Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 21 OCTOBER 1966

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 21 OCTOBER, 1966

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

QUESTIONS

CONTRACTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PILOT VESSELS

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) Have any contracts been let in recent times for the building of two pilot vessels? If so, what tender prices were received and who obtained the contracts?

(2) On what date were the contracts let and when were the security deposits paid on each vessel?

(3) Are the vessels under construction and, if so, what are the delivery dates?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes. Tender prices received were— F. W. Woodnutt and Co., Cairns, 1 vessel, $149,288; H. Morris, Brisbane, 1 vessel, $183,176.42; Norman R. Wright and Sons, Brisbane, 1 vessel $194,198, 2 vessels $387,000; Millkraft Boat Yard Pty. Ltd., Brisbane, 1 vessel, $194,467.89."

(2) "Contracts were awarded to F. W. Woodnutt and Co. on August 9, 1966, and H. Morris on August 10, 1966. F. W. Woodnutt's security deposit has not yet been lodged. H. Morris's security deposit was lodged on October 14."

(3) "Woodnutt has commenced preliminary construction work. It is expected that Morris will commence preliminary construction work next week. The delivery periods are 68 weeks in the case of Woodnutt's contract and 52 weeks in the case of Morris's contract."

SAFETY PRECAUTIONS AT SITE EXCAVATION FOR GOVERNMENT BUILDING, WILLIAM STREET

Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

(1) What was the number of inspections carried out by inspectors of the Machinery and Scaffolding Department on the excavation work being carried out on the site for the new administration building?

(2) On what date was the tubular steel erected for shoring on the William Street end of the site inspected?

(3) Did the report indicate that a collapse of the embankment would occur?

(4) On what date were the barricades or hoarding inspected for the safety of the general public?

(5) In view of the depth of the excavation work being carried out, when and on what date was the last inspection made of the site to see that all safety regulations were being fully observed?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) "This excavation work, which is site clearing only, does not come within the ambit of *"The Inspection of Scaffolding Acts,* 1915 *to* 1963". It is being carried out by the Department of Works. Furthermore, the hoardings in this case are matters for the Brisbane City Council."

CONTRACT FOR SITE EXCAVATION FOR GOVERNMENT BUILDING, WILLIAM STREET

Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) What are the names of the firms presently engaged on the excavation work for the site of the new administration building?

(2) What were the accepted contract prices for each contract for the excavation work and the cartage and disposal of soil and shale obtained from the site?

(3) What are the reasons for the revision of the present contracts when the cave-in and other factors associated with the excavation works of the site should have been covered in the original contracts and tenders called for the work?

Answers:—

(1) "The contractors for earthworks and site preparation—Block I, Government precinct development, Brisbane, is Rail and Road Constructions (Queensland) Pty. Limited. The approved sub-contractor for hoarding and associated works is Costain (Australia) Pty. Limited."

(2) "A tender of $29,069 was accepted for the whole of the work covered by the contract, including cartage from the site."

(3) "The present contract is not being revised."

REHABILITATION OF DISCHARGED PRISONERS

Mr. Newton, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Does the Government make a financial grant to the Southern and Northern Queensland Prisoners Aid Society to help in the rehabilitation of prisoners and ex-prisoners? If so, what were the amounts granted for 1964-65 and 1965-66?

(2) In view of the Government training scheme being carried out for the benefit of prisoners, does the Government help to rehabilitate prisoners by accepting them for employment in Government Departments?

Answers:—

(1) "Financial assistance provided by the Government to Prisoners Aid Societies in Queensland during the 1964-65 and 1965-66 financial years is as follows:—

	1964-65	1965-66
South Queensland Prisoners Aid Society	$3,400	$3,400
North Queensland Prisoners Aid Society	$800	$1,200"

(2) "Discharged prisoners who have accepted training and discipline in prisons have been employed by some Government departments on discharge. Others have been employed by Local Authorities following representations by prison officials. Many prison-trained men have been assisted to enter private business, a number on their own account, and have been successful. Government departments which have accepted discharged prisoners are Forestry, Main Roads, and Works. Ex-prisoners employed by the Works Department have been allowed to re-enter prisons as employees in the normal course of their employment. In addition, a number of men have received employment in a skilled capacity with the Railway Department, especially in outlying places, and where the offence for which they served terms of imprisonment was not of a serious nature. No details of the numbers, dates of discharges and periods of employment are kept."

DEEPENING OF SMALL-BOAT ANCHORAGE, PICNIC BAY, MAGNETIC ISLAND

Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

Will he consider using the dredge, now at Townsville and recently used at Lindeman Island, to deepen an area of Picnic Bay, Magnetic Island, in the vicinity of Hawkins Point for the use and safe anchorage of small boats in the Townsville area?

Answer:—

"There is no provision in the approved programme for the current financial year for carrying out dredging work at Hawkins Point. I will have some inquiries made in the matter."

ILLEGAL INTRODUCTION OF MEAT INTO TOWNSVILLE ABATTOIR AREA

Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

(1) Are any prosecutions pending against persons or companies for importing meat illegally into the franchise area of the Townsville abattoir?

(2) Is he satisfied that the present supervision is adequate and such as to preclude the escalation of this practice?

Answers:—

(1) "The introduction of meat into district abattoir areas is under the control of *"The Meat Industry Act of* 1965". Officers of the Slaughtering and Meat Inspection Branch of my Department act as inspectors under this Act. In addition to general inspection duties they supervise the regulations governing the introduction of meat into district abattoir areas. Operators are permitted to introduce a quota of meat subject to certain conditions but if meat is introduced contrary to such conditions it may be seized. A detailed report by the slaughtering inspector outlining the circumstances of any unlawful introduction is relayed through the Slaughtering and Meat Inspection Branch, to the District Abattoir Board for any action that the Board may consider necessary. Since September 13, 1966, inspectors during normal shop inspections have on five occasions detected meat which may have been illegally introduced into the Townsville district abattoir area. Reports have been prepared on each of these introductions and have been submitted to the Townsville District Abattoir Board. I have not been advised whether the Townsville Board has instituted action in these cases."

(2) "An inspector is usually engaged full time on inspection and general supervision of butchers' shops in the Townsville district abattoir area. His duties are supervised by and complementary to those of the district slaughtering inspector for the area. These officers can adequately handle the inspection and supervision of butchers' shops in normal circumstances. One inspector was recently granted recreation leave and the district inspector at Townsville was advised that if necessary he could draw on the services of an inspector from an adjoining town. It is considered that the present service is adequate for the detection of illegally introduced meats."

ADDITIONAL POLICE RESIDENCES AT MACKAY

Mr. Graham, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

As there are senior police officers in Mackay who are not provided with Departmental accommodation, will he, in view of the shortage of suitable housing accommodation there, consider the erection of further homes for them?

Answer:—

"No provision has been made in the Loan Works Programme for 1966-67 for the erection of police residences at Mackay. The erection of further residences at Mackay for occupancy by senior police officers will be considered in collaboration with the Police Department in the light of available funds when future works programmes are being drafted."

FINANCIAL STABILITY OF CONTRACTORS, BEEF CATTLE ROADS

Mr. Walsh for **Mr. Aikens,** pursuant to noticed, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) Is the Main Roads Department responsible for the calling and acceptance of tenders for the construction of beef roads in Queensland and, if so, what precautions are taken to ensure the financial stability of the various contractors?

(2) Was a firm named Phillips Construction Pty. Ltd. given a contract for the Julia Creek-Normanton road construction?

(3) If so, has the firm defaulted and failed to pay truck drivers employed by it amounts up to $961 in one case and does the Main Roads Department accept any responsibility for payment to these unfortunate workers?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes, subject to Cabinet approval. Considerable investigation is made into financial stability."

(2) "Yes. He had previously done a large contract on the same road and successfully carried it out without any trouble."

(3) "The firm had its last contract determined due to lack of progress and bankruptcy proceedings against it in another State. Up to the time of determination of the contract the Department of Main Roads paid several people, including truck drivers, who produced orders to pay signed by the contractor. At the time of the determination of the contract, the contractor had been declared bankrupt and it was considered that no further payments could be made to people claiming to be creditors."

BUILDING OPERATIONS, MITCHELL RIVER AND EDWARD RIVER MISSIONS

Mr. Graham for **Mr. Wallis-Smith,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

Is it the intention of the Government to complete the rebuilding plan at Mitchell River and Edward River Missions? If so, when will tenders be called?

Answer:—

"The Government intends progressively to extend housing for residents at the Mitchell River and Edward River communities taking into consideration other work required at other communities. It is not possible at this juncture to nominate when further building will take place at either of these centres."

HERBERTON STATE SCHOOL PLAYGROUND

Mr. Graham for **Mr. Wallis-Smith,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has he received any request from the Herberton Parents' and Citizens' Association relative to the redesigned playground area at the Herberton State school?

(2) Will he have investigations made as to the suitability of the new playground area?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Information recently received from the Department of Works indicates that the new playground area should be quite satisfactory when all work to be undertaken as a full State responsibility has been completed."

CANDIDATES, ABORIGINAL COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Mr. Graham for **Mr. Wallis-Smith,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

What is the average number of candidates seeking election to Aboriginal Councils on Reserves and how many Aborigines have forfeited their deposits under Section 324 of the Regulations?

Answer:—

"On Government sponsored communities an average of four candidates presented for election to Aboriginal councils. One candidate forfeited his deposit. Details are not available in respect of religious sponsored communities but no forfeiture of deposits occurred."

CONSTRUCTION OF WARRIGAL CREEK BRIDGE, FLINDERS HIGHWAY

Mr. Lonergan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) Does bridge work on the Bruce Highway carry a higher priority than similar work on the Flinders Highway?

(2) Will he increase the work force on the Warrigal Creek bridge to ensure that this project is completed before the commencement of the expected wet season?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes, because the Bruce Highway is in a much heavier rainfall area than the Flinders Highway, causing streams to flood more frequently, and because traffic density on the Bruce Highway is five to ten times that on the Flinders Highway. I would remind the Honourable Member that, in the past four years, some fourteen concrete bridges have been constructed in his electorate, ten of which were on the Flinders Highway, and include such major structures as the Campaspe River, Mundic Creek, Homestead Creek, Balfe Creek, Eastern Creek and Betts Creek bridges. Work is well advanced on the Warrigal Creek bridge and a scheme has been authorised for the Walkers Creek bridge. In the next few years, bridge jobs are planned for Holy Joe Creek, The Gilliat, Fullerton River, Williams River and Scrubby Creek."

(2) "No, as it is anticipated that the bridge will be completed before the wet season with the work force which is presently employed."

RAILWAY PERMANENT-WAY GANGS

Mr. Davies for **Mr. R. Jones,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) To what extent have Railway permanent way gangs been amalgamated due to the introduction of mechanical equipment in the maintenance section?

(2) Are further proposals intended to extend gang lengths and/or amalgamate gang strengths? If so, will he announce details?

Answers:—

(1) "The amalgamation of permanent way gangs as a result of the introduction of mechanical equipment is set out in detail in Departmental Weekly Notices 47/65 of November 25, 1965, and 32/66 of August 11, 1966."

(2) "Yes. When full details have been decided particulars will be advertised in the Departmental Weekly Notice."

Papers.—Whereupon Mr. Knox laid upon the Table of the House the Weekly Notices referred to.

CONDUCT OF MELBOURNE CUP SWEEPS BY POLITICAL PARTIES

Mr. Davies for **Mr. Mann,** pursuant to notice asked The Minister for Justice,—

Is it legal for any political party or any branch of a political party to run a sweep on the Melbourne Cup or any other major horse-race run in Australia?

Answer:—

"It is not legal at present for any person or organization to conduct a sweep on the Melbourne Cup where money prizes are involved. However, the Bill now before the Assembly enables new conditions for Melbourne Cup sweeps to be considered. Sweeps are a form of art union and the purposes for which permitted art unions may be conducted exclude sweeps for the benefit of any political party."

Extension of Hours, Wynnum Medical Clinic

Mr. Harris, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

In view of the limited time available for outpatients to interview visiting doctors at the Wynnum Medical Clinic, will he rearrange the hours so that the doctors will be available from 9 a.m. to 2.45 p.m. continuously?

Answer:—

"The existing system is that patients are required to register between 9 a.m. and 10.45 a.m. and between 1 p.m. and 2.45 p.m. on each day the clinic is conducted. The medical team comprising two doctors, a sister, a nurse, a pharmacist and a clerk operate the clinic as a team and have a lunch break from 12 noon to 1 p.m. All patients who present themselves at the clinic by 2.45 p.m. are seen and receive treatment, if necessary, that day. It is not reasonable to expect that the members of the medical team forego their lunch break."

PAPER

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Order in Council under the Grammar Schools Acts, 1860 to 1962.

SUGAR BOARD BILL

Second Reading

Hon. J. A. ROW (Hinchinbrook—Minister for Primary Industries) (11.15 a.m.): I move—

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

It is very gratifying to me to have such support expressed for this legislation by both sides of the House. The debate at the introductory stage has left me with little to comment on in relation to the purposes of the Bill. One or two hon. members touched upon such matters as the recent expansion of the sugar industry and the support forthcoming from the banking institutions, and so on. I do not feel that it is necessary on this occasion to comment further upon these matters, other than to say that the problem we are dealing with is one of industry liquidity and certainly not one of industry solvency. In spite of the present overseas prices, the sugar industry is undoubtedly still a very sound industry. Hon. members will have ample opportunity during the debate on the Estimates of my department, and also on other sugar legislation presently listed for this session, to discuss all aspects of the industry. One or two hon. members suggested that the amount of $19,000,000 concerned in the present arrangements is not sufficient for industry needs. I repeat that the amount of $19,000,000 was determined by the industry itself after much consideration and consultation by and between the various industry interests. The Government agreed to support the request at this level as being a prudent figure. In the circumstances, I feel that the amount of $19,000,000 should not be disturbed. I thank all hon. members for their support of the Bill, and through the Bill, for their support of our great industry.

Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (11.17 a.m.): I intended to make my contribution to the second reading of this Bill the briefest speech in my history. But unfortunately, yesterday—I exclude the Minister from these remarks—comments were passed in the Chamber relative to the sugar industry which expressed no appreciation of the work the Australian Labour Party Government had done for it. As a matter of fact, there was only criticism, and, strange to say, in years of prosperity, because the Minister for Transport at that time imposed railway freight increases.

When the Opposition had indicated at the introductory stage that it would give unqualified support to the Bill, I felt that there would have been some expressions of appreciation from members representing the sugar industry in this Chamber. But in spite of what the Minister said to the Committee—I think I commented that although he was brief, his information was complete—we still have these hon. members using the sugar industry as a political issue, even after the Opposition had given unqualified support to the Government in this important matter.

