

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 2 DECEMBER 1969

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 2 DECEMBER, 1969

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr. Speaker:—

Appropriation Bill No. 2;
Medical Act and Other Acts (Administration) Act Amendment Bill;
Succession and Probate Duties Acts Amendment Bill;
Gift Duty Act Amendment Bill;
Land Tax Act Amendment Bill.

QUESTIONS

RESTRICTED CERTIFICATES UNDER ELECTRICAL WORKERS ACT

Mr. Davies for Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

(1) How many Restricted Certificates have been issued in Queensland under the Electrical Workers Act?

(2) What types of certificates of the restricted class are available and how many of each type have been issued to date?

(3) What is the general nature of work allowed under the Restricted Certificate?

(4) As many firms in country areas, and in particular Rockhampton, are employing TV, radio, washing machine and air-conditioning mechanics who are carrying out electrical work but who do not possess the necessary Restricted Certificate, how many complaints has he received from trade unions or from individual persons concerning this matter?

(5) What policing of establishments in the electrical trade is carried out to ensure that only fully qualified persons are engaged in this work?

(6) In the interests of public safety, if no policing is being done, will he seek the services of the State Electricity Commission or instruct industrial inspectors to carry out regular inspections of all electrical appliance and repair firms in order to ensure that only qualified persons or those in possession of a Restricted Certificate are engaged in this type of work as part of their general employment?

Answers:—

(1) "1,087 to June 30, 1969."

(2)—

Instrument Technicians	2
Electronic Technicians	2
Office equipment Mechanics ..	193
Photo copying machine Mechanics	1
Photographic	8
Phonographic	1
Radio and Television Mechanics ..	342
Refrigeration Mechanics—	
A	2
B	268
B plus Room Conditioners ..	32
C	49
Scale Mechanics	1
Science Teachers	1
Sewing Machine Mechanics ..	11
Special lamp standards	1
Technical Representatives	1
University Lecturers and Demon-	
strators	43
Vending Machine Mechanics ..	3
Washing Machine Mechanics ..	119
Watch and Clock Mechanics ..	6
X-ray Equipment Technicians ..	1

1,087"

(3) "Generally, restricted certificates provide for the replacement of defective component parts in various types of equipment and for the fitting of plug tops to flexible cords, and of flexible cords to their respective appliances."

(4) "In the past twelve months, ten complaints have been received including one complaint involving a number of firms in Rockhampton, and another involving several firms on the South Coast, that electrical work was being carried out by persons not possessing the necessary restricted certificate. All of these complaints have been thoroughly investigated."

(5) "Investigations are being undertaken from time to time by Electric Inspectors of the State Electricity Commission, who are also Inspectors under *"The Electrical Workers and Contractors Acts, 1962 to 1968,"* of matters referred to them by the Electrical Workers and Contractors Board, but to date there has been no regular policing."

(6) "Yes."

TRANSPORT OF GOODS BY PASSENGER TAXIS

Mr. Davis, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

Has he entered into negotiations with the Taxi Council of Queensland to amend the appropriate Act to allow taxis to transport goods, wares and merchandise? If so, what are the conditions of the arrangements?

Answer:—

"No."

OPERATIONS OF "KINDY KREATIONS"

Mr. R. E. Moore, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

Has he received any enquiries, either from Queensland or interstate, since he recently announced in the House details of the operations of "Kindy Kreations"? If so, what are the details of the enquiries and what monetary value is likely to be involved?

Answer:—

"Since my Answer in reply to the first Question on this matter asked by the Honourable Member for Townsville South on October 24, 1969, the number of enquiries and/or complaints received up to and including Monday December 1, 1969 is as follows:—

Interstate	72
Queensland	19
Total	91

This does not include over seventy complaints also received by the Police Department, but includes a number referred to my Department by Crisis Line of Truth Newspaper after my Answer on October 24. The total amount in respect of which assistance was sought from my Department in securing refunds was \$1,059.38 Mr. V. C. Coote has reneged on the verbal promise made by him to the Industrial Inspector who interviewed him, namely that he will refund moneys to any interstate person who requests this and he has advised enquirers and I quote from an undated letter received by some complainants, "We are unable to give any refund whatsoever, due to expenses experienced" end of quote. It will also be seen that his verbal advice to the Industrial Inspector that only eight Queenslanders were involved and in respect of whom Mr. Coote gave the Inspector refunds, was also false. The whole position has been closely examined and on the advice of the Solicitor-General, I regret that all that I can inform the complainants and enquirers at present regarding their dealings with this avaricious and unscrupulous person who has also been confirmed as a pedlar of pornography is as follows and I quote the letter which I am sending to each person who has approached me on this matter:—

"I refer to your letter wherein you state that you forwarded the sum of \$12 to the business known as Kindy Kreations, 161 Stanley Street, South Brisbane. This would have been as a result of correspondence which you entered into with Kindy Kreations following an advertisement which Kindy Kreations had inserted in a newspaper or other publication read by you. The only member of the business known as Kindy Kreations is a Company called Vivaco Holdings Pty. Ltd., which, I am

advised, has a capital of \$4. The Solicitor-General for the State of Queensland has advised me that, so far as the relevant provisions of the Factories and Shops Act regarding prohibition of premiums are concerned, it does not appear that any master and servant relationship exists between Kindy Kreations and a person who has paid \$12 to Kindy Kreations in consideration of Kindy Kreations' supplying material for the manufacturing of garments for which Kindy Kreations stated payment would be made at the rate of \$1.08 per hour. The Solicitor-General has advised me that, in his opinion, the relationship of such a person to Kindy Kreations in these circumstances is that of an independent contractor. The matter, therefore, is one which is outside the purview of my Department. Whether or not you desire to proceed further in this matter is, of course, one for you to determine after possible consultation with a solicitor. However, it is warned that the prospects of recovery are very remote in view of the capital of \$4 of Vivaco Holdings Pty. Ltd. At the present time, the Queensland Government is considering a legislative enactment to prevent the type of activity engaged in by Victor Colin Coote of 13 Akuna Street, Kenmore, who is a Director of Vivaco Holdings Pty. Ltd., which company is the sole member of the business "Kindy Kreations".

