable him to have free dining on the South Coast for many years to come.

Quite seriously, I think there is something wrong with the principle of an arbitrary limit and the Premier himself when in Opposition indicated that about soldiers' clubs. In that case there were 102 licences, and the Premier, who was then Leader of the Opposition, was not very happy about that limit. I think there was reasonable justification for the Premier's opinion on that occasion.

Here it is proposed to limit the number of licences to 32, with an annual increment of not more than two. What will be the position? For a start, I think there will be more than 32 applications. Consequently, the Commission must have some basis of allocation, and I do not think it should be geographic location. I think it should be a basis of standard. Certain standards are laid down in the Bill in regard to the provision of toilets and other requirements, but there is nothing in it to

say how the Commission should exercise its discretion. Licences should be granted to restaurants that are up to a certain standard, and I personally know of at least 10 in Brisbane that will be making application. There will be many more that will believe they are justified in making an application for a licence, of course. Taking into account the number of restaurants operating on the South Coast and in other parts of the State, 32 licences will be absorbed very quickly indeed.

What will be the position if licences are granted according to a standard and restricted to two new licences each year? Take a development scheme such as the one at Fig Tree Pocket that has received so much publicity recently and where millions of pounds are being spent. In that development there may be plans for the erection of a very superior type of restaurant. There may be other large-scale projects on the South Coast. For example, the Hilton chain of hotels may make additions to their hotel and include in them a cafe of some importance. At one stage Mr. Korman was going to build a cafe in the water.

Mr. Gaven: A floating restaurant.

Mr. DUGGAN: Yes. If such a scheme came to fruition—I am not saying it will, but at least it was canvassed by a man who had a great deal of influence and power—it most certainly should receive a licence. But there may be three or four other big-development schemes opened, and the number of new licences will be restricted to two a year. A new restaurant opened only a few weeks ago in Brisbane—Carousel—and I know that the Treasurer has been there. I have not, but reports are quite favourable and I believe it has a good view and is of a high standard. Indeed, new restaurants are being opened each week and available custom must be shared. I do not think any more liquor would be consumed if we had 62 licences instead of 32. It is a question whether 50 or 100 people are attending a restaurant or whether they are distributed amongst two or three restaurants, and I do not think an increased number of restaurants will increase the drinking habits of the people. Everybody knows that people usually indicate in advance that next Tuesday night, for example, they are going to take their wife to a restaurant and then on to a play, or perhaps a group of girls working in an office may decide to go out or a celebration party may be held. It is not very often that people decide on the spur of the moment to have a party in a restaurant. A party is generally planned in advance.

If we restrict the number of licensed restaurants to 32, trafficking in licences could take place, and I think that is undesirable. Obviously, there will be a premium on licences that are subject to financial considerations, and I do not think there should be any consideration for the granting of a licence. If a restaurant is up to a certain standard, any goodwill that may be involved when the premises are sold should not be based on the fact that it has a licence for which the person did not pay anything other than what he spent in bringing the restaurant up to that standard. I do not think that in any circumstances there should be monetary consideration for a right given by the Crown. I think that is very wrong. As I pointed out when dealing with Golden Casket agencies, the Labour Government took a very strong stand and if there was any financial consideration passing in the transfer of an agency, the transfer of that licence was withheld. On several grounds there are very strong reasons why we should not fix an arbitrary limit of 32. Perhaps the Minister will say that if the door is opened there will be hundreds of them throughout the State. But let us be realistic. I would not mind so much if the Minister said there were going to be 32 at the start but that the Government reserved the right to look at annual increment in 12 months or two years' time. But two is a disproportionately small number considering the size of Queensland. The Friday afternoon Sydney paper lists a great number of restaurants where one can wine, dine and dance.