Let me say to the hon. member for Mirani that I have here a Press report in which he claimed that the sugar industry was in desperate need of aid to the extent of $30,000,000. That was on 31 August, 1966. Strange to say, that follows a statement by a spokesman for the industry, in an article in "The Courier-Mail" of 26 August under the heading, "Sugar prices slump is not all that bad." The article contains some figures which, to the man in the street, who is the one who reads these things, are of outstanding importance. Blazoned across the pages of the Press are references to the low price of sugar on the world market, and then we see that on the home market 600,000 tons of sugar are to be sold this year at about $A121 a ton. Another 335,000 tons are to be exported to Britain at $A108 a ton, and 150,000 tons are assured of sale to the United States at about the same figure. That

is revealed by a spokesman for the industry. In spite of that, the hon. member for Mirani claims that the industry needs approximately $30,000,000.

The Minister stated categorically that this matter had been fully examined by the industry, and agreement was reached that an approach be made to the Commonwealth Government for $19,000,000. These points are important, because we on this side of the House went into the matter thoroughly and, whilst we appreciate that there is a crisis in the industry with its overseas markets, we know that there is also a degree of prosperity in the industry.

The hon. member for Mulgrave adopted an attitude similar to that of the hon. member for Mirani when he stated quite categorically yesterday that twice the amount of the present loan should be granted to the industry. He also suggested quite emphatically that the domestic price of sugar, now 9 cents (or 11d.) a lb. should be increased. The industry, supported by the Government, adopted the commendable attitude that the domestic price should stay at its present level.

I also wish to refer to another Press article. It appeared in July and showed the break-up of the sugar price into the amounts received by growers, millers, and retail grocers, and the amount attributable to transport costs. It reads—

> "Of the 11d. per lb. retail price for sugar in Australian capital cities the industry receives 7·15d. per lb.
>
> "The break-up between growers and millers is 4·84d. and 2·31d. per lb. respectively."

The article goes on to explain that wholesale and retail grocers receive 1·54d. per lb.; refining costs are responsible for 1·43d. per lb.; and transport costs represent ·88d. All that we on this side of the House did in the Budget debate was support the sugar growers, who complain that increased transport charges will add to the costs of the industry. Therefore, we feel quite keenly on this matter.

We do not take things such as this lightly, because we know how prosperous the sugar industry has been in the past. I was in Bundaberg in 1963, and while walking round the city one night—there must have been several functions on in the city—I counted 1,000 motor-cars. Hon. members know that those motor-cars would represent a capital investment of more than £1,000,000. In fact, people who have been to the sugar areas have always spoken of sugar-growers' prosperity and of the numbers of them who have a motor-car and a boat on a trailer in the garage or carport, or whatever it may be. For decades we have heard of their prosperity.

The Opposition appreciates the importance of primary industries. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members on this side of the House have said over and over again that they want to see men on the land enjoying prosperity. We want primary producers to be as free from encumbrances as possible and to be good spenders in their localities, no matter what activities they may be engaged in, so that rural centres, which are so important to our civilisation, will grow and expand. We have already advocated that; we shall continue to do so. Therefore, it is completely incomprehensible to me that people associated with primary industries do not express some appreciation of Labour's attitude.

For some time to come, when hon. members are called upon to deal with legislation in this House, I think they may be faced with problems in other industries. The Opposition wants all primary industries to be elevated to a prosperous standard. We mean that, and we will never do anything to prevent it from happening.

Mr. Wharton: That is an important point.

Mr. O'DONNELL: We are conscious of the secondary benefits that flow to people in the community.

The hon. member for Burnett interjected a moment ago. He makes the poorest contributions in this House. He interjects, as far as the Opposition is concerned, politically and on no other basis. We do not hear any constructive criticism from him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. O'DONNELL: If the attitude exemplified in the proclamation is put into effect, something of benefit to the industry will emanate from it. I know that the Minister feels a great deal of responsibility to the industry. After all, he has practical experience in it, and all hon. members appreciate, I think, that he regrets the need to bring a Bill such as this before the House. Would it not be wonderful if all industries could live without grants, loans, or subsidies?

In conclusion, I say that the Opposition gives its unqualified support to the ratification of the proclamation, and that hon. members on this side of the House hope sincerely that the money to be made available to the industry by way of loan will carry it through the difficult period from the present slump to the state of stability and prosperity that it knows so well.

Motion (Mr. Row) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Hodges, Gympie, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 3, both inclusive, and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Row, by leave, read a third time.

COLLECTIONS BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.31 a.m.): I move—

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

As hon. members have now had an opportunity of perusing the Bill, I feel it will assist them in their discussion on its contents to reiterate, though briefly, its objects. They are—

1. The making of better provision for the regulation of appeals to the public for the support of genuine objects, and for the prohibition of appeals for spurious purposes;

2. The achievement of those objects by a simplification of the present means of regulation and control;

3. The division of objects that are worthy of public support between charitable purposes and community purposes;

4. The making of provision for ensuring a greater measure of regulation and control over appeals to, and collections from, the public where a commercial undertaking, or some private gain, is involved;

5. The giving of lawful authority in cities and towns, where needed, for the controlling of door-to-door appeals and the assistance of street collections;

6. The elimination of the need for duplication of authorities needed in relation to appeals for support;

7. The making of more satisfactory provisions in relation to the investigating of appeals for support, the records to be kept, the audit of accounts and the lodgment of returns;

8. The ensuring for the benefit of the community of the use of moneys collected or assets obtained from appeals to the public for charities and community purposes upon the organisation or association in question ceasing to operate or upon the failure of the purpose for which the money or assets were obtained.

Although a more detailed explanation of the particular provisions of the Bill could be left to the Committee stage, I propose to emphasise one or two matters that were raised during the introductory stage. The first is the matter of the reduction in clerical work. Here I am pleased to see that hon. members support my proposals to lessen the amount of clerical work that is required at present. It is necessary, of course, to impose certain safeguards against fraud or deceit in connection with appeals for support and public collections. Even though there will, under the proposed measure, be a considerable reduction in paper-work, adequate safeguards against the evils of fraud and deceit will be maintained. I am well aware of the magnificent work that is voluntarily undertaken in the charitable and community field, and it will be the voluntary workers who will greatly benefit from these proposals.

The second matter has reference to fees. I should like to emphasise that any association that desires to register as a charity or obtain a sanction for an appeal for support is not required to make any payment of money to the department. No revenue is collected by the charitable section of the Department of Justice. If money is to be raised by an art union, then, of course, the provisions of the Art Union Regulation Act will apply.

The regulations under the Art Union Regulation Act exempt certain designated charities from the payment of fees. The relevant regulation provides—

"(i) For the purpose of raising funds in aid of—

(a) Any ambulance or hospital;

(b) Any spastic children's welfare centre, home for crippled children, kindergarten, or orphanage;

(c) Any school or educational institution;

(d) Any war veteran's home conducted by The Returned Sailors' Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia; or

(e) Any activity exempted from the provisions of 'The Charitable Collections Act of 1952' by section 3 thereof.

(ii) To raise funds—

(a) For the Australian Red Cross or a Legacy Fund;

(b) For the Royal Flying Doctor Service;

(c) For flood relief;

(d) For affording aid to sub-normal children;

(e) For affording aid to blind persons;

(f) For the Queensland Bush Children's Health Scheme;

(g) For the National Heart Foundation of Australia (Q'ld. Division);

(h) For the Queensland Cancer Fund;

(i) For the Surf Life Saving Association of Australia Queensland State Centre and any affiliated branch or club registered under 'The Charitable Collections Act of 1952';

(j) For the Queensland Multiple Sclerosis Society; or

(k) For the Queensland Police-Citizens Youth Welfare Association."

Under the Art Union Regulation Act those pure charities are forgiven fees other than a nominal fee covering the application for a permit, which ranges from nothing to £1.

The Register of Charities will be open to public inspection at all times without fee, but where any typing work is involved in preparing copies of or extracts from the Register, then a fee will be charged to cover the cost of that work.

I should like to express my appreciation to all hon. members who spoke at the introductory stage for their very constructive approach, in particular the hon. member for Merthyr who, from his experience of his own organisation, was able to give us informative details of how rag-collectors operate. The information that has been made available will enable us to frame a suitable regulation which Parliament will have a chance to look at in due course.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.38 a.m.): At the introductory stage the Minister gave us a more or less detailed statement of the Government's intention in bringing down this Bill. It became quite evident as the debate ensued—the Minister mentioned the speech of the hon. member for Merthyr—that the whole of the provisions covering the soliciting of funds for charitable and other purposes were due for review. However, I do regret the circumstances which apparently have dictated that the Minister should bring on the second reading of the Bill only two days after it was printed.

This is a very important Bill. I do not want to speak on this subject in a plaintive tone, but apparently the urgency of the second-reading stage is being dictated by a comparatively minor section of the Bill contained in Part VIII—Miscellaneous, the importance of which is in no way comparable with that of the rest of the Bill.

Part VIII—Miscellaneous deals with certain approvals to be given for the conduct of Melbourne Cup sweeps. I enjoy a mild flutter on the horses and I certainly have no objections to sweeps, or reasonable betting as such. However, I think we are being a little carried away by our own folklore as far as the Melbourne Cup is concerned. Under this measure the Charitable Collections Act is being repealed and re-written on a much wider scale and it seems wrong that it should be hustled through Parliament before hon. members can fairly assimilate it, or examine it as they should, in order to pass a minor piece of legislation tagged on to the end of it to legalise some Melbourne Cup sweeps. As there is some authority for these sweeps in existence, the impending running of the Melbourne Cup this year should not cause the Minister to race this Bill through Parliament to get that part of it authorised.

On 17 November last year the Minister announced that, as from 1 January 1966, permits could be given by clerks of the court for art unions, including Melbourne Cup sweeps, up to a value of $50, and that applications for Melbourne Cup sweeps for greater amounts would be considered by his department. I do not know whether any applications have been made for such sweeps.

Mr. Bromley: They have been, and they have been granted by the Justice Department.

Mr. HANLON: The Minister indicated publicly that that would be the case, and he later confirmed it in Parliament, when I asked a question on 9 December, 1965.

This matter is again referred to in the Bill. I have some queries to put to the Minister about some provisions in that part of the Art Union Regulation Act dealing with Melbourne Cup sweeps. I will go into them in detail later, or in the Committee stage when we are considering the clauses of the Bill. I am merely mentioning the Melbourne Cup aspect of the Bill early in the piece, as I believe that, as a Parliament, we are being somewhat carried away in racing through an important Bill for what is, after all—no matter what importance folklore attaches to the Melbourne Cup—apparently of no significance compared with the rest of the Bill.

This measure repeals the Charitable Collections Act of 1952, and it is re-writing it on a much wider plane. It is by no means a simple replacement of the Charitable Collections Act. As the Minister pointed out when introducing the measure, the Charitable Collections Act, by its very name, was obviously framed in 1952 to provide some control legislatively and administratively, by regulation, over appeals for charity. The Minister said that more or less by the application of the Act when dealing with applications that were given entitlement under it, in the intervening period between 1952 and the present time it has become something of a hotchpotch of what is, in fact, a collections Bill.

The Minister indicated that of several thousand bodies registered under the Act, only about a quarter could be regarded in the real sense of the word as charities. As he said, the others have community purposes or are for good causes of some description but by their nature they could not be regarded as direct charitable causes. It may be true to say that in this way the 1952 Act has become something of a collections Act without that part being written in the law as such. For that reason, I do not think any opposition would be voiced and we welcome a review of the general question by the Government through the introduction of this measure. The scope of the legislation now gives broad cover to collections generally; it does not cover purely what might be regarded as charitable collections.

In view of the extension of the scope of the legislation, we are entitled to a little more information from the Minister on the way it will be applied. If it is to cover all types of appeals for and collection of funds, the question of exemptions arises. Also, there may be collections that are neither exempted

nor covered by the legislation. One point of difference between the Bill and the Charitable Collections Act is that under the Act the Minister can authorise not only registration of charities but also exemption from the Act. That provision may be in the Bill. There are 40 clauses in it and we have not had long to study them. So I do not know for certain whether the Minister has that authority. Organisations which are neither covered nor exempted by the legislation will be acting in a form of limbo in their transactions.

When we try to set a legal boundary for something that previously had no legal foundation, in many cases we create anomalies and difficulties for people of goodwill and bona fides. That happened when provision was made under the Art Union Regulation Act for football doubles. We know the part played by the sale of football doubles in contributing to the finances of the various football codes. Before the 1964 amendment to that Act, football doubles were operated in a sort of uneasy limbo; they were not provided for legally and were always conducted with the feeling that they were illegal. On odd occasions there was a temporary enforcement of the Act by the police, but generally speaking football clubs and other organisations raising finance in this way proceeded along on a fairly steady course.

Then the Government decided that it should legalise football doubles, and an opportunity was given for people to operate within the law. The intention of the Government at that time is to be commended, as it is in this case, because the majority of people —99 out of 100—desire to operate within the law, if possible. These people contribute to the well-being of our young people, through these various sporting activities, and there is no doubt that they would prefer to operate within the law and not feel that at any time there could be intervention. When such things are made legal, it is almost unavoidable that we write into the legislation many conditions and circumstances under which they can be conducted.

It was pointed out on this side of the House at the time that the matter would become virtually one of administration, and that if all the conditions prescribed by the Art Union Regulation Act of 1964 were applied to the various sporting clubs that sell doubles tickets, they would not receive even a "cracker" out of them. All sorts of conditions were laid down in the regulations. Doubles tickets could be sold only on the day of the game to which they applied, and only at the ground where it was to be played. They could be sold only by clubs whose teams were playing on the ground on that day. Many things had to be done which made the selling of doubles tickets to finance football clubs quite impracticable.

I am not going to enter into the history of what followed. Suffice it to say that representatives of football clubs found it necessary to approach the Minister and point out their difficulties. I think the Minister assured them, as he pointed out to hon. members when the Bill was introduced, that common sense would be used in administering the Act. A great deal of common sense will also be required in administering the proposals contained in the Bill now before the House, in respect of both the collections aspect and the miscellaneous section that deals with sweeps on the Melbourne Cup. The Minister and his officers approach these responsibilities with common sense.

We all know that it is common for people, both in and out of Parliament, to say, when it suits them, "The law must be upheld." That is easy enough to say and, in itself, is quite true. We all know, however, that if laws were applied to the letter there would be very little progress. At times when unions, in such fields as transport, building, and communications, have decided in certain circumstances to work to regulations, chaos has resulted. Quite obviously when laws are made they have to be made in such a way as to give to the bodies concerned with their administration the power to deal with blatant breaches of them that are not in the public interest.