CARRIAGE OF MEAT FOR SALE OR DELIVERY

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

(1) Did he receive a letter from the Housewives' Association, Toowoomba, complaining of the conditions under which fresh meat is delivered?

(2) Are there certain regulations appertaining to door-to-door delivery of meat? If so, what are they and who polices them?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Yes. Regulations 83 to 88A (inclusive) of "The Slaughtering Regulations of 1953" (operative under "The Meat Industry Act of 1965") apply to the carriage of meat for sale or delivery. These regulations are administered by the Slaughtering and Meat Inspection Branch of my Department."

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND FOR COORPAROO STATE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

(1) Did his Department in October resolve to resume some properties in Cavendish Road, Coorparoo?

(2) If so, (a) on what date, (b) how many, (c) who or which department requested the resumptions, (d) when were the people concerned notified of the decision to resume, (e) for what purposes are the resumptions being made and (f) what is the terminal date for evacuation by the property owners?

(3) As this area is classified light industry, thereby enhancing the value of the properties, will the owners receive full market value as compensation?

(4) If resumptions are proceeding, why was I, as Member for the district, not officially informed, as Coorparoo State High School and its surroundings may be affected?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "On October 14, 1969, the Works Department requested this Department to open negotiations with a view to acquiring the following:—Sub. 345 of section 1 of portion 52, parish of Bulimba—Mr. and Mrs. G. Somogyi; subs. 346-7 of section 1 of portion 52, parish of Bulimba—Mr. and Mrs. C. A. Friederichs, for addition to the Coorparoo State High School. On November 26, 1969, the owners were requested to advise if they would sell their properties to the Crown. Pending developments a date for vacation cannot be stated. If negotiations are unsuccessful resumption proceedings will have to be considered."

(3) "Upon acquisition, just and adequate compensation will be paid and on the basis as provided in "The Acquisition of Land Act of 1967".

(4) "In the circumstances I have outlined, advices at the time would have been premature."

SUSPENSION OF MOTORISTS' DRIVING LICENCES UNDER NINE-POINT SYSTEM

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

(1) Are a certain number of convicted drink-driving motorists paying their fines by small instalments? If so, (a) how many during the past twelve months were paying their fines by instalments and (b) what is the amount being paid under the time-payment or instalment system?

(2) Since the inception of the points system, how many motorists have had their licences suspended after receiving nine points for breaches of the Traffic Act?

Answers:—

(1) This Question should be directed to the Honourable the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General."

(2) "6,586 licences have been suspended from December 1, 1967, to October 31, 1969."

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL LAND FOR
SOUTH GIRLS AND INFANTS' SCHOOL,
TOOWOOMBA

Mr. P. Wood, pursuant to notice, asked
The Minister for Education,—

(1) Is he aware that two residential properties in Ruthven Street, Toowoomba, adjacent to the South Girls and Infants' School, were to be acquired by an oil company, but that the Toowoomba City Council refused the company's application to build?

(2) Will he make enquiries to establish the feasibility of acquiring the properties mentioned so that additional playground space may be made available to the school?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "Yes."

PARKING SPACE FOR PARLIAMENTARY
MEMBERS AT STATE GOVERNMENT
BUILDING, ROCKHAMPTON

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

Will he consider making two parking bays available to State Members of Parliament in the parking area at the Government Building, Rockhampton and having the bays marked accordingly?

Answer:—

"Parking space available to visiting officials will be increased by one bay for general use by such officials including Parliamentary Members."

BANYO KINDERGARTEN FEES; INCREASED
FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO
KINDERGARTENS

Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the report in *The Courier-Mail* of November 26, wherein a mother complained of the charges at the Banyo Kindergarten?

(2) Is he aware that these charges are necessary?

(3) Will he consider providing additional financial assistance to kindergartens throughout the State to enable them to continue the work they are doing?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Yes."

(3) "Increased financial assistance will be available to affiliated and approved kindergartens from January 1, 1970. The grant for affiliated kindergartens has been increased from \$1,250 to \$1,500 per unit per annum and the grant for approved kindergartens from \$400 to \$600. The total Government grant for kindergartens and the Creche and Kindergarten Association for 1969-70 is \$271,500 compared with \$195,349 for 1968-69 and \$47,958 for 1960-61."

SCHOOL CHILDREN'S BUS SERVICES,
CAIRNS DISTRICT

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

(1) What is the extent of cancellations of school rail-motor services in the Cairns district and to what points are extensions of school children's bus services proposed?

(2) How many school children are involved in each instance?

(3) To whom has the franchise been granted, for what period and under what conditions of licence will the bus services operate?

Answers:—

(1) "I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply of September 9 to the Honourable Member for Cook. The licensed passenger service operating at present between Cairns and Hambledon has been extended to Aloomba on and from December 6, 1969. Information related to the extension of school services under the control of the Education Department should be referred to my colleague, the Honourable the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities."