Mr. Gaven: 160-odd.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am indebted to the hon. member. Sydney's population would be about 3½ times that of Brisbane, yet there are six times as many licences in Sydney than for the whole of the State of Queensland. I am not suggesting that they are all of high standard, nevertheless there would be some screening down there. These things will sort themselves out in due course, but I do not like the idea of trafficking. I saw any amount of that with Golden Casket agencies when I first became a member of Parliament. When he got an agency a man would occupy a small shop, stock it with £25-£30 worth of tobacco and a few odds and ends like hair-cream, then offer it for sale to some gullible person for £200 or £300. It was quite wrong. That will undoubtedly happen with liquor licences, except that the premiums will be ever so much higher because gullible people will be prepared to pay more for them.

The Bill provides that there must be certain minimum facilities. The premises must be suitable for the purpose; it must have certain linen, china, napery; it must serve not less than a minimum number of courses. I would be prepared to go along with the Minister if he would make it 20 or 25 a year, but two is far too few. I am not one to suggest that we should have enlarged facilities for drinking. What applies to hotels would apply equally to cafes. If cafes cannot give good service the provision or non-provision of wines with meals will not save them. People will not go in merely

to drink liquor at a restaurant without partaking of considerable quantities of food. If it was only the wine they wanted they could buy single bottles of wine more cheaply elsewhere and drink it in their own homes or cars. The quality of the restaurant will determine the patronage of the public. If they knew that if they developed their restaurants up to the required standard they could obtain a liquor license there would be an incentive to people to improve their premises. There would be competition to improve restaurants to the standard where they could say, "We have a standard sufficiently high to merit the granting of a licence." In France there is a tremendous amount of competition by restaurants to have their names recorded every year in the Michelin Guide. The first-class premises are indicated by three stars. That type of incentive should be provided here. The amendment would have the effect of encouraging restaurant and cafe proprietors to improve the standard of their premises. By accepting the amendment the Government have an opportunity to demonstrate the truth of their declaration that they want to improve tourist facilities.

They are being very unwise in limiting the number to 32 and in making provision for only two new licences each year.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (1 a.m.): I do not propose to accept this amendment but, before speaking to the amendment itself I refer very briefly to the case mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition about which I understand he feels that there may be some hardship due to the cancellation of the wine-seller's licence. From what he has said, it appears to me that this is probably the same case that was brought under my notice some little time ago by the hon. member for Whitsunday, who was a bit concerned as to whether the application of this new law might impose some hardship on a particular proprietor of a wine saloon.

I can only say that it is, of course, not possible to legislate for particular cases but, with regard to wine-sellers' licences generally, whilst it is true that all such licences must be cancelled not later than 30 June, 1963, it is also true that we have incorporated in the Bill quite adequate provisions for compensation. I feel that the Licensing Commission can be relied upon, in conformity with the law, to give fair determinations in all these cases.

With regard to the amendment itself, I am more than surprised that it should be proposed by the Leader of the Opposition at this stage, coming on top of the previous debate and the other amendments that have been proposed. I do not want to be provocative or to attempt to score any political point, but I think one would go a long way in any Parliament before one found such an example, of a Bill being bitterly opposed and voted against at the second reading stage and then, the Opposition officially coming forward with a whole sheaf of amendments, almost every one of them along the general lines of accepting the basic principles of the Bill and saying, "You have not gone far enough."

Mr. Hanlon: It is a matter of principle. Discrimination is a matter of principle in any Bill.

Mr. MUNRO: There is no principle at all.

Mr. Hanlon: You say discrimination is not a principle?

Mr. MUNRO: In the debate today, I will concede that there was one point taken where the Opposition objected to a major part of the Bill. They objected to the Government obtaining increased revenue by an increase in fees. They did that notwithstanding that it had virtually been decided earlier, in the course of the Budget debate. Some of the other amendments we thought reasonable and we accepted them. Others went too far and we felt they were unreasonable, and we would not accept them; but, almost every other amendment has said, in effect if not in so many words, "What you are doing is right but you are not going far enough. We feel you should go further." If that is not an anomaly I have never heard of one in my life.

Getting down to the merits of this particular amendment, as I say, we are not prepared to accept it because I think it would go altogether too far. First of all, on the idea of a statutory limitation to the number, we already have a statutory limitation to the number of licensed victuallers' licences. We have a statutory limitation of the number of wine-sellers' licenses.