Although generally the Opposition gives its approval to the Bill, I point out these things because there are some aspects of it that we find rather illogical. There are some provisions which, if applied exactly as they appear, could be used in a way that would not be justified except in very extreme cases. However, my experience, under the present and previous Governments, is that the administration of this type of legislation is approached with common sense along the lines that I have mentioned. The Bill is being hurried through the House—to my mind, quite unnecessarily—and I mention these things only to ensure that should there subsequently be any need to raise any criticism or objection we cannot be told, "You gave your blessing to the Bill when it was before Parliament."

We give the Bill our approval and accept the Minister's sincerity when he says that it is designed to provide an overdue tightening up of many aspects of public collections which obviously require it.

Having said that, I shall refer briefly to a matter that was raised this morning by the hon. member for Brisbane in a question to the Minister for Justice about the position of political parties wishing to conduct Melbourne Cup sweeps. My remarks will not necessarily be confined only to the conduct of Melbourne Cup sweeps, but I shall deal with the matter briefly under these circumstances.

Under a Bill such as this, if wide cover of authority and law is to be provided in relation to appeals and collections from the public for one purpose or another, the question not only of the conduct of Melbourne Cup sweeps by political parties but also of the appeals that they make to the public for funds to support them and enable them to carry out their administrative responsibilities as a party, and, no doubt, at

election time to prosecute a campaign designed to return them to Government and to place before the public information that they think is relevant to its decision at the poll, is involved. I am not introducing this question in order to seek a direct answer from the Minister as to whether the Bill will apply to collection of funds by political parties, irrespective of their political colour, and I stress that I am not examining it from the point of view of the Country Party, the Liberal Party, the Australian Labour Party, or any other party, but from the point of view of its application.

If one looks at the Bill, one is left in no doubt that under its provisions certain people may be authorised to make appeals for various causes, charitable or otherwise, or for community purposes. The proposed provisions of the Bill are very much wider than the provisions of the Charitable Collections Act, and they will permit only authorised persons to make such appeals. As I said, I raise the question of the position of political parties, not having in mind Melbourne Cup sweeps that may be conducted by them, which I believe to be only a minor aspect, but having in mind the collection of funds generally by political parties.

I think I should refer to the matter at this stage because if in future one party or another—as I said, what I am saying does not apply to only one political party—decides under some circumstances to apply the provisions of clauses of the Bill or regulations issued under it, we do not want to be told that such provisions or regulations were approved by Parliament, including members of the Opposition. It is impossible not to consider this question, because the provisions of the Bill as it stands permit a person or a body to be authorised to make an appeal for any purpose. Authority must be obtained, and one is forbidden to make appeals or collections if one is not authorised or exempted. That certainly would mean that, technically, no political party could in its own right make appeals to the public for support.

Mr. Ramsden: Do you think that would be a good thing, or a bad thing?

Mr. HANLON: I do not think it would be a good thing, because of the very essence of the way in which this Parliament operates. It may be a good thing, perhaps, if we could get away from a party system and act on the plea made by the hon. member for Burdekin, who wished to see a Parliament of true Independents. If we could get that, I should say it would be a very good thing. But I think that about an hour after such a Parliament of 78 members assembled, one would see 40 Independent members sitting on one side of the House and 38 Independent members sitting on the other side although they would not be members of the one party. That is the ideal, but in practice no-one has been able to work out a way of reaching that happy state. So we continue to recognise the party system, both inside and outside this Chamber, and it has become almost an integral part of parliamentary democracy as we know it.

That does not mean to deny, of course, the right of Independents in the Parliament to form themselves into any particular group at any time or to take some concerted action together as Independents. But the essence of this or any other democratic Parliament is that the electoral decision is given on the particular approach made to the electors, not necessarily by the individual member. His approach might play an important part in his own seat, but so far as the form of Government is concerned, acceptance or otherwise is decided on the proposal put up by the party and the way in which it is put up.

If we accept that as being a reality in politics, it is apparent to me that unless we give political parties the opportunity to appeal for contributions, and appeal for them in a bona fide manner and without any strings attached—that is, such as advertisements appearing in the Press appealing for funds for the Liberal Party, or the Labour Party or any other political party; or the type of thing that was read out last night by the hon. member for South Brisbane as coming from Dr. Hartwig on behalf of the Liberal Party—we will perhaps have to put up with some of the less desirable consequences in the manner in which they secure their funds for the purposes for which they are established.

For that reason, I point out that it would not be useful to prohibit the collection of, or appeals for, funds by political parties. This is necessary for their conduct and I do not see how we can get away from it. I merely raise the matter to point out that the Bill as it stands would appear to leave political parties more or less in the sort of limbo that the football clubs used to be in before doubles were legalised. I do not think that is desirable. Governments of all political shades have been loath directly to provide authority or otherwise for political parties and to set it down in the law, because of the difficulty of defining just what constitutes a political party.

If the Government were to set down in a Bill such as this an exemption for a political party or a specific provision for it—perhaps provision that it could operate outside of the Bill—I do not suppose it could deny a similar right to any individual who wanted to declare himself a political party. We have an example in this Parliament, in the hon. member for Townsville South, of a man declaring himself to be a political party, although it is not for us to deny it no matter in what focus we might regard some aspects of his action.

But there is no reason why any individual should not declare himself to have started a particular political party under whatever name he likes to give it. For that reason, Governments in the past—and this Government in this Bill—have not sought to provide definite legality in the collection of funds by political parties. This Government has gone

further than its predecessors in endeavouring to provide legislation to deal with the less desirable aspects of soliciting funds from the public and has replaced the Charitable Collections Act with this Bill, but if one Government or another wanted to use this legislation in any way other than that put forward by the Minister, I do not think that would be right.

I conclude my remarks on this matter, and also in relation to the less important subject of whether political parties can raise funds by way of Melbourne Cup sweeps, by saying that I do not think that the Bill as set forward has any intention of restricting political parties in the way I have mentioned. If the Minister will indicate that that is so, then I shall be prepared to accept his assurance.

Unfortunately, hon. members opposite do not always give us credit for the attitude we adopt towards Bills on matters of public importance, such as this one is, if we accept them rather than make them the subject of a political dispute. Subsequently we often find hon. members opposite, including some Ministers—I am not referring to the present Minister for Justice—saying, "You blokes should have said something about this when the legislation went through." Therefore, it becomes necessary for us to make some general remarks of this nature to indicate that in our opinion this Bill does raise a certain legal query about appeals that might be made by political parties in a bona-fide fashion. We do not think it is intended to apply in any way restrictively or unfairly in that regard, and we accept it on that basis. However, we have recorded our possible objections in the terms I have outlined. The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned to me that the Opposition is prepared to accept the Bill as being designed to do what the Minister set out in his introductory remarks, and no more.

I will bring out certain points at the Committee stage, when we can discuss them in detail, but if I could get some information from the Minister now it might save time then. The Charitable Collections Act of 1962 provides certain exemptions under section 3 (3) (b), not only for religious denominations but also for the conduct of schools, hospitals and other such good causes. The Bill provides the same exemptions as are provided in the Charitable Collections Act for the various religious denominations that make appeals for the advancement of their activities, but the same exemption does not seem to be maintained on the second aspect of of the matter. It seems to me that the terminology of the Bill is such that its provisions do not apply in the same way to exempt their schools, hospitals, homes for the aged, and so on. Perhaps the Minister will deal with this matter in his reply.

We virtually have had only 24 hours to look at the Bill. By its very nature it has been something of a buck-jumper for the Government; it has taken the Government quite some time to lasso it. No doubt considerable difficulty has been experienced in drafting the Bill; that would be understandable. As the Minister and his departmental officers have been poring over it for 12 months since he first indicated his intention to introduce amending legislation dealing with sweeps, that is an obvious reason why the Opposition has some difficulty in comprehending the full intent of some of the clauses in the very short time since the Bill was printed.

In conclusion, I shall refer to the provisions dealing with Melbourne Cup sweeps which, as I mentioned earlier, although only a minor part of the Bill, apparently dictated the desire of the Government to have the legislation dealt with promptly. Here again it seems to me that the Minister has laid down provisions that inevitably must create anomalies. There is some lack of logic in his approach.

I mentioned earlier that without doubt the Melbourne Cup is a big event in the racing calendar. That is due to the excellent promotional work in its early days by the Victorian Racing Club which, I think, is the club that conducts it. Over the years the Victorian Government Tourist Bureau, the Victorian Government itself, and the Victorian people, have promoted it to make it a national affair. While we must admire what they have done, I think it is unique for the Government of one State to give official recognition to a race that is promoted—and very well promoted—by another State.

I am not making these remarks in any "wowserish" sense. I am merely pointing out that we are recognising in law what is more or less a tourist attraction—a very successfully publicised attraction; and good luck to them—of another State. However, there is a lack of logic when we are, somewhat provincially, carried away by the folklore of the Melbourne Cup and give it priority over events in our own State that we would like to see become nationally recognised. The B.A.T.C. in 1946 promoted the Doomben Ten Thousand, as it has become known. It was the first £10,000 race in Queensland. It attracted a Queensland-bred horse named Bernborough, which immediately drew attention to the event.

If we examine this matter we see that there is a certain lack of logic in providing for sweeps to be run on the Melbourne Cup, and in assisting in the promotion of an already successful event run in another State, while overlooking our own State and events that should be promoted here to attract attention to this State from interstate tourists, as well as from those in this State. If we are to encourage the type of Melboure Cup fever that seizes the public at this time of the year in other States of Australia, we should encourage the same fever in our own State and about our own races if we want people from elsewhere to take an interest in them and come to see them and talk about Queensland, where the event is run, and so on.

I reserve our decision on whether it is wise to try to provide a legal basis for these things. If the Government's decision to recognise Melbourne Cup sweeps is a wise decision, surely in logic we should allow similar latitude for important racing events in Queensland, either at Doomben or at Eagle Farm. To my mind, there is some difficulty in obtaining the permit that was indicated 12 months ago by the Minister as being available for any form of sweep. The Minister may say that any form of sweep, perhaps other than a Melbourne Cup sweep can still be applied for under Division II of Part III, of the Art Union Regulation Act. The Minister has not indicated that the only intention of this Bill is that such a permit under the Art Union Regulation Act, as distinct from approvals under this legislation, would be only for the Melbourne Cup. I should like the Minister to indicate how these permits can be given to people to conduct sweeps under Division II of Part III of the Art Union Regulation Act.

One of the requirements of that Act is that certain property is not to be disposed of by permitted art unions. The first thing listed that permitted art unions cannot dispose of is money. So it would seem that in sweeps to be run under this Division—and the Minister indicated that permits can be applied for under Division II of the Art Union Regulation Act to conduct a single art union, outside the approvals given under this Bill—a person would not be able to give money as the prize. Some people might like to have a sweep run with two bars of chocolate for a ticket, and the prize would be 440 bars of chocolate, or if it was two bottles of cordial a ticket the prize would be the same. It seems to me that logically, by the very essence of the fact it is a sweep, it is an art union for money. I should like the Minister to clarify the doubt in my mind.

I reserve any further comment to the Committee stage, except that I note that the Minister is taking certain powers to freeze funds. Where it is considered necessary or where the protection of the public dictates, the Minister will have power to freeze any funds held by any person or to direct any bank to hold those funds until the Minister comes to a decision on the matter. By no means do I object to his having those powers. I suggest, however, that the Minister give himself the same powers to act as quickly and directly under the Companies Act. Subject to correction, I would say that this power under the Companies Act applies to the trustees of debenture-holders, for example, who can apply to the Minister for an order, and he can direct them to apply to the court. But in this case the Minister himself acts with the utmost speed. I accept that it is necessary for him to have this power, and I hope that he considers taking similar power under the Companies Act for the protection of the public.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (12.18 p.m.): I have two brief observations to make: one is a suggestion to the Minister and the other is a query. During the introductory stage of the Bill the hon. member for Townsville North referred to income-tax deductions. We all know that these deductions are a matter administered by the Federal Treasurer and are not included in the ambit of this Bill. But from personal experience I know many people who have organised appeals, and because they have been registered under the Charitable Funds Act they believe that subscribers to the charity have the right to claim a donation as a taxable deduction. They do not know better. They often say in good faith things which are wrong and obviously misleading and can lead them into trouble.

I suggest that when applications for permits are made under this Act it would be useful if, in the documentation, there was an indication that authorisation did not also make the donations deductible under the Income Tax Act, and that a separate application in that respect should be made to the Treasurer. I readily agree that this is not the responsibility of the Minister. However, it would be a protection for people who, in good faith, organise these appeals and tell people something that is incorrect.

The other matter I wish to raise deals with door-to-door collections. This may possibly come under some other Act and I should like the Minister's advice on the point. Frequently people are so carried away with the aims and significance of their appeals that they get young children to assist in these door-to-door appeals, with the result that immature youngsters can find themselves in possession of considerable sums of money and subject to a degree of danger. Secondly, I do not think it is a good thing for children of tender years to be going into homes. No-one knows who the residents are. I think a minimum age should be prescribed for people who are participating in door-to-door collections.

On the one hand, I suggest that the Minister look at the question of income-tax deductions and offer useful advice to people who organise appeals, and, on the other, I should appreciate his advice concerning minimum ages for those taking part in door-to-door collections.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (12.21 p.m.): I wish to reinforce the contention of the hon. member for Baroona that the Minister has shown undue haste in proceeding with the second-reading stage of the Bill. If it had dealt with one or two amendments to the Charitable Collections Act, nobody could have made such an accusation. However, we are now, in the short period of time since 1 o'clock on Wednesday, asked to give consideration to a Bill containing 36 pages which actually repeals another Act. I do not think that under the stress of the Budget debate the Opposition could be expected to do justice to an examination of the measure now being debated.

Quite frankly, I agree with the hon. member for Baroona that there is a need to tidy up the Charitable Collections Act. Whilst I agree that possibly some of the measures contained in the Bill are designed for that specific purpose, I am afraid that I view the Bill with more than a little suspicion. Recently I asked a question of the Minister concerning the revenue received by his department from the issuing of permits for the conducting of fund-raising activities by parents and citizens' organisations and sporting clubs throughout the State. One thing that has been brought home to the Parliament and the people of Quenesland is the large sum of money that dedicated people raise for good community use. In all cases the whole purpose of charitable work is the good of the community, whether it be supporting homes for the under-privileged, fostering sport, or providing amenities at schools.

I have been endeavouring to bring to the notice of the public the great amount of money voluntarily contributed to such causes. In reply to my question on 25 August, the Minister said that for the year ended 30 June, 1966, parents and citizens' associations lodged 2,582 applications for permits. They were for the holding of art unions. The Minister also said that 59 such associations applied for registration as approved associations. That would be for the conduct of small art unions. The Minister went on to say that in the same period sporting organisations lodged 1,360 applications for permits, and that 596 organisations applied for registration as approved associations.