(2) "286 children use rail-motor services."

(3) "The Extended Licence is issued to Miss Noreen Mary Metcalfe, who operates under the name of 'Cairns-Hambledon Bus Service'. The licence is current to April 30, 1972, and may be renewed after that date. The extended service to Aloomba will cater for the carriage of both adults and children as a passenger service licence."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid upon the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Grammar Schools Acts, 1860 to 1962.

The Rural Training Schools Act of 1965. Forestry Act 1959-1968.

Revocation and Reissue of Amending Regulations under The Electric Light and Power Acts, 1896 to 1967.

FORM OF QUESTIONS

Mr. HARRIS (Wynnum) proceeding to give notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's question is far too long. It contains much more material than is necessary. I will allow him to complete giving notice of it, but I assure him that it will not be approved in its present form. It is a speech, not a question.

Mr. HARRIS having completed notice of the question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is apparently aware of the answers to certain sections of his question. I inform him that it is not permissible to ask a question the answer to which he almost certainly knows.

Mr. HARRIS: I am not aware of the answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should not argue with the Chair. I distinctly heard him pose an answer to the question.

Mr. JENSEN (Bundaberg) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member does not have to make a speech. I heard his question.

ORDER IN CHAMBER DURING
QUESTION TIME

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) proceeding to give notice of a question—

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have frequently spoken of the seriousness with which I view interjections during question time. It behoves hon. members on both sides of the House, including those on the front bench, to take notice of my rulings in this regard.

MONEY LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL

THIRD READING

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

LIQUOR ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.35 a.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Liquor Acts 1912 to 1965 in certain particulars.”

The Premier, in presenting the Government's policy speech for the 1969 general election, stated that it was proposed to amend the Liquor Act to—

(i) remove the numerical restriction on the number of restaurant licences granted each year;

(ii) grant restaurant licences to those motels which have dining facilities of an acceptable standard; and

(iii) remove the numerical restriction on the number of licences granted to approved clubs.

The Premier further stated that, in each of those proposed changes, the Licensing Commission will determine, as it does now, whether any application for a licence should be granted, bearing in mind the standard of service to be provided, the situation of the premises and any objections which may have been lodged.

It is my Government's intention that, where practicable, the policy speech be implemented immediately. Our desires in this regard have been amply illustrated by the legislation which has already been introduced during the current session. A full review of the Liquor Act will take place early in the New Year, but, in conformity with my Government's intention of immediate implementation, I propose now to amend the Liquor Acts to comply fully with the policy speech.

In 1961 provision was made in the Liquor Acts for the granting of restaurant licences. A restaurant licence authorises the licensee to sell and supply liquor in the restaurant in respect of which the licence is granted, and the premises shall be deemed to be licensed premises. Before an application for a restaurant licence may be granted, the Licensing Commission must hear and determine all objections and must be satisfied that the restaurant provides facilities of not less than the prescribed minimum standard. This prescribed minimum standard includes the provision for not fewer than 40 persons seated at tables, adequate floor space and suitable staff, fittings, furniture and equipment essential for the preparation, service and consumption of meals. Adequate toilet facilities must also be provided.

The initial aggregate number of restaurant licences in force in Queensland was fixed at 32. This was in respect of the year which ended on 30 June, 1962, but the Governor in Council was empowered to increase this number by two in each succeeding year. The Governor in Council has exercised this power on five occasions, and for the year which commenced on 1 July 1969 the number of licences in force was 42.

The lifting of the numerical restrictions on the aggregate number of restaurant licences will mean that other restaurants, including those situated in motels, may be granted restaurant licences by the Commission if their dining and other facilities are of an acceptable standard and the other

requirements of the Act, including the hearing of objections, if any, have been complied with.

In the case of motels, the restaurant licence authorises the sale, supply and consumption of liquor only in the restaurant. It does not extend to the other sections or parts of the motel.

I mention for the information of hon. members that at present 10 restaurants in motels with dining and other facilities acceptable to the Commission have been granted restaurant licences.

The other objective of the Bill is to remove the numerical restriction on the number of licences granted to approved clubs. This restriction does not affect bowling and golf club licences as no restriction is placed on the number of such licences which may be granted. The type of clubs which will benefit from the lifting of this limitation will be registered clubs, ex-service-men's clubs, workers' clubs and principal sporting clubs.

In 1954 the aggregate number of such club licences, other than those granted to bowling and golf clubs, in force in Queensland was fixed at 102. The aggregate remained at this figure until the Liquor Acts were amended in 1959, when the number was fixed at 112 and the Governor in Council was then authorised to increase this number by two in each succeeding year. This power has been exercised on seven occasions, and the aggregate number has been increased from 112 as at 30 June, 1959, to 126 for the year which commenced on 1 July, 1969.

As mentioned previously, the Licensing Commission will determine, as it does now, whether any application for a licence of the types enumerated will be granted, bearing in mind the standard of service to be provided and the other requirements of the Act.

I believe that the objectives contained in the Bill are both necessary and desirable, and I commend it to the Committee.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.42 a.m.): This is another example of the inefficiency of a coalition Government that is torn asunder by factional fights and ideas, and of how the people of Queensland have to suffer because Government members cannot come up with a Bill that will meet the requirements of our times. This Bill is another step in the piecemeal extension of liquor consumption in this State.