Mr. Duggan: And you have not used all the licences.

Mr. MUNRO: No. And as the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned, we have a statutory limitation of the number of club licences. Although we have statutory limitations on other types of licences, he suggests, now that we are bringing in something completely new, that we should open the door without limit and say in effect to the Licensing Commission, "You have an open go. If you think it is the right thing to do, you can grant a restaurant licence to every suitable applicant."

Mr. Duggan: You know the Premier said there should be no arbitrary limit when it was 102.

Mr. MUNRO: The Leader of the Opposition went further, and as an alternative, suggested that we as a Government should take to ourselves the power to increase the number. That would not be reasonable. We think the matter is of sufficient importance that it should be determined by Parliament and, if after a year or two we think 32 is not an adequate number, our proper course is to come back to Parliament and by submitting an amending Bill seek some increase in the statutory number.

Mr. Hanlon: We did have a consequential amendment to provide for determination by the Governor in Council which would mean that the matter would have to come before Parliament from time to time.

Mr. MUNRO: The matter is of sufficient importance in our view that—and I do not indicate any intention in that way—if circumstances do arise later, indicating that the statutory number should be greater than 32, or 32 with such additions of two per annum as might be made, we can come back to Parliament. That is precisely what was done in relation to club licences. As the Leader of the Opposition said, that number was fixed at a statutory maximum of 102 but in the year ending 30 June, 1959, it was found that the statutory maximum number was not adequate, and we came to Parliament and by an amendment of the Act obtained authority to increase the number from 102 to 112. There is not really any case at all for accepting the principle that we have embodied in the Bill and extending it by going very much further than is desirable. Hon. members opposite may ask why we think it wrong that substantially all better class restaurants should have licences. The reason is very simple. We think there is a need for some licensed restaurants, but equally we think there is a need for some good class restaurants that do not have licences. As I indicated earlier, we want to retain the position where if a young man wants to take his girl friend to dinner he can if he feels that way inclined choose a restaurant that has not a licence where he will not have a wine list flourished under his nose.

There is only one further point. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that with a statutory limitation there may be trafficking in licences. There is no real foundation for the suggestion. As I have pointed out, we have statutory limitations on other types of licences and there is no reason at all to believe that restaurant licences will be so valuable that there will be a likelihood of trafficking. Although the explanation of the Leader of the Opposition was quite interesting, there is not the slightest justification for my accepting the amendment, and I do not do so.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (1.10 a.m.): The Minister has some very peculiar ideas about the rights and duties of hon. members of the Opposition. Simply because the Opposition indicated at the outset that they were against the Bill——

Mr. Munro: Don't you like my replying?

Mr. WALSH: I do not like the Minister putting his silly nonsense over. He seems to think that the views of members of the Opposition should coincide with the view advanced by him.

Mr. Munro: When illogical arguments are advanced it is my duty to point them out.

Mr. WALSH: They may appear to the Minister to be illogical but he has intimated that many of the arguments that have been raised have been logical because he has accepted several amendments from this side of the Chamber.

Mr. Munro: Some of them have been good.

Mr. WALSH: The Minister is qualifying his remarks now. Hon. members on this side opposed the Second Reading. They made their attitude quite clear by their vote on the division and that is recorded in "Hansard". As is the duty of the Opposition they have tried to make the best of a pretty bad piece of legislation brought down by the Minister, and it is apparent that to a large extent they have succeeded as the Minister has accepted some of their amendments. The Minister is trying to justify this clause to license restaurants by saying that there is a statutory number of licensed wine saloons throughout the State and after 1963 they will be closed and the licences will be parcelled out to numerous restaurants in the State. The Minister refers to the Licensing Commission but he has a fair idea where many of the licences will go. It is stupid to suggest that some 32 licences will be sufficient to meet the requirements of the hundreds of restaurants throughout the State that could qualify. I can nominate at least three restaurants in Bundaberg that would have the required standard of accommodation, space, and so on necessary to qualify for a restaurant licence, and no doubt the hon. member for Maryborough would have as many restaurants or cafes in his electorate. We could go to every city or town in the State and probably find 200 or 300 restaurants and cafes that would qualify, yet the Minister says that by closing 32 wine saloons and transferring the licences he will satisfy the requirements. I hazard a guess that the bulk of those licences will go to the South Coast despite the many protestations of the hon. member for South Coast. He has a fair idea that he will get half of the 32 licences allocated to his area. Although he may suggest that a certain number may go to Toowoomba I did not hear him say that any were going to Bundaberg.