He then went on to say that, as a result of all this, $246,409 was raised by parents and citizens' associations and $841,728 by sporting organisations, and by means of art unions. It is readily seen, therefore, that the public does contribute very heavily when an endeavour is made to provide amenities for the youth of the community.

The Minister concluded his answer to my question by saying that his department had received $5,431 from parents and citizens' associations and $45,229 from sporting organisations. So, in a total of a little over $1,000,000, the Department of Justice collected $50,000 in permit fees and so on. That represents 5 per cent. which, as far as I am concerned, is not a bad return on such an amount.

Parents and citizens' associations raise money by holding fêtes, by voluntary donations, whether on a weekly or a monthly basis, and by various other means. When they spend that money, the Government pays a subsidy on it. I am not saying that the Government gives them a dollar for every dollar they raise, but it subsidises them to the extent of one dollar for each dollar they spend, whether it is on library books, improvements to school grounds, or any of the other projects that attract subsidies from the Department of Education. It seems rather ridiculous to me that parents and citizens' associations raise money, that the Government pays a subsidy on that money when it is spent, and that another Government department takes it away in tax.

Dr. Delamothe: We do not touch any of those raisings. We do not tax any of those raisings at all.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister admitted in answering my question that the department took $5,000 from parents and citizens' associations.

Dr. Delamothe: That was in art union fees.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am not saying that the department is "touching" them.

Dr. Delamothe: It hasn't anything to do with fund-raising.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: This money would have been available to parents and citizens' associations if the Department of Justice had not taken it from them.

Dr. Delamothe: You mentioned that they run fêtes and canteens, and so on, to raise money. There is no tax whatever on that.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I did not say there was. I am merely pointing out that, in art union fees, the Department of Justice has taken out of circulation $5,000 that otherwise would have been available to parents and citizens' associations.

Dr. Delamothe: You might say that about everything. You might say it about sporting bodies.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: If the Minister will allow me to develop my argument, he can then run his stethoscope over it and make a clinical diagnosis at the end of my speech.

No matter how the Minister tries to argue, the plain fact is that the Department of Justice has taken $5,971 from the funds of parents and citizens' associations, money that could have been used to provide amenities for schools throughout the State. When one looks at the size of Queensland and the number of schools in it, it might seem that $5,000 is not a very significant amount. But if a dollar-for-dollar subsidy had been paid, $10,000 could have been used to provide books for school libraries, and I think that is significant.

I agree that there must be some control over art unions, whether or not they are run by parents and citizens' associations; but it dismays me to think that because the Department of Justice has received that amount of revenue, at least $10,000 worth of books have been lost to school libraries.

Dr. Delamothe: A lot of footballs and other things for sporting clubs have been lost, too.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: As I say, I am progressively operating on this Bill. I have not yet applied the scalpel but I may, as I go along, do a fair amount of dissecting. When

one examines this, one could probably say that, after having taken some $5,000 from parents and citizens' associations and about $45,000 from sporting organisations, the department is like a doctor who performs a very scientific operation on a certain part of a patient and then, because he receives the plaudits of his fellow-men, whips out the patient's appendix as an encore.

Dr. Delamothe: That is what you are doing. You are discussing the Art Union Regulation Act, not this Bill.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: These people must be registered under the Charitable Collections Act.

Dr. Delamothe: No.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: They are.

Dr. Delamothe: They are now.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister should make up his mind.

Now, dealing with the amount raised from sporting organisations, I do not think the donating public would be very happy to know that money that is being contributed to many organisations that perform good services in the community is going into Consolidated Revenue.

For a number of years I have had an association with a certain cricket club, and I know what a battle it has been for sporting organisations to raise funds. People give generously to many appeals for handicapped persons. I believe there would not be a person in our community who begrudges giving to such appeals, but one does not get the same feeling towards an appeal made for a sporting organisation, whether it be done by the running of a chocolate wheel, the selling of raffle tickets, or in any other manner. One just does not get the same public support.

So, to my mind, the fact that these sporting organisations have contributed to Consolidated Revenue a sum of $45,000 is not helping much. I think everybody in this Parliament, irrespective of his political colour, has a genuine desire to uplift the youth in our community, but we are not helping them much when we take $45,000 a year from them.

I ascertained by means of another question that I asked concerning hostels, youth clubs, service clubs and soldiers' and sailors' organisations that the total proceeds raised in a year amounted to $2,736,863 and the fees paid to the Department of Justice to another $43,208. So, over all, from something like $3,000,000 raised by these organisations, the Department of Justice has extracted $100,000 or more. I do not think that is a good approach.

I agree that there is need to control very strictly appeals to the public. I do not know, and I do not think anybody could assess, the number of spurious appeals that are made to the public and that have never been brought to the light of day. Those members of the public who are prepared to give must be protected from anybody who wants to "cash in". All worth-while organisations that raise money by approaches to the public deserve the protection of an assurance that the public will not lose its humanitarian interest in their cause by being the victims of some spurious organisation. I agree that there is a need to strictly supervise such appeals to the public. I feel that we are missing the point very badly when we make this kind of thing merely another revenue-earner for the Government.

I do not know whether the Minister has gone out for an "anaesthetic", but he has left the Chamber. I am very sorry he is not present to hear what I am detailing. He probably went out because he was completely overwhelmed by the logic of my argument.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Anybody who disagrees with what I have said must support the idea that we should tax these charitable appeals.

Mr. Campbell: Were you happy for them to be run "under the cush" before?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member would make a silly remark like that! I have already said that I support every worth-while appeal. In principle and by cheque book, I support them.

I did not want to buy into this argument, but this Government has driven appeals underground because of the ban on applications by political organisations. I let it go at that. I am not going to argue the merits or demerits of the matter, or whether political organisations should obtain permits for art unions. The mere fact of banning them drives them underground, and I do not think that is desirable. Let us not get petty about this.

The Bill is titled "Collections Bill"—it is in bold type on the cover—so why is there the necessity to differentiate between public bodies that are all in fact collection bodies? The Bill provides—

> "For the purpose of this Act registered charities shall be divided into two classes—
>
> (a) exempted charities;
>
> (b) non-exempted charities."

In the Minister's introductory remarks he said that organisations would be divided into two categories: those organisations with a sole basis of charitable work, and other organisations of whose objectives charitable work was only a part. This is why I view the Bill with suspicion. I have no doubt that any Minister would want to see that all of the money collected for the sole purpose of charity went to charity. I have no doubt that once the various organisations presently registered under the Charitable Collections Act are separated into the two categories it will not be very long after the passage of the Bill

before an Order in Council is issued to increase permit fees on applications under the terms of this Bill.

Dr. Delamothe: There are no applications for permits under this Bill. There are no fees of any sort.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister is trying a subterfuge——

Dr. Delamothe: I am trying to put you on the track.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: These organisations are controlled; they will have to register under this Bill. The applications for permits for raffles, art unions, lucky envelopes and football doubles will go to the Department of Justice. The Minister's department will collect the revenue.

Dr. Delamothe: Under the Art Union Regulation Act.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It does not matter if the Minister has it in his right-hand pocket or his left-hand pocket; the whole point is that the Minister's department gets the revenue.

I view this matter with suspicion; I believe there will be an increase in permit fees for art unions and so on. Why should we trust the Minister for Justice after the performance of the Minister for Transport, who promised cheaper suburban fares and then slugged the public with a 25 per cent. increase?

Dr. Delamothe: I do not think you mean what you say.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It is our duty as an Opposition to investigate all these matters. While the Minister may try to side-step the issue by saying that permit fees for art unions come under the Art Union Regulation Act, nevertheless they are all under his control. All these organisations are registered under this legislation and it does not matter what pocket the money goes into; it all ends up in the same bank account. I give credit to the hon. member for Townsville North, who has just said, "Make sure you don't let the doctor's bedside manner overcome the logic of your argument." I do not intend that it should. I assure the Minister that he will have to administer a full dose of anaesthetic before I abandon my argument on this matter.

Mr. Murray: He will cure you before too long.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: No doubt he is a good doctor—I do not wish to detract from that—but I would say that, in my opinion, as a Minister for Justice he is a good doctor. It is the Opposition's duty to examine these matters. I see every avenue that is open, as I do not trust the Government at all.

I come now to some of the provisions in the measure. We have indicated that, without giving our whole blessing to the measure, nevertheless we consider that there are certain sections with which we agree. One matter of concern is the control of door-to-door appeals. I pointed out earlier in my speech that the worst thing that could happen to the donating public would be to have spurious organisations cashing in. We must not allow the donating public to be deterred from giving to charitable organisations. We should insist on the identification of people who associate themselves with charitable organisations as collectors. Collectors visit our homes and say, "I am collecting for a certain charity," but never at any time do they display a badge or certificate.

Mr. Lee: Some of them display badges.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I will correct myself; I am quite happy to say that some of them do, but the great majority simply say that they are collecting for a charity, without producing any certification.

Mr. Newton: They are bogus.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Yes, they are bogus. Most members of the public are charitable and support these organisations, but very often collectors do not give any indication that they are bona-fide collectors. The Minister could well consider making it compulsory for collectors to carry an identification card or badge when an application is granted for a door-to-door appeal.

Mr. Bromley: When you are collecting you find that the workers are the ones who give the money.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I do not see that we can approach this thing in degrees.

Mr. Lee: He is getting political.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: No, the hon. member for Yeronga is not going to trap me into saying that. I think that the hon. member for Norman is a very genuine person and that he would agree with me that the person who contributes 20c—if that represents the extent to which he is able to give—derives the same pleasure as the one who writes out a cheque for $400 or $600. In saying what he did, the hon. member for Norman was endeavouring to illustrate that out of his limited capital the worker gives more.

I feel that there should be some means of identifying these people and their bona fides, and that those who they approach should not be called upon to ask for it.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Would you accept a printed receipt as sufficient identification?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Yes, but many collectors do not give receipts. There should be some evidence that the person is a bona-fide operator. We must not destroy the faith of the public by making them the victims of bogus organisations.

That brings me to the question of people who organise the promotion of appeals. If there is one thing I am dead set against it is somebody who makes money out of appeals

for charity. We had nation-wide campaigns for the National Heart Foundation, the Cancer Fund, the Asthma Foundation, and so on. I disagree in principle with them because I think those services should be provided by the Commonwealth Government; however, I do not want to canvass that argument at the moment.

The public subscribed heavily to those appeals. I acted as an area chairman for one of them. Some time later I was approached by a man who was organising another appeal. He told me that he had been employed previously by the company that promoted the first appeal and that he had formed an organisation to promote this one. He asked me if I would again lend my name as an area chairman. I turned him down flat, because I would not ask voluntary workers to collect money from the public so that somebody else could get a rake-off.

This principle of organisations promoting charities and getting the greatest amount of the proceeds is wrong. Nevertheless, the principle is there that organisations are growing merely to promote charity appeals and are taking their share of the proceeds.

Mr. Lee: Don't you think that sometimes, owing to the magnitude of the art union or collection, it is worth having a paid organiser?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Maybe so. But I do not agree to their being promoted by some public relations authority on a percentage basis. That is quite wrong. I have no objection to the employment of a paid organiser, but if people are to be allowed to set themselves up as public relations companies to promote these appeals, the whole point of donating is lost. I believe that that is quite wrong, and anything that is done to protect the public from it is good and will receive my whole-hearted support.

I think the legalising of Melbourne Cup sweeps is another instance of, "Where you can't beat 'em, join 'em!" There are literally thousands of people in the community who have no financial interest in horse-racing except their "couple of bob" in Melbourne Cup sweeps.

Mr. Ramsden: On the one day of the year they ought to leave it alone.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Yes, I agree. In my experience, it is the hardest race in the world in which to pick a winner.

Mr. Ramsden: I didn't know you were a betting man.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I put a "couple of bob" on them occasionally.

I think we have been rather tardy in recognising this national institution, although I do not think anyone would want to see the principle extended. I do not think anyone would wish to see, as happens with the T.A.B., it include races at Kembla Grange, for instance. I think we are sensible enough to realise that everyone from the office boy to the company director ceases work and listens to how his "couple of bob" is going in the Melbourne Cup. I am always amused by the way in which the Press invariably comments on the number of members in the House during the running of the Melbourne Cup. That is quite humorous, because I think all Australia stops to listen to it. It has always been a source of amusement to me that members of Parliament are expected to stay on the job while even Johnny the office boy is listening to the race description.

I think I have covered most of the things that I wish to deal with. Possibly I could speak on a lot more subjects because the Bill covers a wide field. The Opposition's attitude is that it is essential to protect charities that make appeals, and those who contribute to them, from those who wish to take something out of the money collected. If the Bill provides such safeguards I do not think the Opposition will be disposed to contest any minor points. I think it could be said that we agree with its application although we might disagree with its extent. That possibly sums up the attitude on both sides of the House.

At this stage I should like to pay a tribute to those from all walks of life who work for charity. Quite frankly, often they do not receive the encouragement that we, as legislators, should give them. I am not saying that in any political or nasty way. I have great admiration for those who devote so much time, energy, and enthusiasm, to this cause.

Mr. Murray: Sometimes their good intentions appear to be frustrated by the difficulties facing them.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I quite agree. I am glad that I took the opportunity in 1958 to give evidence before the Committee on Youth Problems, with which the hon. member for Merthyr was associated. At that time, speaking on behalf of youth clubs, I pointed out that enthusiasm for community work was killed, firstly because of the tardiness and slowness of real progress that can be made by a club that is not helped by officialdom.

I believe that the whole basis of the lack of community interest in many worthy charities is to be found in difficulties of this sort. One finds a body of people who are very keen and very happy to take part in a community project. However, when they have to go to the trouble of raising finance initially by devious means, when they find that they receive insufficient public support to help them achieve the ends they wish to achieve, when they find that, instead of using bulldozers to level sporting grounds, they have to do the work with picks and shovels, their enthusiasm cools. I do not want to deal with the question of a Ministry of Sport, but I think that in many instances more encouragement could be given. If the organisations were investigated and were able

to satisfy the authorities that they were genuine, they should be able to get loans repayable over a long term to enable them to carry on their charitable work. This would enable them to survive. Many organisations are killed because of the tremendous amount of hard work needed to establish them. I have been a very strong advocate of giving organisations a grant—a repayable grant, if necessary—to help them get started. They can then go to the public and raise money for the repayment of such loans, instead of using pick and shovel and doing it the hard way.

In conclusion, let me say that I have a very high regard for the charitably minded people in the community, whether they do purely charitable work, or help youth and sporting organisations, or help schools by assisting parents and citizens' associations. They are dedicated people, and I do not think they should be fleeced of money to the tune of the amounts that I have mentioned.

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.*]

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (2.15 p.m.): In speaking to the second reading of this Bill, I should like to say, in the first place, that I am sorry that the hon. member for Salisbury appears to be so suspicious of the Government's actions.