Instead of getting on with the job and considering all aspects, needs and desires of the great majority of the people of this State, the Government is content to go a little way, at the same time promising some further review of the legislation in the future. Everyone in Queensland knows that this practice of saying "We will give you a bit

now but we will have a look at it again in the future" has been going on ever since this Government came to power.

Mr. Miller: Are you in favour of eliminating the 40-mile limit?

Mr. HOUSTON: There is no need for interjections from Government members. I am sure that everyone in this State knows exactly where the A.L.P. stands on this matter. As I go along, I shall make quite clear exactly where the A.L.P. stands. Our party does not play around with matters of grave public importance. It is prepared to come out in the open and say, "This is where we stand", so that the people will know exactly what the position is. The Government does not know where it is going. It introduces amendments that will obviously create more anomalies and problems.

Let us go back to 1961, when the then Minister for Justice (Sir Alan Munro) introduced a Bill to amend the Liquor Act.

Mr. Ramsden: Can I ask you a question?

Mr. HOUSTON: No. You will have to ask the Chairman. I do not want to usurp his position.

The Government amended the Liquor Act in 1961. It dismissed Labour's ideas on the holding of referendums, made it legal to drink alcohol on a Sunday beyond a 40-mile limit from Brisbane, and introduced many other amendments relative to the consumption of liquor. The then Minister and his supporters said that those amendments were necessary so that the law could be upheld and to meet the times. The Government made excuses all the way. It tried to have "two bob each way".

During the course of that debate the Minister said, as recorded at page 709, Volume 230 of "Hansard"—

"It may be helpful if, at this stage, I outline the basic principles which have guided our consideration.

"Shortly, these may be stated as a five-point programme to give effect to—

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

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

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

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

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

They are the principles that were laid down by Sir Alan Munro—and, I believe, in good faith. But let us see whether they have been adhered to by the Government; let us see whether subsequent events followed the principles then laid down by the Government.

On the first principle, surely no-one will claim that at the present time the law is not being broken. Those who think that the law is being enforced throughout the State must walk around with their eyes closed.

Mr. R. E. Moore: In Gladstone?

Mr. HOUSTON: If the hon. member wants to talk about Gladstone, he can do so. My colleague from that area will deal with him very effectively.

When one goes to country areas one finds on any Sunday, except on those occasions when the word goes out that certain people will be in the area and that the law should therefore be obeyed, that people are drinking in hotels in other than the lounges, and in the premises of sporting organisations. People will also be found drinking outside the permitted periods of two hours in the morning and two in the afternoon. Some time ago, as the hon. member for Roma well knows, the law was enforced to the letter in that city. And what happened? There was an outcry by the people, and the hon. member for Roma took up the case.

The whole point is that the Government is not having the liquor laws enforced. If they were enforced, there would be a public outcry in many areas because the people wish to have facilities made available to them for drinking. Whilst the police are not taking action against illegal drinking according to the law, the people generally in the areas concerned are quite happy with what is going on. If the law were so flagrantly broken to the extent that those drinking were causing a public nuisance, I have no doubt that the police would take action.

It is also well known that in country areas the crowding in what are known as hotel lounges, which are rooms not usually used to any extent during the week, is so great that men and women drink in other parts of the hotel. That situation is accepted by the great majority of people in such areas. The point that I am making is that the law is not being enforced.

Occasionally prosecutions are launched under the provisions relating to drinking by travellers. There were some just before the last State election. For every instance of such drinking that results in a prosecution, there are many others on which no action is taken.

I now pass to a consideration of the second principle mentioned by Sir Alan Munro. In Queensland there are approximately 1,088 hotels, of which just over 100 are in Brisbane. Within a 40-mile radius of Brisbane there are approximately 80. The great majority of hotels are therefore now permitted to open on Sundays. How can the Government claim that it believes in "the democratic principle

of freedom of the responsible individual" when it considers that in approximately 800 hotels people are capable of drinking with decorum and without becoming offensive to others, yet in the other hotels they are not?

The Government is virtually saying that the people who run the approximately 200 hotels in Brisbane and within 40 miles of it are not responsible and will not conduct themselves in the way in which the great majority of the people in the community expect. It is saying also that it is right for a person going from Brisbane to Toowoomba to have a drink at Laidley but it is not right for him to have a drink at Marburg. Why is there a difference? Is there a difference in the way in which the hotel proprietor in each place conducts his hotel? Is the behaviour of a person who stops for a drink at Marburg different from that of a person who stops for a drink at Laidley?

The question of responsibility arises again when one discusses Redcliffe and Redland Bay. Is it suggested that the people running the hotel at Redcliffe have a different standard of conduct from those running the hotel at Redland Bay? By its attitude, the Government is supporting the suggestion that there is a difference both between the people who run the hotels and between those who visit the hotels. Of course, the Government clears its conscience by saying, "Fair enough, but do not forget that Redcliffe is a tourist centre and Redland Bay is not".

Again, there is a difference between Gympie and Ipswich. The Government says that people are permitted to have a drink at Gympie on Sunday but not at Ipswich.

What constitutes a tourist centre? I believe that a tourist centre is one that caters, in the main, for tourists in the true sense of the word, not a seaside resort associated with the metropolitan area. Surely there is no difference between the actual tourist attractions of Redland Bay and its surrounding areas and those of Redcliffe and its surrounding areas.

Mr. Harris: Much more beautiful; that's all.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member could be correct. However, without becoming involved in an argument about the two areas, the point is that there is virtually no difference between them.