In the first place, I do not see any justification for extending the facilities for liquor to be consumed in restaurants. I do not agree with the point of view advanced from this side of the Chamber. In my opinion there are enough facilities now for the consumption of alcohol. The Minister has said that the law is not being enforced and I could probably take him now into a restaurant or cafe in Queen Street, where liquor is being sold, and if I know about it, I take it that the Government also know. That has happened only since his Government came to power. I suppose it is another case of legalising a practice that is already in operation.

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (1.15 a.m.): The Minister reminds me of the Vicar of Wakefield, "E'en though vanquished could argue still." He displayed persistence and fortitude even if they were exemplified by a stubbornness unsurpassed in all the years I have been in the Chamber.

He said restaurant licences were not likely to be valuable and he tried to dismiss the matter lightly. Nobody knows better than he that the day after a licence is granted it will have a capital value and, although three months must elapse before it can be transferred, the licensee will have an equity on which he will have no trouble raising an overdraft from any bank in spite of the so-called credit squeeze. If there is any section of any legislation that invites corruption or that lends itself to corruption or that leaves the Government open to corruption, it is this.

If the issue of a new hotel licence is contemplated it cannot be issued until it has been advertised, tenders have been called, and plans of the standard of the building proposed to be erected have been submitted. A prospective tenderer has to engage an architect and submit plans of the design and details of the standard of the building. He has to compete by tender and pay a premium for the right to the hotel licence.

The requirement for a licensed restaurant will be much lower. The licensee will not have to provide board and lodging for travellers or indeed any other accommodation. His will be purely a grog shop. What is most remarkable is that no consideration will be paid for the licence as in the case of a hotel licence. There is no provision for tender. It will be like the New Year's honours or the Queen's Birthday honours; it will be open to the gravest suspicion and it will be something in which some politicians —and I am not going to back and fill about the matter—would not be above accepting some consideration in respect of their representations for a licence. I am not going to take anybody's part in the matter. Where you have a group of 78 men, no matter whether they are in Parliament or out of Parliament or anywhere else, you cannot tell me that all of them will be absolutely beyond reproach and incorruptible.

Mr. Row: Speak for yourself.

Mr. BURROWS: I am not going to back and fill, and I will say it inside the House or outside it. This invites corruption and it should be the aim of the Parliament to do everything within its power to prevent that. Providing the means to do ill-deeds causes ill-deeds to be done. There has not been a statute passed by this Parliament since it was created in 1859 that has left its members so open to corruption as does the provision for the handling and distribution of these licences. If the Minister or the Government are so anxious to serve and give these privileges, why not put them on the same basis as hotel licences? That is the query I want the Minister to answer. I quite forgive him at this hour of the morning for being a little irascible and intolerant but I appeal to him to give an intelligent reason why it was not possible to distribute the licences in that way. First of all, limiting the number makes competition for them much greater. If there were to be only 32 licences, one would expect to get more for each licence than if there were 132. I am open to correction, but I cannot see any provision in the Bill under which the Crown will receive any consideration for the granting of a licence as it does in the case of a new hotel licence. I do not doubt that by regulation and in the principal Act some standard might be set, but I should like the Minister's assurance that an investigation will be made into the character of the persons to whom licences are granted. It would usually be taken for granted that special consideration would be taken care of, but nothing can be taken for granted under the Bill. The more one looks at the provisions contained in it, the more one is convinced that the Government and the Minister should be ashamed to be associated with it.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from Clause 54 (Mr. Duggan's amendment) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 36