Mr. Davies: We are always suspicious.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am afraid that is a natural trend in the Labour Party generally. No-one can help their mental outlook.

For a start, I assure the hon. member for Salisbury that, as chairman of a registered charity in Queensland, I am quite happy to accept this Bill in good faith as being in the best interests of the charities of Queensland. I remind the hon. member that when the Minister introduced the Bill he said that some of its objects were to give a greater measure of protection to the public from deceit and fraud, to enable the public to be better informed on the use to be made of their donations, to promote those objects that are worthy of public support and to ensure that donations by the public are appropriated to the purpose for which they are made.

Having studied the Bill, I am convinced that it does achieve the things the Minister has set out as its ambition. In saying this, I am sorry that the hon. member for Salisbury is not in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. Davies: He was just called to the telephone.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I wish I could hold what I have to say until he gets back, because I was particularly gratified to hear him say that his heart was in the right place and that he was prepared to back up his heart with his cheque book. Since he has made this remark, I should like to say that I have in my desk a receipt book and I shall be only too happy to exchange a receipt from the Multiple Handicapped Association of Queensland for a cheque from his cheque book. I am delighted that he has made this public offer.

On the other hand, just as the bells rang the hon. member for Barcoo said he hoped I was not going to take round the plate. I assure him that I shall; I shall bring the plate to him at the same time as I see the hon. member for Salisbury.

Mr. O'Donnell: You will get a contribution from me, for sure.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Having heard from my sponsors, may I go on and say that I am 100 per cent. with the hon. member for Salisbury in his desire to ensure that public faith in charities is not shaken by surreptitious methods and by appeals which, in fact, are not properly conducted and have no real foundation. I could not agree more with him that the public of Queensland are particularly generous in their response to the various charitable appeals that are made from time to time. On one occasion I went to the trouble to take extracts from the published results of various public appeals such as the heart appeal, the cancer appeal, and so on, and the aggregate amount that had been given freely by the public of Queensland was out of all proportion to what one might expect, so great was its generosity.

And so I assure the hon. member that I, too, am most anxious that this public faith in charities should not be shaken. It was for this reason that I spoke as I did at the introductory stage of the Bill, and I now want to continue on the line I was using when my time expired. I was about to suggest that, in view of the lucrative profits being made by the rag trade—with only $50 a month being paid to the charity whose name is used, and many thousands of dollars a month profit going to the firm that trades on the public sympathy for that charity—the contracting company should be required to pay a sum of not less than $50 a month to the charity concerned and, at the end of each financial year, be required to submit an audited statement of net profits. The charity concerned should then be paid not less than 5 per cent. of the net profit for the year.

Mr. Davies: Are there many of these firms?

Mr. RAMSDEN: There are six of them operating in Brisbane. I thank the Minister for acknowledging my contribution at the introductory stage about the ramifications of the rag trade. I am grateful to him for advising me that Regulations (ix) and (x) give the necessary power to do the things I desire.

Had time permitted at the introductory stage, I would have suggested further that all the contracts between the contracting rag-collecting companies and the interested charities should be approved by the Department of

Justice, and that if any such contract was not approved it should not be a valid contract in law.

Now that the Bill has been printed I am glad to note that, broadly speaking, the regulations will provide for this requirement. I am certain that in taking cognisance of my comments and advice we will be working in the best interests of charities whose sponsorship is being used to collect rags and clothing, but who receive in return a mere pittance of the wealth accrued by the collecting company by the generosity of people who donate rags and clothing, believing that their donations is going direct to the charity sponsoring the appeal.

I have here the relevant Acts from South Australia, Western Australia and Victoria, where cognisance has been taken of the rag trade. Victoria, for instance, has taken note of it in an Act to consolidate the Law relating to the Collectors of and Dealers in Special Wares, Marine Stores, and Old Metals. South Australia has taken cognisance of it in the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act of 1939 to 1947, and Western Australia in an Act called the Marine Stores Act. So that other States are particularly aware of this facet of charitable collecions.

In South Australia only two charities are permitted to engage commercial organisations to operate and control rag collections. Those two charities are the South Australian Spastic and Crippled Children's Association and the Adelaide Children's Hospital Incorporated. As I understand it, one of the firms concerned pays to one of the charities that it works for better than the market price.

Mr. Sherrington: Did you say that these firms pay only about $50 a month?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I made a suggestion about that. If the hon. member reads my speech I think it will be clear to him.

In South Australia the recognised market price is the amount that one particular firm pays to the charity concerned; at the time of my inquiries, it was $80 a ton. At that time it was paying in excess of this amount; it was paying $112 a ton to the children's hospital. From this had to be deducted the cost of collection, which amounted to a mere $12 a ton, leaving $100 a ton for the charity.

In Adelaide this procedure is controlled by an audited monthly statement by the companies that operate under the sponsorship of the charities. So far as I can establish, the licence to operate and a copy of the audited statement are open for perusal at any time by the Chief Secretary's Department. This method of operation has been allowed to continue by the South Australian Government as both the operating firms have zoned the metropolitan area and systematically collected in turn through the various zones. In practice, this means that each company has collected four times a year from each house in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

I said that only two charities in Adelaide are permitted to engage in professional collecting. Other charities may be permitted to have rag drives conducted by their own people, but they are not permitted to engage outside commercial contractors. In other words, there are two charities, the spastic and crippled children and the children's hospital, which are permitted to have professional, commercial contractors, but other organisations, with their own collectors, may occasionally collect rags that are sold in bulk to the rag-buying trade.

I understand that this system has been in operation in South Australia for about 18 years. Allegedly, it enables both companies to obtain reasonable quantities of raw material. The organisations in South Australia that have been permitted to collect in their own right sell their rags, unsorted, to the recognised trade in that State, and they thus get their fair proportion. The Government of South Australia is in a position at all times to check and control any untoward happenings of a nefarious nature.

I have made these comments not to imply that the Queensland Government should emulate South Australia, or blindly follow it, but merely to put on record for the guidance of the Government and the department a procedure that is effective in another State.

As I said at the introductory stage, I am particularly interested in the growing rag trade business, which is playing such an important part in building up some of the charities in this State. With those comments, I conclude my remarks at this stage of the debate. I may have something further to say during the Committee stage.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (2.28 p.m.): I join this debate to lodge a very strong protest against this legislation and to express my annoyance with it. In this way I am expressing my dissatisfaction with the privileges and the high priority given to the consideration of this legislation over that given to more important legislation that we should be considering. I have in mind particularly the legislation dealing with the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade, which we have been awaiting for months. Anything verging on gambling, vice, or the Liquor Act gets priority in this place. This afternoon we will push this legislation through in tremendous haste. Like other legislation, no doubt it is important, but it should not be attracting the high priority given to it this afternoon over other legislation which is destined for the common good of the people.

Mr. Bromley: They are putting it on the same plane as L.B.J.

Mr. DEAN: That would be right.

I am lodging a protest this afternoon because legislation dealing with liquor and gambling receives first preference. In other words, we are condoning vice. It could be likened to the T.A.B., and I would give S.P.

betting preference over the T.A.B., which has increased gambling to a tremendous extent. I belong to a party, and naturally I respect the wishes of my party. But I say that personally I have no time whatever for this legislation.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (2.30 p.m.): I was surprised and horrified at the utterances of the hon. member for Sandgate. If in his view this is not important legislation, he is out of step with the requirements of the times and public opinion. It is very important legislation because it protects the public. Is that not the main purpose of this Assembly? How can it be suggested that the legislation is of no importance and that we are condoning vice?

Mr. DEAN: I rise to a point of order. What I said was that it is important legislation, but that it is not as important as other legislation that is coming forward.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member would have it put in the limbo of forgotten things and would let the file gather dust. He said we are condoning vice. I wonder if the hon. member for Maryborough is prepared to join with him and divide the House on this issue. This Bill will protect the public, as well as the public purse. Personally, I think it is long overdue. In September, 1964, I referred to the odium and the embarrassment caused to housewives, the confusion, chaos, and the conflict, all of which occur in door-to-door appeals.

Mr. Sherrington: You are not Robinson Crusoe, you know.

Mr. HUGHES: I realise that. Apparently there are only one or two out of step with their party on this matter.

This legislation is long overdue because of the spectacle in recent times of certain organisations going out to the public espousing and supporting worthy causes when door-to-door appeals have been held at the same time by others. The Bill covers door-to-door appeals, sweeps and raffles conducted by charitable and community organisations, including parents and citizens' associations.

I feel that the measures contained in the Bill will protect those who exercise idealism at its best and get a personal sense of satisfaction out of giving and lending a hand. It is a long-established practice in this democratic society to assist charities, institutions and organisations doing this good work. We have heard, during the initiation of the Bill and now, of various organisations. The hon. member for Merthyr is connected with a number of very worthy ones, and I am associated with the Girl Guides, Boy Scouts, Blind, Deaf, Mater, Spastic, Aged, Orphan, Sporting, School, Handicapped, and a wealth of other organisations and community bodies.

It should not be suggested that these people do not desire a measure of protection, and that is the purpose of this Bill. It outlines in clear terms how the protection will be afforded, and how it will be administered. This will also cut the cost of administration in the Department of Justice in the processing of applications which, over the years, have snowballed. It is not a matter of what the hon. member for Sandgate or the hon. member for Maryborough feels personally about raffles; we are here to legislate for the majority.

Mr. Newton: Don't you think this is because it was not policed properly?

Mr. HUGHES: Does the hon. member suggest this is not being policed properly?

Mr. Newton: You never see them.

Mr. HUGHES: I have been to gatherings where, under a permit granted by the Department of Justice, raffles have been conducted. I am speaking of those who do the right thing and make an application. An inspector could walk in, as I think happened when a raffle was being drawn at a function at the Milton State School years ago. Because people in authority do not happen to be at all places where raffles are drawn, goods sold, or traffic offences committed, that does not mean that those activities are not being policed.

Mr. Newton: Give me one instance of an inspector checking door-to-door collections.

Mr. HUGHES: That has never been an activity for which the Department of Justice has had to give permits. A door-to-door appeal can be conducted without making any application to the department, so that this activity does not come within the administration of the Department of Justice. The Bill will correct that position. Does the hon. member for Belmont not agree that such a provision is necessary?

Mr. Newton: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: I pay a tribute to the Minister and the officers of his department who have had the foresight to perceive many of the problems associated with the work of worthy charities and their voluntary workers. They do wonderful, hard, and unselfish work.

There is an obvious need for legislation to suit the times, and the Bill will give recognition to those charities and community organisations that are properly conducted. Whilst some returns will have to be furnished to the department, charitable bodies will not be fettered by officialdom and red tape, as is at present the case in the granting of licences even for minor activities. The Bill will protect not only people and organisations but, in the event of winding-up, the objects of the organisations as well. This has provided vexed questions, and worth-while provisions are contained in the Bill concerning disposal of the funds. In this way it will be possible to deal more satisfactorily with the affairs of organisations which from time

to time fall by the wayside. It is a common-sense measure that cuts irksome red tape and will save administration costs for the department and charitable organisations.

The public will now be able to interpret with more certainty what is required, although I wonder whether a "community organisation" is defined as well as it could be. There have been some misinterpretations under the cloak of charity, where parents and citizens' committees and other charities have been able to register under one section.

It is pleasing to note that there is now to be a form of discipline over door-to-door collections, to make them fair and equitable. I believe that this will save confusion and embarrassment to the public. In 1964 I said that the public had been suffering in this direction for too long. Many organisations tended to concentrate their efforts on the inner areas of the city that are the most accessible, which meant that the same people were being asked for contributions time and time again. Many in the outer suburbs who wanted to assist were not being approached. People in inner areas were being asked for donations not only every week-end but sometimes many times on the same day.

Mr. Newton: I get just as many out in my electorate as you get in yours.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not doubt what the hon. member says. I realise that he works hard and knows his electorate, and I do not challenge what he says. However, people in areas such as New Farm, West End, Yeronga, and Coorparoo, where the population concentration is heavy, are called upon more frequently than those in the outer suburbs. I refer to areas such as Acacia Ridge, Mt. Gravatt, and Cribb Island.

The number of voluntary collectors has fallen over the years. Once a collector would go to the door, get a smile, 2s., and a cup of tea; now he is lucky to get a donation. It is not really surprising that in some instances the donation is given grudgingly, because people are called upon very frequently.

Mr. Newton: You cannot expect charity and a cup of tea, too.

Mr. HUGHES: There is charity in the soul of the giver as well as of the worker. The hon. member has never been out on an appeal if he says that a collector does not get a cup of tea.

Mr. Newton: Yes, I have; but I have been flat out getting the 2s.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not intend to attempt to deal with the clauses, of course, but I suggest that the Minister might give careful consideration to the provisions dealing with the control of door-to-door appeals. I am happy to see that the Bill provides for the nominating of areas in which collections may be made. As I said on an earlier occasion, the conduct of appeals would be easier to arrange and better results would be achieved if certain areas were nominated. If an organisation had 1,000 collectors, for example, I think it is obvious that they could not cover the whole of Brisbane, and better results would be achieved if they concentrated their efforts in a certain area. The Minister has seen fit to embody in the Bill the suggestion that I made, and I believe it will be of great assistance.

Somewhere in the Bill a door-to-door appeal is defined as an appeal for support made for a charitable purpose or a community purpose, or any of those purposes joined with some other purpose, made by visiting any places of residence or places of employment, or both, one after another, and making collections, and so on. I wonder whether we are leaving a loophole in the law in that respect. Although we may be thinking clearly and know what we mean at this stage, it seems to me that this provision could be interpreted differently by someone else who has an ulterior motive for doing so. We should ensure that proper control is provided.

Mr. Davies: Why didn't you ask the Minister this at lunch-time instead of wasting the time of the House?

Mr. HUGHES: I did not say anything at the introductory stage; I am saying it all now.

I think the Minister should consider this question and decide whether the Bill should be amended to provide that a pattern or form shall be followed. As I read the Bill, it is one business after another or one house after another that will constitute a door-to-door appeal. Someone may attempt to get around this by calling on three or four houses in one street, then ducking round the corner to a house in another street. He may contend that he is complying with the provisions relating to the control of collections, yet his activities may be conflicting with those of an organisation that has had a specific day and time allotted to it. I again ask the Minister to consider that point very carefully.

Finally, under the terms of the Bill the Minister may from time to time sanction any purpose to which Part III of the Bill applies. Does that mean that parents and citizens' associations, for example, would be granted permits that give almost a blanket cover? I think all hon. members who have been associated with school functions know of the multiplicity of small raffles that are conducted at them. What I say would undoubtedly apply also to the hon. member for Sandgate because he, like the majority of us, probably arranges these matters. I wonder whether we are not going to add a little confusion in this matter if we do not spell out in the clearest terms what the Bill aims, or purports, to do. One organisation or a school fête, on one day, may conduct two, four, six, or 10 small raffles, the net proceeds of any one of which may be only from $2 to $10. I was wondering if such organisations,

which would be termed community organisations, could have a blanket permit for that day or for a specified period of time which would cover all the raffles at the one time.