I have heard the Minister for Tourism, when referring to the development of tourist centres, tell hon. members how many motels have been built. I remind hon. members that only three motels in the Redcliffe area meet the standards set by the R.A.C.Q. How can one compare that number with the number on the Sunshine Coast or the Gold Coast? I do not know how many motels there are on the Gold Coast, but if the hon. member for South Coast was told that only three motels in his area met R.A.C.Q.

standards, I am sure that even he would not classify it as a tourist centre. There are 35 motels on the Sunshine Coast.

In my opinion, there is no weight in the argument that Redcliffe is different from Brisbane. There are six hotels on the Redcliffe Peninsula—one at Scarborough, two at Woody Point, and three at Redcliffe—and one cannot say that the area has been or is being developed to cater for tourists. It is true that it is a very fine place for the people of Brisbane to visit, and many of them go to Redcliffe for the day, both during the week and, more particularly, on Sunday, for swimming and recreation close to home, and I have no fight with that.

Recently I asked a question of the appropriate Minister relative to the number of people who had been arrested for driving on a Sunday whilst under the influence of liquor. If the Government was considering introducing legislation covering Sunday drinking, surely it would analyse what effect having hotels open on Sunday has had on the number of drink-drivers on the roads. One of the reasons given by those who want prohibition of Sunday drinking is that it has increased the number of drink-drivers. If that argument is valid, at least some accidents associated with people driving while under the influence of alcohol should have occurred. If they have, a record of them should have been kept. In my opinion, that would be one of the fundamental bases on which to determine future action. However, the Minister's reply to me was that these figures are not known. The mere fact that there are none clearly indicates that instances were not sufficient to warrant the keeping of such statistics.

It is not true to suggest that the opening of hotels at Redcliffe has increased the number of drink-drivers on the roads. Even if it has, why would Brisbane be any different from the rest of the State. The Government is not putting Sir Alan Munro's fundamental principles into effect. Time has shown that what was done in 1961 has not created any great hardship for the majority of people.

One of the fundamental principles enunciated by Sir Alan Munro was the medical principle of the comparative advantage of partaking of food with liquor. No-one has disputed this. The Minister has suggested that no restriction is to be placed on the number of licensed restaurants. For the life of me I cannot see any reason for separating a restaurant at a motel from an ordinary restaurant. Surely the fundamental basis should be that it is a restaurant.

Dr. Delamothe: That is not what I said.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister said that licences would be given to restaurants associated with motels, but people can drink only while they are at the restaurant.

Dr. Delamothe: That is so.

Mr. HOUSTON: Why separate them? The reason, of course, is that some sections of the Minister's party want eventually to grant licences to motels. This is the first step towards doing that.

Mr. Hinze: Are you opposed to the licensing of motels?

Mr. HOUSTON: That is a much broader question than could be covered by the simple answer "Yes" or "No".

Mr. Hinze: Are you opposed to room service?

Mr. HOUSTON: Under the present circumstances, yes. Hotels pay massive licence fees for certain privileges. A hotel has to face a local option poll before being allowed to operate in any area. Therefore, before I would say "Yes" or "No" to the hon. member's question I would want to know what the Government has in mind relative to the protection of hotels on the one hand and of the public on the other.

I hit the nail right on the head in saying that the Government is putting this matter up in its present form as the first step towards a further stage. That is why I object to all this legislation. First of all the Government says, "We are going to give licences to restaurants", and then, to the temperance people and others opposed to this, it says, "Don't worry; we propose to issue only two a year. What harm is there in that? We shall put so many restrictions on them that only those with plenty of money will get them, so you need not worry." Then, when that stage is under way, the Government sees a serious anomaly that was obvious from the word "go" and, of course, it goes a step further.

I am not opposed to an increase in the number of licences for those who reach the high standard required, but I am opposed to this method of doing it by which the Government tries to "soft-soap" those opposed to it for reasons best known to itself. I can see no reason at all for dealing differently with a restaurant at a motel and any other restaurant in the issuing of licences.

The Minister very carefully refrained from mentioning what is now happening at many service stations which operate restaurants and provide a great variety of meals. Is the Minister going to licence them so that while a motorist's car is being filled with petrol he can eat food and drink alcohol as well? Is that the next stage that the Government will embark upon? Anyone who has travelled interstate will have seen the high standard of some of the restaurants associated with service stations.

The consumption of liquor and the consumption of food with liquor are two entirely different things, and the Government introduces the eating aspect as an excuse for its actions. If a person desires to have a drink to quench his thirst, surely he should not be required to spend nearly \$1 to buy

a sandwich to eat with that drink. The Government couples the two merely to salve its conscience.

The fourth principle is the protection and safeguarding of our young people. This would be one of the greatest laughs of all time. Today many young people obtain liquor and, unfortunately, many of those who consume it are killed on the roads.

Mr. Hinze: Are you in favour of lowering the drinking age to 18?

Mr. HOUSTON: That is a complex question associated with the adulthood age of 18, and it cannot be answered simply by either "Yes" or "No".

Mr. Hinze: But you haven't answered it.

Mr. HOUSTON: And I do not intend to answer it at present.

There is no evidence to show that this Government is clamping down on the supply of liquor to young people. As on the peddling of drugs, the Government talks a lot about doing things but implements no practical measure at all to rid the State of the menace created by those who supply drink to young people. Over the past 12 months, how many people who have supplied alcohol to minors have been prosecuted? Not one.

Mr. Hinze: That is not right.