Mr. Anderson	Mr. Jones
,, Beardmore	,, Knox
,, Camm	,, Low
,, Campbell	,, Madsen
,, Chalk	,, Munro
Dr. Delamothe	,, Nicklin
Mr. Dewar	Dr. Noble
,, Evans	Mr. Pilbeam
,, Ewan	,, Pizzey
,, Fletcher	,, Rae
,, Gaven	,, Richter
,, Gilmore	,, Row
,, Harrison	,, Sullivan
,, Hart	,, Tooth
,, Herbert	,, Windsor
,, Hiley	
,, Hodges	*Tellers:*
,, Hooper	Mr. Ramsden
,, Hughes	,, Wharton

NOES, 24

Mr. Bennett	Mr. Lloyd
,, Burrows	,, Marsden
,, Byrne	,, Melloy
,, Davies	,, Newton
,, Dean	,, O'Donnell
,, Donald	,, Sherrington
,, Dufficy	,, Thackeray
,, Duggan	,, Wallace
,, Graham	,, Walsh
,, Gunn	
,, Hanlon	*Tellers:*
,, Houston	Mr. Bromley
,, Inch	,, Tucker

PAIRS

Mr. Lonergan	Mr. Adair
,, Carey	,, Baxter
,, Morris	,, Diplock
,, Hewitt	,, Mann
,, Armstrong	,, Hilton

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 54, as read, agreed to.

Clause 55—New ss. 125AD and 125AE inserted; Restrictions on the granting of the restaurant licences—as read, agreed to.

Clause 56—New ss. 125AF, 125AG, 125AH, 125AI, 125AJ, 125AK 125AL, 125AM, 125AN and 125AO inserted—

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (1.27 a.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 50, lines 1 to 7, omit the paragraphs—

'(125AK.) (1.) The holder of a restaurant license shall not permit dancing on any part of his licensed premises open to public resort at any time when liquor may be lawfully sold, supplied or consumed pursuant to this Part on the licensed premises.

(2.) Subsection (1) of this section shall be in addition to and not in derogation from section 166A of this Act.'

and insert in lieu thereof the paragraphs—

'(125AK.) (1.) Subject to subsection (2) of this section, the holder of a restaurant license shall not permit dancing on any part of his licensed premises open to the public at any time when liquor may be lawfully sold, supplied or consumed pursuant to this Part on the licensed premises.

(2.) Subsection (1) of this section and section 166A of this Act do not apply with respect to dancing by diners between the hours of six o'clock and eleven o'clock in the evening on any day except a Sunday, Good Friday, Anzac Day or Christmas Day—

(a) in a dining room on the licensed premises of the holder of a restaurant license wherein an evening meal is supplied to the public; and

(b) in the course of those diners partaking of that evening meal.' "

The nature of the amendment is almost self-evident from the wording. To show the amendment in its proper perspective I should explain that lines 1 to 7, which are to be omitted in terms of the amendment, contain Section 125AK, the broad effect of which was a complete prohibition on dancing in licensed premises of a licensed restaurant. The alteration is to give a qualified permission for dancing in licensed restaurants subject to the conditions that are precisely stated in the terms of the amendment—that is, that dancing is only to be permitted in the dining room wherein the evening meal is supplied and only in the course of those diners partaking of that evening meal. I think hon. members will agree that it is a reasonable amendment. The substantial effect is to bring licensed restaurants into line with similar provisions in regard to diners in hotel premises.

I make the point too that it is framed in such a way that it will not permit any licensed restaurant to become anything in the nature of a public dance hall.

Amendment (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (1.33 a.m.): I move the following further amendment:—

"On page 51, line 13, after the word 'sections', insert the words and brackets—

'eighteen (excepting subsections (1) and (2) of that section),' "

This is really a drafting amendment, I did make some reference to it earlier. It is merely to complete the reference to certain sections that are already in the statute but which are to have application to licensed restaurants in terms of the new law.

Amendment (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Clause 56, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 57 to 64, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

The House adjourned at 1.36 a.m.