I was at a State school meeting recently and these problems were discussed. Nobody knew whether it would be necessary to make an application for each particular raffle, or whether it would be necessary to have a representative of the Department of Justice at the drawings, and things of that sort. I think we should help these organisations by not having any ambiguity in the language of the Bill that could possibly be open to misinterpretation, and by setting out the law in the clearest possible terms that would allow of some latitude, because these are necessary community matters.

I pass now to Melbourne Cup sweeps, and wonder whether a Doomben race or a Stawell Gift race would come within the ambit of the Bill. We should face these uncertainties now instead of having possibly to sit in judgment at a later date. I think it would save the time of the House in possibly avoiding subsequent amendments and at the same time preventing any embarrassment to worth-while organisations. At the same time we would achieve the real aim of the Bill, which is to protect the public.

I hope that the hon. member for Maryborough and the hon. member for Sandgate will not divide the House on this issue in order to prevent this worth-while legislation being passed.

My final point relates to sales tax. Under the terms of this Bill many organisations that register themselves as charities will now be registered either as charities or community organisations. There could be a very worth-while organisation with some charitable aims and objectives, but because of the general framework of the organisation it would be registered by the Department of Justice as a community organisation. If this is the case, will it in any way alter its right to exemption from sales tax, or raise the possibility of such an organisation being brought under the income-tax laws? I know the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation would make a special ruling on such a case.

Mr. Newton: Those that become commercialised will certainly have to pay. The Commissioner will certainly have to rule in that way.

Mr. HUGHES: Quite so, but I am more interested in sales tax. We are trying to help some of these organisations, but in doing so we may be doing them a disservice. By transferring an organisation that is now registered as a charity to registration as a community organisation, even though we may be saving administration costs we may be putting it in danger of losing its sales-tax exemption. Some of these matters should be attended to now, rather than later on.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (2.50 p.m.): I realise that this is a very important piece of legislation, and I agree with the hon. member for Baroona that it is undesirable that it should be rushed through the second-reading stage. I agree that there is a need for this legislation for the protection of the people. The hon. member for Kurilpa mentioned a series of raffles. I think that matter is well covered by the Art Union Regulation Act, so I will not deal with it now. I have a few comments to offer at this stage so that I will not have to rise continually during the Committee stage.

As this Bill will supersede the Charitable Collections Act, to what extent will the presently registered charitable organisations be affected? How will it affect sporting bodies? Will they have to re-register at a later date?

The Bill contains 48 clauses, and as it will be unnecessary to debate all of them at the Committee stage I will take the opportunity now to put forward some suggestions. I am particularly concerned about parents and citizens' associations. People say that the Government gives so much to schools by way of subsidy. Admittedly the Government does give money by way of subsidy, but it is not given until the parents and citizens' association has raised its money. When a parents and citizens' association has a $2,000 project in mind it cannot say to the Department of Education, "We want $1,000 to complete this project." It has to raise the $1,000 before it can approach the department for subsidy approval and permission to proceed with the project.

It is very difficult for parents and citizens' associations at small schools to raise such large sums of money. For a long time the parents and citizens' association of the Narbethong School for Visually Handicapped Children has been trying to raise money to buy a bus. On many occasions we unsuccessfully approached the Minister for Education for assistance. The Government should be prepared to lend money to the parents and citizens' association on the association's guarantee to repay the money in due course. The Government has fallen down in that respect.

As I understood that this legislation was coming before Parliament, when I was in Perth recently I made some inquiries about the Western Australian legislation. I realise that the Government wants to get this Bill passed so that it can become law before Melbourne Cup day on the first Tuesday in November. In Western Australia there is a practice in connection with charitable collections that could be well followed here. That Government decided that only one or two organisations—usually two—should be allowed to collect during a specific week and, during that time, no other organisation would be allowed to conduct door-to-door or street appeals. Publicity is given to the current appeals by advertisements in the Press and placards throughout the city. There is no

doubt that people here are getting fed up with continual door-to-door and street appeals. We should seriously consider having Government control of collections, which should be pooled so that all charities—and there are many worthy charities—receive an equal share.

I have participated in many door-to-door collections; I have been an area captain for the Cancer appeal, the Heart appeal, and the Salvation Army appeal for the home for delinquent girls. When collectors knock on a door people often say, "I don't give to this organisation; I give to such-and-such an organisation." People have favourite charities, and that is their right. However, certain charities that are not well publicised do not receive the money they really need.

When the hon. member for Salisbury was speaking I said that the ordinary working people seem to give the most money to collectors. I remember calling at a magnificent home on a Sunday morning for a donation. I will not mention the worthy charity that I was collecting for, but it is a well-known registered charity. A person who was lying back on the verandah reading "The Sunday Mail" and "Sunday Truth" said, "I am sorry, but I have no money in the house." He had a big Ford Galaxie in the front yard, but he refused to give me any money. I said, "Haven't you got 2s.?" He said, "No; my wife has gone down the road in her car to do the shopping." Conservatively, the house would have been worth $20,000, and the family owned two vehicles, but he refused to make a donation. That is why I say that the ordinary people in the lower-income bracket are the most generous to door-to-door collectors.

Door-to-door collections are very important, but they should be strictly policed. Although some people may say that a receipt is not necessary, I believe that collectors should be instructed to leave a receipt when a person makes a donation.

I think the Minister would agree that a simple method of organisation could be established. People are being "hit" every Saturday and Sunday. Most members of Parliament donate regularly by cheque to many organisations, but when collectors call to the house they are expected to make another donation. If we say, "We sent a cheque to that organisation," the collector goes away very disappointed and probably says under his breath, "You're a lousy so-and-so." After already having sent a cheque for $10, out of the goodness of our hearts, we probably give another $1.

Irrespective of what the hon. member for Sandgate may say—and he has a right to express his own opinion—this is important legislation—and he said that it was—and it should not be rushed through. Perhaps the hon. member may have been considering the gambling aspect, and was referring mainly to Melbourne Cup sweeps. This point has already been dealt with by some hon. members. Although the Minister did not say it in so many words, he indicated to the hon. member for Salisbury that no authorisation had been given by his department for Melbourne Cup sweeps. However, I have had quite a few tickets sent to me. I do not intend to divulge the name of the very worthy organisation, but the covering letter sent with the two books of tickets said that the sweep had been authorised by the Minister for Justice. This legislation is not yet law, and this practice should not be adopted even though the Minister indicated last year that Melbourne Cup sweeps were to be made legal this year. Although the organisation is a worthy one and helps many people, it should not have stated that the sweep had been authorised by the Minister for Justice. That is wrong.

I shall now deal with sweeps. This suggestion of mine is a favourite hobby-horse. If we are to have sweeps, we should have a special Golden Casket for a community purpose. I suggest that consideration be given to a series of gigantic Golden Caskets so that a Ministry of Sport can be set up. I believe that in that way we could raise money for that worthy cause, which would serve community interests, particularly those of our youth. I have spoken to many organisations, charitable and otherwise, and they are right behind this. They would be happy to donate regularly to any art union or appeal of that nature provided it is used for the good of the community, particularly our youth.

Mr. Newton: Sport and culture.

Mr. BROMLEY: As the hon. member said, culture and sport go together—and art, too.

In "The Courier-Mail" this morning there is a report of a meeting of the Queensland Social Service League that was held last night. Unfortunately I could not attend, and I sent my apologies. Like many other hon. members, including the hon. member for Belmont, I take an interest in this league. The article reads—

> "The Queensland Social Service League was told last night that 'professional beggars' were hampering the league's work and depriving needy cases of social help."

Perhaps the Government could look into this sort of thing with a view to having the league refer those people to a certain Government department. Although the league is subsidised by the Government, it is not fully controlled by it. It does submit an annual report each year.

The report continues—

> "In his annual report, the league's general secretary (Mr. A. W. Marshall) said: 'Whilst it is our maxim that no genuinely distressed person is refused assistance, we always have to guard against overlapping.' "

Parliament should also worry about that position so far as it relates to helping distressed persons.

Mr. Marshall continues—

". . . the person who gets around various organisations obtaining whatever he can at no cost to himself."

We know that a person, in some circumstances, will go along to a charity and ask for a hand-out, and later he is at another organisation asking for a hand-out, and in that way will make a living. I do not think that is fair to the people who make donations to those organisations.

Mr. Marshall concluded—

"Despite investigations, it is not always an easy matter to discern these contemptible types who, if allowed, would take all, thereby excluding worthy cases."

These things must be considered when collecting for organisations with charitable interests at heart.

The report concludes—

"Mr. Henderson paid tribute to 'The Courier-Mail' on behalf of the people assisted by the annual blanket appeal, and said that the newspaper's Christmas appeal continued to bring a spark of 'Santa' to countless children of poor parents."

I, too, pay tribute to "The Courier-Mail" for the work it has done in that respect. Without its assistance a number of organisations would not be able to do the work they are doing. Therefore, we should pay due respect to requests for things of that sort.

I could discuss many aspects of the Bill. I regret the necessity to bring on the second reading at this stage, irrespective of whether it is because of the Melbourne Cup. It seems to me that a lot of publicity is given—perhaps rightly so—to the Melbourne Cup and, as a result, the State of Victoria.

Mr. Newton: It has always been an open day.

Mr. BROMLEY: That is so.

Mr. Newton: It would not have been any different this year.

Mr. BROMLEY: No, it would not. For many years the R.S.L. has been running Melbourne Cup sweeps and nothing has been done about it.

Mr. Row: At Roma.

Mr. BROMLEY: Everywhere. I have some tickets here. The first prize on the ticket is stated as $750, but the covering letter says that the first prize is $600. If I win, I hope the prize printed on the ticket is the one I get!

Mr. Dewar: That would be illegal. Will you give the name of the organisation running it?

Mr. BROMLEY: The Minister for Industrial Development is a member of the R.S.L., just as I am, so I do not think that he will do anything about it. I am not condemning the R.S.L. I think it does a very good job for ex-servicemen.

Dr. Delamothe: They cannot break the law doing good.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Does the hon. member propose to table the tickets?

Mr. BROMLEY: No, I do not intend to do that. I was replying through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister for Industrial Development because I know he is interested in the R.S.L., just as I am. I am quite happy to see that organisation raising finance, because I know that it helps distressed servicemen and assists by providing holiday homes for them on the South Coast and at other places.

There is no need to worry about the legalising of Melbourne Cup sweeps, because nothing has ever been done about them. At about this time each year the hon. member for Townsville South, who represents a political party, runs a sweep for himself, and it is well known that nothing has been done about that. The hon. member for Baroona mentioned political parties, and the Minister may give a definite answer to his question when he replies.

That is about all I have to say. I felt that some matters should be brought up, because I am very interested in charitable organisations and pay a tribute to those who work for them. I am always surprised at the small band of people who always seem to be able to find time to do a little extra work for charity, no matter how busy they are. There are others who live in a rut and do nothing, and, when asked if they will give a hand to assist some worthy cause, say that they are too busy. They do not deserve any respect at all.

From what I have been able to gather from the Bill in the short time we have had it, I should say it will be a worth-while piece of legislation. Whilst I do not compliment the Minister on rushing the Bill through, I concede that there is perhaps some merit in it.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (3.9 p.m.), in reply: I thank all hon. members who have taken part in the debate. Many interesting facets of the Bill have been dealt with, and also quite a few points that have no bearing on it. In the first place, there has been criticism of the haste with which the second reading was brought on. The Government's legislative programme is very large and a number of important Bills will be brought down. The Bill now before the House is fairly small compared with others to be introduced, and this was considered an opportune time to clear it from the deck.

Mr. Hanlon: Some of the others went through the introductory stage some weeks ago; this was printed only on Wednesday.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: That is true.

On the subject of Melbourne Cup sweeps, it has been said that I made the statement that they could have been conducted under the Art Union Regulation Act. Hon. members who have made a study of that Act

know that it makes provision for three types of art unions: a single one, a succession of small ones, and one conducted by an approved association. In the case of the single art union, there is no provision, as there is for the other two, stating that no drawing shall be based on any event or contingency relating to any horse-race. That proviso applies only to a succession of small art unions or one conducted by an approved association. Although the single art union does not have that bar to it, it has another bar that applies to all art unions; that is, that no money prize or anything the equivalent of money can be given. So, unless people running a Melbourne Cup sweep as a single art union were prepared to give prizes in kind, not in money, they could not run an office sweep, an R.S.L. sweep, which the hon. member for Baroona mentioned, or any sweep of that sort. To permit Melbourne Cup sweeps for money prizes to be conducted, it was necessary to exclude them specifically from the provisions of the Art Union Regulation Act. Does the hon. member follow that?

Mr. Hanlon: Yes. To what extent does this allow it, then? Only up to $200?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: No. Three types of Melbourne Cup sweeps are permitted under the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. Hanlon: Yes, but if you relate it back to the relevant provision of the Art Union Regulation Act, it contains the provision to which you referred.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: No. If it is above $200 an art-union permit has to be obtained, but the provisions relating to giving money prizes apply under this section of the Act. It is only the procedure for getting a permit for a sweep that relates back.

I think one hon. member opposite asked, "Why shouldn't we do it on the Doomben Cup?" I think the hon. member for Salisbury hit the nail on the head when he said that all Australia pauses for two or three minutes on Melbourne Cup day. It is completely different, and the interest in it is much greater than any popular or national interest in a little local race meeting.

Mr. Hanlon: What about the Doomben Ten Thousand? Why should we assist in promoting Melbourne Cup sweeps and not permit sweeps on our own races?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: How would the hon. member for Norman's selling tickets in a Melbourne Cup sweep promote the Melbourne Cup?

Mr. Hanlon: Because he contributes to the fever of interest in the Melbourne Cup. More people go to Melbourne to see the Melbourne Cup than come to Brisbane to see the Doomben Ten Thousand.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The only people interested in the Doomben Ten Thousand are a few people living in the Brisbane area, and perhaps a few people in country areas of the State.

Mr. Hanlon: Rubbish!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: If anyone wishes to run a sweep on the Doomben Ten Thousand, he can do that under the provisions relating to single art unions.

Mr. Hanlon: Are you prepared to issue permits for sweeps on the Doomben Ten Thousand from now on, under the Art Union Regulation Act?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: That provision is always there.

Mr. Bromley: If you will agree to that, I think it will help tourism in Queensland and promote the Doomben Ten Thousand.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: As a racing man, I do not think I could come into that.