Mr. HOUSTON: Let the hon. member try to name one person who has been prosecuted. Not one has been. On the one hand the Government talks about protecting the young people of this State, while on the other hand it does nothing about it. If the Government is sincere in its desire to prevent under-age drinking, surely it could empower the police to inquire from minors who have been arrested for drunken driving or involved in accidents the names and addresses of those who supplied them with liquor. Until the Government takes positive steps to rid the community of those who supply liquor to minors, the Opposition will look with suspicion upon the Government's statements relative to liquor.

Of course, drug peddling has no place in our community—it should be out altogether—but when I condemn the supply of alcohol to young people I do not mean that responsible people should be prohibited from obtaining liquor. It is wrong to impose restrictions upon people who drink liquor and comply with the law upon the pretence of protecting young people, when in fact no positive action is taken to protect them.

The last principle is the social principle of educational and health measures to discourage intemperance and to prevent and cure alcoholism. Here again, what action has the Government taken to give effect to that principle? A few pamphlets have been published. When the previous legislation was introduced, in order to soft-soap those who were opposed to the Government and to the consumption of alcohol the Government

said that it would set up a fund—which, incidentally, was to be paid for by those who drank liquor—to be used in the distribution of literature aimed at combating alcoholism. Yet the Government does not donate large sums of money to the many sporting bodies that provide amenities designed to foster and encourage youth organisations to teach young people the advantages to be gained from going through life without resorting to alcohol and drugs. That is the starting point. It is all very well to hand a young person a sheet of paper and say, "Here is some literature encouraging you not to drink", or, "Here is a bit of paper telling you what happens if you drink too much", but that line of action does not mean very much. If the Government wants to spend money, let it spend it in creating and fostering youth organisations to teach our young people the benefits of clean, outdoor living, and foster amongst them a desire to be participants in sport rather than merely onlookers. In practice, the onlookers far too often become bored and look for an outlet which frequently is the drinking of beer and other liquor. And, unfortunately, the boredom is now leading to drug taking. If the Government wishes to be practical and positive in its thinking it should look after the welfare of the young people by assisting them to enjoy themselves and helping them to build good, healthy bodies.

Only the other day His Excellency the Governor saw fit to call many people together to hear Mr. Padman, from the Y.M.C.A., outline ways and means of assisting young people to find their feet so that they can take their rightful place in society.

Mr. Hinze: Are you saying that you are opposed to young people drinking?

Mr. HOUSTON: I did not say that at all; but I am opposed to young people of 14, 15 and 16 drinking alcoholic liquor.

Government funds should be used to assist youth organisations. That is what I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted. I pointed out that His Excellency called the meeting I mentioned with the purpose of discussing this subject.

(Time expired.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind hon. members on both sides of the Committee that conversations during the two preceding speeches were much too audible. I do not intend to allow that situation to continue. If hon. members continue with their loud conversations, I will have to deal with them.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (12.8 p.m.): This legislation is another faint-hearted, long-overdue attempt to tackle a very broad problem in this State. It is an instance of the Government's continuing attitude. It is obvious to me that Liberal and Country Party members alike lack a genuine and real interest in liquor reform. I do not believe for one

moment that the great majority of Government members are in any way interested in liquor reform. It may be that the Minister in charge of the Bill is genuinely interested, but he is shackled and hobbled by other members of the Government—particularly Government back-benchers—who are not interested, and will not let those who are genuinely interested introduce proper liquor reform, which Queensland needs so badly. For the last 12 years—ever since it came to power in 1957—the Government has been dabbling with liquor reform without achieving any positive results. Surely that is most unfortunate for Queensland generally, and Queenslanders particularly. Ministers have made many half-hearted promises, but they have never been transformed into positive action to implement liquor reform in our great State. In the last 12 years the promises and half promises about what may happen next week, the week after, or the month after, have been akin to the television serial “Peyton Place”. The episodes continue—and there are plenty of new episodes—but none of them take us nearer to the ultimate solution or a proper climax in liquor reform.

Mr. Tooth: You don't mean to say that there have been no changes?

Mr. TUCKER: There have been changes, but they have not been changes of any importance.

Mr. Tooth: Think back to 1961 and 1965.

Mr. TUCKER: Not that I can see, anyway. The Minister for Health will have his chance to stand up and express his opinions. I will listen to him with interest if he does stand up, and if in fact he ever makes a positive statement on anything at all.

There has been a build-up of talk about liquor reform for 12 years, and the public has been promised something next week, or next month, or next year. The previous build-up began about February, 1968, when the Minister for Justice published an article on liquor reform in “Sunday Truth”.

Later that year the Minister led a delegation, of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member, to South-east Asia, ostensibly to learn more about various countries. I have no argument with this because it was very good. However, on his return the Minister for Justice held a Press conference at which he said that one of the main things he had done overseas was to study the liquor trade. He said that he had taken a special interest in this matter because he wanted to introduce liquor reform in Queensland.

Here is this build-up again. Promises are made, an article is written, there is an overseas delegation, and then there is a Press conference. The Minister said, “We will have it this time. I was very impressed with what I saw in the countries I visited.” If he did not say it, he at least implied it. At that

stage he hinted that we would have sweeping changes in our liquor legislation and that many reforms would be introduced.

However, did we get them? Let us look at what happened after that statement was made. At that time, or just afterwards, the then Premier, the Honourable J. C. A. Pizzey, died in rather tragic circumstances, and the Honourable Johannes Bjelke-Petersen stepped into the breach. The new Premier had often referred to gambling and drinking as the twin evils in Queensland. I have no argument with his attitude or his thoughts. He made many other statements on liquor. We found, quite suddenly, that there had been a complete change in the Government's attitude to genuine and realistic liquor reform in this State. Within a matter of weeks or a month there was a complete change of mind—a complete turnabout or a somersault. This was completely predictable at that stage. Having heard what the new Premier had said before he became Premier, I, and many others on this side of the Chamber, predicted what would happen shortly after he was elected as Premier. We notice this complete about-face or complete somersault on liquor reforms. Again there was a build-up, and then a let-down. What a farce there has been in Queensland in the past year with this build-up and let-down.

In 1968 the Minister responsible for administration of the Liquor Act made promises of sweeping changes, but the year ended with a comical series of statements and nothing done. After that build-up, Cabinet and joint party meetings promised the people exactly nothing. As another example of what the Government has been doing for the last 12 years, another decision was made to inquire into the matter. Although promises of sweeping changes were made in 1968, after the problem had existed for a decade, again the Government went backwards and made the statement, “We will have another inquiry into liquor reform in this State.”

In 1969, after the disgrace of an eight-months' period in which Parliament was in recess, the Government again failed to grasp the nettle. On behalf of the people of Queensland, it has failed to come to terms with liquor reform, and the attitude that prevails today is the same as it was in 1957 when the Government first took office. There is the same indecision and the same failure to grasp the nettle and make a clear-cut statement to the people. It has now been said that there will be another review in March next year. Is it any wonder that the hon. member for South Coast and others must be disgusted with this lack of action after 12 years, particularly after they said that they were sure that liquor reform would be undertaken to change the present hick-town attitude to a more modern approach? Is it any wonder that people who think as they do die in frustration? No doubt those in North Coast areas have similar feelings. I wonder what they say to responsible people

in their electorates who have been bringing this matter forward and asking for appropriate action from the joint parties. I wonder how they face up to those people? They must feel very embarrassed when they meet men and women who understand this problem and who have been making sensible submissions on it to them.

I believe that the proposed Bill contains insufficient amendments to the Act. They will operate in only a few limited areas. Again the Government has been ducking and diving. Although I have no argument with what is proposed, it is not sufficient and it will not apply to all the people of Queensland. The Government's approach is almost a cowardly one, in that it fails to come to grips with the whole problem. We could have expected that this would be the Government's attitude because it failed a few weeks ago to come to grips with the margarine and butter issue. Indecision is apparent every time the Government is faced with a fairly difficult problem necessitating a positive approach. It was predictable that at the last minute the Government would back away from the liquor problem, just as it backed away from the margarine and butter issue.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houghton): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I ask hon. members to remain silent.

Mr. TUCKER: A moment ago I referred to a television programme. I believe the "Fugitive" will catch the one-armed man in this endless television series long before the Government settles down to legislate seriously in the field of liquor.

Under a Labour Government, the liquor laws in Queensland were in advance of those in every other Australian State at that time. Today they lag sadly behind those in every other Australian State, and I know that every hon. member who is truthful will support my statement. The Minister for Tourism regularly, after going on safari in the Outback, paints a glowing picture of why Queensland is attracting tourists, yet the Government inflicts on the tourists coming here liquor laws that may have been suitable in Cromwell's time but which certainly are not suitable today. People visiting this State have been used to much more liberal liquor laws, but we force them to accept our laws whether they like them or not.

In my opinion, the present administration has a feudal outlook. It has one law for 50 per cent. of Queenslanders, as the Leader of the Opposition said, and another law for the other 50 per cent. I am speaking, of course, about Sunday trading and the 40-mile limit round Brisbane. Surely that is sectional legislation; surely it is unjust. It certainly is unfair to everyone in this State. In my electorate and many other areas of Queensland, in the provincial cities and the far-distant Outback, people are

allowed to drink for four hours on Sundays. It is now part and parcel of life in the country and in provincial cities. That provision was introduced by a Country-Liberal Government and has been accepted. If the Government dared attempt to remove that provision and prevent drinking in provincial and country areas on Sundays, it would be headed for political oblivion. On the other hand, the same Government that gave that right to people in provincial cities and country areas decrees that if the other 50 per cent. of Queenslanders living in Brisbane and Ipswich seek to obtain what I can obtain in Townsville and what persons living in country areas can obtain, they are criminals and are open to prosecution.

Mr. Hinze: You don't believe in sectional legislation?

Mr. TUCKER: Of course, I do not. A person is law-abiding if he has a drink in Kingaroy, in the Premier's electorate, or in Gattin, in the Treasurer's electorate; but if he endeavours to get a drink in Brisbane or Ipswich, he risks a heavy fine or arrest.

Other sections of the existing law are even worse. As the Leader of the Opposition said, the position in Redcliffe, 25 miles from Brisbane, is similar to that in country areas. On the other hand, a person cannot drink on Sunday at Redland Bay, where there is a tourist industry. Is not Brisbane also a tourist area? Does the Country-Liberal Government say that it is not? I believe that the Government's attitude shows that it does.

Let us consider the position of workmates employed by the same Brisbane firm and working at the same bench. One of them travels from Redcliffe to work, and the other lives in Brisbane. The fellow who lives at Redcliffe can drink on Sunday, but his workmate who lives in Brisbane cannot drink and would be regarded as a criminal if he tried to obtain a drink at a hotel. Surely legislation is sectional when similar amenities are not open to two workmates. This anomaly would be swept away if the Government had the intestinal fortitude to do something about it. What a crazy set-up exists in Queensland today when the things I have mentioned can happen! One worker can enjoy his drink on Sunday whilst his workmate cannot. This is the position created by a Government that believes that the people of Brisbane are second-class citizens and that those outside Brisbane are first-class citizens. I wonder how long the people of Brisbane will put up with this gutless Country-Liberal Government, with the Liberals, who should understand the needs of the Brisbane area, dominated by a weak-kneed Country Party.