Another point raised related to the raising of funds by conducting sweeps. As hon. members know, a sweep is defined as a form of art union, and the bodies that can get a permit for an art union are itemised in the Art Union Regulation Act. Political bodies are not included in that list. However, there is nothing in the world to prevent political parties from raising money in any other legal way they may think fit.

Mr. Melloy: Such as what?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: One way that readily comes to mind is to conduct a barbecue.

Mr. Sherrington: What would they sell at a barbecue?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Steak.

Let us make it perfectly clear, there are more important things——

Mr. Hanlon: Clause 5 refers to "any dance, concert, social entertainment, bazaar, fair, fête, carnival——"

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There will be time to discuss the individual clauses during the Committee stage.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The hon. member for Chatsworth raised two points. One was the question of income tax deductions, and he very rightly told the House that the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation takes no notice whatever of our departmental registrations or permits. It is a matter entirely between the organisation and the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation. The same remarks apply to sales tax, which was mentioned by the hon. member for Kurilpa. That again is purely a matter between the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation and the organisation concerned. The matter has been brought up and the Taxation Department officials say, "We do not take the slightest notice of your register; we make up our own minds."

The hon. member for Salisbury, although he went on with some facetious cross-chatter did raise some quite important points. The

first was the matter of fees. As I tried to make clear in the various stages of this debate, charities that raise money by means of art unions are listed under the Art Union Regulation Act as being free from the payment of any fees whatever, except the fee on application for a permit. The whole of our concession is to the charity and nothing to the organisation such as the parents and citizens' association. They get a subsidy as well as something else that has been generally overlooked. I think the hon. member for Norman, or the hon. member for Salisbury, posed the question, "Why doesn't the Government do something about making loans to parents and citizens' organisations?"

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I raised the question of making loans to sporting organisations.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I think it was the hon. member for Norman who mentioned the parents and citizens' associations. As hon. members know, there is provision that where a school wishes to build a gymnasium or an assembly hall, all that the parents and citizens' association has to do is raise a quarter of the cost. It gets a subsidy on that, and then it can get a loan for the other half, guaranteed by the Government.

Finally, there was criticism by the hon. member for Salisbury about the fees amounting to $48,000 in a year. In fact, as hon. members know from the Budget, the Government puts aside a good deal more than that amount for the encouragement and training of youth leaders in various spheres. So, if we take it with one hand we give it back with the other.

Mr. Sherrington: That way you are giving it in one way and taking it back in the other; you are reversing the process.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I put it the opposite way.

The hon. member for Salisbury mentioned the identification of people who take part in door-knock appeals or street collections. That is one point that will be kept very closely in mind when we are issuing permits under the Bill. We will make it a condition of the sanction that people taking part in a collection must be identifiable.

The hon. member also made the point about the promoter's percentage. I have specifically written into the Bill provision to cope with this problem. The percentage or the emolument of the promoter will be laid down in the sanction.

Mr. Sherrington: I am pleased that you accepted my submission on that point.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It is right in line with my own thinking. I was glad to have it confirmed by the Opposition.

The same remarks apply to the point raised by the hon. member for Merthyr about the rag trade. Provision is specifically written into the Bill to ensure that charitable organisations receive a proper amount for the use of their names.

I appreciate the action of the hon. member for Sandgate in raising the opposite point of view. I do not criticise it at all. Although the hon. member may have been a voice crying in the wilderness, it was good to hear him take the opposite point of view.

The hon. member for Kurilpa raised several important points, the main one, I think, being related to the protection of the public. This Bill actually completes the job that I set out to do, first of all by means of the Art Union Regulation Act, and then by the main provisions of this Bill and finally by its Melbourne Cup sweep provisions, to protect the public from the spurious organisations that have been taking money from them and, what is more important, probably preventing genuine organisations from receiving support. I believe that by means of those three provisions organisations of a charitable or community nature will in future receive greater support, because the public will know that the money they donate is going to organisations that are more likely to spend it in the proper manner than the people who help themselves to it.

The hon. member for Norman brought up the point whether sporting bodies will have to register again, and whether parents and citizens' associations will have to register. The answer is "No." They will be classified as community organisations, being already registered as approved associations——

Mr. Hughes: What about the wording of the Bill—"One after another"?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: That matter was raised with my committee, and I sought advice from the Crown Law Office on it. They are quite satisfied that the wording will not lead to any confusion.

Mr. Hughes: There will be no loop-hole in the law?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: No.

Motion (Dr. Delamothe) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—Meaning of terms—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (3.26 p.m.): I did not wish to take up more time than necessary on the clauses, and for that reason I sought some information from the Minister at the second-reading stage.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. HANLON: As the hon. member for Maryborough has said, in view of the protest that we made at the second-reading stage about hurrying on this legislation within 24 hours of our receiving the Bill——

Dr. Delamothe: It is 48 hours.

Mr. HANLON: I think it was printed on Wednesday.

As the hon. member for Maryborough said, the consideration of the clauses in detail could well have been held over until next week. The Minister did not indicate he was prepared to do that, so we have carried on.

As I did at the second-reading stage, I point out that this is important legislation and has been under consideration by the Government for at least 12 months. It has probably been under consideration by the committee, the Minister and departmental officers for that time—and rightly so, as it covers matters that are difficult to deal with. That is indicated by the fact that the Charitable Collections Act of 1952 was never amended. In other words, in such legislation it is imperative to try to cover as many contingencies as possible. We do not want to have to amend it here, there, and everywhere, or we would never stop. It is, therefore, desirable to examine the Bill properly and draft it correctly before bringing it to Parliament. No doubt, the Government has tried to do that.

I repeat that, compared with the Government, the Opposition has had only a limited time to examine the Bill. I raised in a general way the matter of political parties raising money—in fact, a question dealing with sweeps was asked by the hon. member for Brisbane—under this Bill, as distinct from sweeps, and in reply the Minister said that there was nothing to stop political parties from raising funds in other ways that are provided by the Bill and that would not bring them into conflict with the law. When he was challenged to name such a way he instanced barbecues. I intend to quote portion of the definitions in clause 5 to indicate how, with a quick look at the Bill, we have been able to discover that the Minister has not given a correct interpretation. It is certainly difficult for the Opposition to pick up a matter like this.

The Minister has had some months to examine this legislation matter, yet he gave us an answer that is not in agreement with the Bill. I am not saying he did it deliberately. He presented it and we have had only 48 hours to look at it, yet in that time we can point out to him that although he suggested that political parties may raise money by barbecues, he does not understand clause 5 of the Bill. On page 2 of the Bill, clause 5 defines, among other things, "Appeal for support". It mentions a number of things, including—

> "(c) any notification to the public expressly or impliedly indicating that any proceeds of, or any moneys from, or any collections at, any dance, concert, social entertainment, bazaar, fair, fête, carnival, show, sports, game, or other diversion, activity, or function (whether of the classes previously enumerated or not) are intended or are to be appropriated for that purpose;"

I do not see how an organisation could get any money unless it gets it in some way indicated in that paragraph.

Clause 9 reads—

> "This Part applies only to appeals for support for any one or more of the following purposes:—
>
> (g) any fund by whatever name called, established or to be established for the payment therein of moneys collected or of moneys received upon the disposal of articles collected and for the payment thereout, whether at times certain or uncertain, of moneys for any purpose or purposes as aforementioned."

Clearly, if a barbecue is permissible under clause 5, is it not necessary to seek that authority under clause 9?

Clause 10 provides—

> "No person shall make or cause to be made or assist in making any appeal for support for any purpose to which this Part applies unless . . ."

Clearly the definition would rule out a political party if it wanted to conduct even a barbecue, because it would not have authority under clause 9 and would be forbidden under clause 10. I do not suggest that the department interpret the Bill in that way.

I mentioned political parties this morning. If the Bill is interpreted to apply to any political party, it seems that the Bill provides authority, and then, having given the authority, seems to forbid it. I cannot imagine a wider definition than the one I have referred to. It takes in everything from a dance to "any other diversion, activity, or function." It becomes an appeal for support if a person indulges in it. Because of the reasons I gave this morning, I do not point this out in a desire to have political parties included. However, the difficulty is that any person who is democratic acknowledges that a political party can be started by one person. Every person in the community has the right to start a political party, and, no matter how big political parties grow, they have to start somewhere.

This highlights the difficulty facing the Opposition in following the Bill. My submission is subject to the Minister's answer. The Opposition is not in a position to familiarise itself with the terms of the Bill and properly take them all in. Yet what we say is subject to the reply made by the Minister. That indicates why Bills should not be rushed into the Committee stage before the Opposition has a chance to study them. In this case the Opposition has been able to pick up this point, and the Minister can tell us whether

it is valid or not. We do not have an opportunity to study these things closely; the Minister gets up and gives a decision like that, and we have to accept it. If that is so, the Committee stage is more or less valueless. We are examining the Bill without being in a position to know what it really means, as we have had an opportunity to have only a brief look at it between attending to other Bills and our parliamentary duties.

Mr. Mann interjected.

Mr. HANLON: No, I am not suggesting that. When I mentioned political parties, I was referring to all parties.

The Bill contains no provision for political parties, or any exemption for them. This means that in their direct appeals to the public they would be working, at best, in an uneasy legality. I raised this matter this morning so that in the event of any Government's taking advantage of the provisions of the Bill to gain a narrow technical advantage over another party by legal quibbling, we would at least have made our attitude clear. It is for that reason that I mention the matter.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (3.36 p.m.): Clause 5 is merely a list of definitions, and one of the things defined is "Appeal for support." It is fairly wide and, as has been correctly pointed out, covers all sorts of things.

Clause 9 is also important. It reads—

> "This Part applies only to appeals for support for any one or more of the following purposes:—"

The purposes are then listed, from (a) to (g). Part III applies only to clause 9 (a) to (g); it does not apply to anything except the purposes listed in those subclauses. That does not in any way hamper the raising of funds for a political party by any one of these forms of appeals to the public. The only type of fund-raising that cannot be used is the running of art unions, and the purposes for which art unions may be conducted are specifically laid down in the Art Union Regulation Act. Political parties do not come within one of the specified purposes.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (3.39 p.m.): The Minister dismisses the importance of a definition in the same off-hand way in which he dismissed the attractions of the big racing carnivals held in Queensland. He said they were of no interest to anybody outside the State. I do not think the Minister for Tourism, the Queensland Turf Club, and the Brisbane Amateur Turf Club would be very enamoured of the back-hander that he has given to events such as the Doomben Ten Thousand and the Stradbroke Handicap.

In a similar style the Minister dismisses definitions off-handedly. He says, "After all, clause 5 is only a definition." Good heavens! What do we have definitions for other than to consult when we are trying to establish what particular terms mean when they are used later in the Bill? Definitions are the essence of the Bill. If there are no definitions the meaning of a particular term can be as wide as one likes.

The Minister referred to clause 9 and said that there is nothing to stop people appealing for support other than as authorised in that clause. Clause 9 says—

> "This Part applies only to appeals for support for any one or more of the following purposes:—"

and subclause (g) says—

> "any fund by whatever name called, established or to be established for the payment therein of moneys collected or of moneys received upon the disposal of articles collected and for the payment thereout, whether at times certain or uncertain, of moneys for any purpose or purposes as aforementioned."

The Minister might say that that refers only to the collection of rags.

Dr. Delamothe: That is the important part of (g).

Mr. HANLON: I do not know whether the Minister is referring to the collection of rags. However, that suggests to my mind that approvals under the Act apply to appeals for support for any charitable purpose or any community purpose, and if a political party is not regarded as a community purpose, I do not know what it is regarded as.

One can argue about the meaning of these terms. The definition of an appeal for support would seem to mean that one is prevented from making an appeal for support unless it is being made for any charitable purpose, and so on. However, I will leave further discussion of that till clause 9 is being considered.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—Application of this Act—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (3.42 p.m.): I mentioned this matter at the second-reading stage, but I did not hear the Minister deal with it. If he did, I apologise.

Clause 6 deals with the application of the Act, and subclause (2) says—

> "This Act shall not apply to any appeal for support solely for the advancement of religion by or on behalf of any religious denomination."

That follows the provisions in the Charitable Collections Act, and I do not think anyone has any objection to it.

Subclause (3) then says—

> "Unless herein otherwise expressly provided, this Act shall not apply to any appeal for support for any purpose to which Part III applies, made by or on behalf of any religious denomination."

The reference to Part III is to clause 9, which refers to "charity purpose," "community purpose," and so on.

As I pointed out at the second-reading stage, under the Charitable Collections Act, which is repealed by the Bill, part of section 3 (3) reads—

> "This Act shall not extend to any activity of any exempted denomination—
>
> (a) Where such activity is wholly or mainly intended for the advancement of religion; or"—

that is repeated in clause 6 (2), but not—

> "(b) Where such activity is wholly or mainly intended for the establishment or maintenance of any school, or of any hospital or institution for the treatment or care of children or sick, aged, infirm, invalid, destitute or incorrigible persons."

Clause 6 (3) of the Bill reads instead—

> "Unless herein otherwise expressly provided, this Act shall not apply to any appeal for support for any purpose to which Part III applies, made by or on behalf of any religious denomination."

For the purposes of clause 9 of Part III, unless independent schools or the schools carried on by one of the various religious denominations are regarded as community purposes, no substantial exemption is given to them under the Act. They are not exempted, as they were under the Charitable Collections Act, which made provision for the maintenance of any school, hospital, institution, and so on. Whilst later in the Bill the Minister is given certain powers to define exemptions on application, to me it seems that the exemption that previously applied automatically to religious denominations relative to support for appeals for their schools, hospitals or institutions could be jeopardised in this Bill, which replaces the Charitable Collections Act.

I do not want to harp on this point, although I think it is inevitable that I should because of our attitude towards the printing of this Bill. If the Opposition had had a longer time to look at this Bill—we received it only yesterday—perhaps we could have brought forward for the consideration of the Minister amendments in some of these matters. But it is virtually impossible in such a short time to draft an amendment or even to ascertain exactly whether an amendment would fit in with the terminology of the Bill.

It appears to me that I should at least request the Minister, under the powers given to him of defining these matters later, that he should carry on the same automatic exemption that is provided under the old Charitable Collections Act and administratively apply this Bill with the same common sense.

I have a further query later with regard to parents and citizens' associations because, to my mind, if we have a parents and citizens' association at any school, it should have equal exemption with other associations so long as the department recognises the school.

There seems to be a further gap later on in this Bill in relation to automatic sanction being provided to the objects of parents and citizens' associations when one refers back to the Education Act, which deals only with parents and citizens' associations at State schools.

Of course, parents and citizens' associations at State schools should get this automatic sanction, but again the independent schools of various religious denominations seem to have half missed the boat in this respect. The automatic exemption that they originally had under the Charitable Collections Act is not replaced in this Bill with the same force and effect as it had under the Act that has been repealed. Similarly, when one refers to the regulation under the Education Act of 1964 prescribing parents and citizens' associations, one sees that parents and citizens' associations at these independent schools are not covered. Whatever opinions might be held on our separated school system, at least when it comes down to the activities of parents and citizens' associations at schools I do not think there is any doubt that they all carry out more or less the same work—trying to improve school grounds, provide playing fields and so on, and generally providing facilities for the school.

As I say, it has been difficult in the time available to us to draft any amendment or to know whether one is entirely necessary, but I feel that the Bill does not quite fulfil the assistance, by way of exemption, that was provided in the old Act. If a parents and citizens' association at an independent school wanted to raise money for ground equipment or something like that, under the previous Act they had automatic exemption but under this Bill they now have to go through some involved application to the Minister provided for under various clauses.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (3.49 p.m.): Very briefly, I will try to clarify this matter for the hon. member for Baroona. If the hon. member looks at clause 6 (2) he will see that it says—

> "This Act shall not apply to any appeal for support solely for the advancement of religion by or on behalf of any religious denomination."

That is one exclusion. Clause 6 (3) provides—

> "Unless herein otherwise expressly provided,"

that is the important part of it—

> "this Act shall not apply to any appeal for support for any purpose to which Part III applies . . ."

Part III applies to charitable or community purposes. I studied this provision very carefully when it was being written. Under that paragraph the denominational and independent school parents and citizens' associations can function, just the same as State school parents and citizens' associations function under the sponsorship of the Department of Education.

I go back again to clause 6 (3)—

> "Unless herein otherwise expressly provided, . . ."

If the hon. member will turn to page 12, clause 14 (2)—Application of Part IV—he will see that it provides—

> "This Part applies to door to door appeals and street collections for any purpose to which Part III applies, including any door to door appeal or street collection for any such purpose made by or on behalf of any religious denomination."

"Unless herein otherwise expressly provided" is to bring door-to-door appeals in any of the purposes of Part III under the Act. The reason for it is to enable them to be given a specific day and a specific part of the city or town on which and in which they have their door-to-door appeal. Does that clarify the point?

Mr. Hanlon: Not enough.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (3.52 p.m.): I am interested to know whether or not the application of this Part of the Bill might somehow or other be tied up with church promotion schemes when conducted by commercial firms.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (3.53 p.m.): They have exclusion from the Bill under clause 6 (2)—

> "This Act shall not apply to any appeal for support solely for the advancement of religion by or on behalf of any religious denomination."

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (3.54 p.m.): I do not want to take up time in debating technicalities of wording with the Minister. A Minister's interpretation of a clause is not necessarily the correct one. Have I the assurance of the Minister that he regards their parents and citizens' associations and any appeals that are conducted by the various denominations for any hospital or institution for the treatment or care of children, or sick, aged, infirm, invalid, destitute or incorrigible persons—in other words appeals conducted by the Salvation Army, St. Vincent de Paul and so on—whose activity is wholly or mainly for the establishment or maintenance of any school, or of any hospital or institution, as a community purpose?

Dr. Delamothe: That is right. All those things you read out are of a community or charitable purpose, which brings them under Part III of the Bill.

Mr. HANLON: If the Minister is prepared to assure me of that I will accept it because it becomes a matter of administration. I merely point out that the definition of "community purpose" includes the words, "for the purpose of use or enjoyment by members of the public." I do not know whether that means any section of the public, or whether it can be applied to the public in general.

Dr. Delamothe: The whole includes the part.

Mr. HANLON: The Minister has assured me that a community purpose is recognised by his department as covering the activities I mentioned in section (3) (b) of the Charitable Collections Act, and I am prepared to leave it at that. I reserve further discussion until later clauses dealing with parents and citizens' associations.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 11, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—Sanctions under this Act—

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (3.56 p.m.): I do not know if the Minister has sufficiently cleared up the matter of sanctions. The clause provides—

> "The Minister may from time to time sanction any purpose to which this Part applies as a purpose for which any appeal or appeals for support may be made and may subject every such sanction to such conditions as he thinks fit.
>
> "A sanction for such a purpose may be in force at the same time as a sanction for that purpose joined with some other purpose."

I share with the hon. member for Baroona some doubts about the proper application of this clause in relation to parents and citizens' bodies, which will be a community purpose under Part III. I wonder if the Minister has cleared this matter up properly for parents and citizens' associations. Obviously they are not released on the basis that we have been debating in clause 6. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Baroona, there is a possibility that some will get through because they are denominational schools, but on that basis what will happen to all the other schools, such as the blind, deaf, sub-normal, and ordinary State schools? Would they have a period of exemption? How will the Minister deal with the matter when they conduct fêtes with a multiplicity of raffles?

I raised this matter earlier in the debate but it has not yet been answered quite properly. I should like the Minister to put it beyond doubt. Will they be defined as in subclause (2) of clause 13, which says—

> "The objects of each Parents and Citizens' Association formed as prescribed under 'The Education Act of 1964' shall, while the association continues to be formed as so prescribed, for the purposes of this Part and without other authority be deemed to be sanctioned under this Act, but otherwise the provisions of this Act shall apply to the association and its objects according to their tenor."

There is a little doubt and confusion about it, and I hope the Minister will clear it up. I hope the terminology means that any such school will have exemption for a period, regardless of the number of raffles it cares to conduct.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (3.58 p.m.): Clause 12 is the clause under which sanctions will be given to organisations whose purposes are community purposes. If the hon. member turns to page 10 he will see—

"Any such sanction may be given for an indefinite duration of time or for such period as may be specified therein:

"Where a sanction is given for an indefinite duration of time, it shall remain in force until revoked under this Act."

A parents and citizens' association of a State school that has been formed under the aegis of the Department of Education will get an automatic sanction because of that fact. That sanction will last indefinitely until it is revoked. Once having got a sanction it will be able to function under this Bill and go on indefinitely.

Mr. Hughes: Without renewal for small raffles?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Once they get a sanction they keep it, but if they want to raise money by raffles they have to obtain registration as an approved association.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (4 p.m.): Clause 12 (5) (a) refers to the Minister's powers to revoke a sanction. Subclause (4) says that while the sanction is in force any appeal for the purpose sanctioned may be made. An association may cease to operate before it has achieved the purpose for which it was created. Should an additional condition be introduced that an organisation inform the Minister when it has achieved its object, or does the Minister read into "Cessation of Appeal" that the organisation has achieved its object?

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (4.1 p.m.): Where a sanction is given for a specific purpose, and it is achieved, the sanction automatically dies. In other words, once the conditions of the sanction run out the sanction automatically dies. I think there is sufficient in the clause to cover the point raised by the hon. member for Chatsworth.

Mr. Melloy: You say sanctions have to be applied for. In the case of parents and citizens' associations they are automatic?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: They are sanctioned by their formation under the aegis of the Department of Education.

Clause 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—When art union permits to be regarded as a sanction—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (4.2 p.m.): I accept the Minister's statements on clause 6 that "Community purposes" are the purposes mentioned in the Charitable Collections Act. I also accept that sanctions are given automatically to parents and citizens' associations. Does that mean that those associations at independent schools do not require sanction because they are exempted on the religious side?

Dr. Delamothe: There are two separate types of exemptions, namely religious and educational.

Mr. HANLON: The Minister indicated that under clause 9 he regarded appeals for support for schools conducted by religious bodies as being for community purposes and that they were exempted under clause 6 (3). Therefore I imagine they would not require sanctions and would not breach clause 13.

Dr. Delamothe: There is a provision bringing them back into Part IV relative to door-to-door appeals so that we can give them a day.

Mr. HANLON: Subject to the reservations contained in the door-to-door Part?

Dr. Delamothe: Yes.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—Control of door-to-door appeals—

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) (4.5 p.m.): Door-to-door appeals must be controlled in an endeavour to space them, and every endeavour must be made to ensure that they do not overlap. Quite a number of causes are closely related, and often a united appeal could be made. The Minister might find that the problem would be eased if the Government persuaded the Commonwealth Government to take over the work of research into heart diseases, cancer, and possibly asthma, for which public appeals are now being made.

There is no need to emphasise the scourge that cancer is, and the problems associated with heart disease. Possibly asthma could be closely associated with them. I believe that the money in the pockets of the people should be reserved for the more intimate appeals such as those for schools, churches, the Blue Nursing Service, Meals on Wheels, and so on. Whilst the depth of public sympathy to appeals to promote research into cancer is appreciated, I feel that the Minister should appeal to the Commonwealth Government to take over this responsibility and thus lighten the burden on the general public.

If we desire a greater degree of security for ourselves and our families, we must be prepared to pay for it. Until recently in my city we had organisations such as Meals on Wheels, the Blue Nursing Service, and churches, making direct appeals. These make the load on the people heavier, but they must be prepared to accept this added responsibility because of the greater degree of security that it brings to them.

I urge the Minister to appeal to the Commonwealth Government to assume responsibility for research into heart disease and

cancer, and possibly asthma, so that it is financed from Commonwealth revenue and not door-to-door appeals.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (4.7 p.m.): I wanted to make this observation by way of interjection when the hon. member for Salisbury was speaking. One feature of nation-wide appeals for funds to fight cancer and heart disease should be recognised, and that is the way in which they have made people much more conscious of the problem than they would be if it had remained solely a Government responsibility. This is particularly true of the cancer campaign. Today people will speak of cancer with less reticence. They are aware of its early signs, and the general enlightenment on it is a direct consequence of the well-organised campaign conducted to obtain funds by door-to-door collection. I am sure that that impact would be lost if Governments assumed this responsibility.

Mr. Davies: You can separate the campaign from door-knocking and still have a campaign.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I think the collection of funds had considerable educational value, because every home was visited and the people, through being given the opportunity to contribute, were made much more conscious of the campaign and its aims.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (4.8 p.m.): This is a matter that comes within the administration of my colleague the Minister for Health. I shall draw his attention to your remarks.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—Control of street collections—

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (4.9 p.m.): I have another question to ask the Minister, as I have been impressed by the concise manner in which he has answered some of the queries on other clauses. Subclause (3) reads—

> "For the purposes of controlling street collections in any city or town to which this section applies, the Minister may from time to time nominate localities or streets therein, in such a manner as he considers sufficient for the identification of each locality or street, as the case may be."

Does this apply to badge or button days? They are street collections. I see the Minister is nodding his approval. As they do apply to badge-day and button-day collections in any part of the city or in any streets that may be approved, I presume that in future any charitable organisation wishing to conduct a button or badge day in the Brisbane metropolitan area, or in any city or town in the State, for that matter, will have to make application to the Department of Justice for a permit.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (4.11 p.m.): Yes. Where a town or locality is prescribed, anyone who wishes to make a street collection in the prescribed area will have to apply for a permit. It will not cost him anything; it merely stops three or four different organisations collecting in the one street or in the one area on the one day, or within a day of each other.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (4.12 p.m.): I appreciate that. There is only one further point that I wish to raise. I understand that they must also apply to the Police Department for a permit. This could cause a person to say, "Well, we have applied to the Police Department, and that is that", and not know that under the Act he has to make application to the Department of Justice. If application is made to the Police Department, is there any way in which it could send the application on to the Department of Justice? Would it be possible to have the one application processed by both departments instead of an organisation that wishes to make a collection on any one day in any one area having to make two applications?

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (4.13 p.m.): Of course, anything that is likely to interfere with the free flow of traffic on a public road or a public footpath has to be approved by the superintendent of traffic. I will examine the suggestion made by the hon. member that one piece of paper might cover both applications and see whether it is possible to give effect to it.

Mr. Hughes: They might apply to you; you could pass it on to the police.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Yes, or vice versa. I will examine the suggestion and see if I can work something out. The hon. member might think about it himself and produce an answer.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 32, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 33—Sweeps on a National sporting event—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (4.14 p.m.): This one is almost in the shadow of the post; it applies to Melbourne Cup sweeps. As I indicated at the second-reading stage—I want to make it clear at this stage—the Opposition does not oppose the clause. The Government, in its wisdom, believes that some basis of legality is needed because of the national fever relating to the Melbourne Cup. However, I think it is illogical to apply a clause to one race in another State.

I thank the Minister for clarifying the application of subclause (2) and Part III to the Art Union Regulation Act to provide for money to become a prize in a sweep when application is made for an individual permit and is approved. Again, this applies only to sweeps on the Melbourne Cup. Therefore, we have the rather peculiar position of the Minister suggesting that if someone asks him for permission to conduct a sweep on one of the big races run in Queensland—I am not referring to the Sixth Division at Albion Park;

I am referring to big races on the racing calendar, such as the Stradbroke Handicap and the Doomben Ten Thousand—he will consider the application but that the prize cannot be in money because the provisions will apply only to the Melbourne Cup. I do not deny that people get worked up about the Melbourne Cup, but I think that, whilst recognising that and providing for it, we should have some regard to building up attractions on our own racing calendar from a tourist point of view. Just because the Melbourne Cup creates a certain fever today, there is no reason why we should write off our own events. They are entitled to some recognition. Due to the activities of the clubs, the Doomben Ten Thousand would run about third to the Melbourne Cup and the Caulfield Cup in the interest of people throughout Australia, and in saying that I am not being boastful. If we ourselves write it off, saying it is not important enough to come and see, then people certainly will not come to see it.

My final point relates to the case where the Minister has given approval for a sweep to be conducted where the total proceeds no not exceed $200 and where the tickets or chances in the sweep shall be sold and issued and the drawing occur and the prize-winner or prize-winners declared on the day of the running of the Melbourne Cup race. That seems to me to be rather restrictive because in effect it means that the only approval that would be given to sweeps of this nature would be those run where there was a Melbourne Cup function on the afternoon, or something of that nature being conducted on the day. I cannot see why we should not extend that to some other charities, particularly when the amount is not particularly high, who will not be conducting a function on Melbourne Cup day. Tickets could be sold and distributed in the weeks prior to the running of the Cup.

If such a charity had 2,000 tickets at 20c each it would have to be a fairly big Melbourne Cup party to be run on Melbourne Cup day in order to utilise the concession under this clause.

I think the Minister might have learned today from what I mentioned about football doubles that when silly restrictions are put on these things it is inevitable that they will not be enforced. It is only a waste of time suggesting that one could enforce these things when we narrow them down so much that it does not allow a charity to conduct a sweep of this nature unless they go through the process of applying and so on or unless they run a Cup party. As I say, I think they should be allowed to sell tickets in the weeks, or the week, before the Cup, and not necessarily have a function on the day itself. Some of the poorer organisations do not have sufficient support to run the type of function that would be necessary in order to dispose of a couple of hundred dollars worth of tickets in a sweep.

Clause 33, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 48, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, by leave, read a third time.

The House adjourned at 4.21 p.m.