Hon. members opposite are always talking about tourism and their great interest in it, yet overseas tourists coming to Brisbane are forced to closet themselves in a room and pay room-service prices to obtain a drink on Sunday. This happens in a State that we

call a tourist State. Surely it is a terrible indictment of the Government that today it is not prepared to bring down an amendment to sweep away the sectional attitude adopted towards Brisbane and restore the residents of all parts of Queensland as first-class citizens.

Mention was made of Ipswich, an industrial city where many men work shift work. Many of them have to work on Saturday. Surely for them Sunday would be an ideal day for a quiet drink with friends, families or relatives, but the Government says, "No. If you drink in the City of Ipswich on Sunday you will be a law-breaker." Just imagine what would happen if the Government tried to do the same thing in the mining town of Moura. The Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs, Mr. Hewitt, would have to get out of Moura and run for his life or be lynched within five minutes. Every member of the Government knows that that is true yet no-one had the intestinal fortitude or, to use the vernacular, the guts, to get up in the party room and push for the abandonment of this sectional legislation.

Hon. members opposite claim they represent a substantial majority of the people of Queensland yet, by their sectional attitude, they have turned the Government into the champion of sly-groggers in the Brisbane area. By this sectional legislation the Government champions the sly-groggers and the undesirables who today peddle liquor because it is not easily obtainable, and, as the Leader of the Opposition said, they peddle it to teenagers, through back doors in alleys.

It has been suggested that if legislation to permit hotels to open in Brisbane on Sundays were introduced, it would be greeted with screams and would result in an upsurge of drink-driving. I do not believe this would occur. The same people who claim this at present turn a blind eye to liquor trading in country areas and support a continuation of laws that force Brisbane motorists and citizens to drive 40 miles, with all its attendant risks, to have a lawful drink on Sunday.

Could any man put forward a good argument for the continuation of this sectional legislation? Could any Government member say truthfully that it is right and fair? Many risks are involved in forcing people to go to Redcliffe to obtain liquor, and I am told by my colleagues that people are flat out obtaining a drink at Redcliffe on a Sunday owing to the very great number of Brisbane people who are compelled to drive there to obtain liquor. Is this good thinking?

An Opposition Member: And they have to take pots.

Mr. TUCKER: They either have to take pots or miss out on a drink. The residents of Brisbane and Ipswich are treated like second-class citizens. Even when they

are forced to drive 40 miles, with all the attendant dangers, to obtain liquor they do not always receive the civility that they would expect because the licensees and bar attendants realise that customers are compelled to patronise their hotels if they want liquor. In my book, and in the Opposition's book, that state of affairs is a very bad one, and surely the Liberal Party would agree that it is. But it is dominated by the Country Party and forced to let that state of affairs continue. The Liberal Party has not the intestinal fortitude to do something about it. How can tourism in this State flourish under this narrow-minded Government? How can the Gold Coast be eulogised if the Government shackles tourists by antiquated liquor laws?

(Time expired.)

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (12.32 p.m.): I was very glad indeed to see that when the hon. member for Townsville North was engaging in his frightening exhibition there was a doctor in the House, for I felt sure that his services might have been required. I can state the position very clearly, without any heat and fulmination. The hon. member for Townsville North and, I understand, the Leader of the Opposition and other hon. members have spoken about liquor reform. What do they mean by "reform"? That word cannot possibly be applied to liquor, because what is considered by one person to be reform would be considered by another to be the very antithesis of reform. What the hon. member for Port Curtis would consider to be liquor reform would be absolutely obnoxious to the hon. member for Sandgate. In saying that, I do not want to embarrass either of those hon. gentlemen because I respect their opinions. However, let us stop talking about liquor reform and face up to the issue fairly and squarely by admitting that there is no more controversial issue in this State than liquor.

Frequently when amendments are introduced into this Chamber groups of people representing what we are pleased to call the wowsier element—and that is a word that I never use—and church groups come to me and ask me to oppose what they consider to be obnoxious amendments to the Liquor Act. I tell them that I am very happy to listen to their viewpoints and to give them whatever thought I possibly can, but that I consider that my job in Parliament is to represent the best interests of the majority of the people and that when I am in this Chamber I will always vote for what I consider to be their best interests.

In the last 20 minutes of the speech made by the hon. member for Townsville North he fulminated when comparing Brisbane with other parts of the State. I thought that he would go "out" a couple of times, so by comparison I shall sum up my attitude in a very quiet and temperate manner. I regard the discrimination against Brisbane in not allowing Sunday liquor trading as a travesty

of democracy, and while it is allowed to remain it is a blot, a blur, and shall I say, an excrescence on the shield or record of this Government. Nobody with any sense of decency and fairness, or with any conception of democracy as we know it, could justify one law for the people of Brisbane and another for those in the remainder of the State.

Mr. Hinzé: Are you agreeing with the hon. member for Townsville North?

Mr. AIKENS: I can say in a few words what the hon. member for Townsville North nearly threw six fits in saying.

Until the Government realises that there can be only one liquor law for all the people of Queensland, it will not be, if I may use the vulgar vernacular, a Government's boot-lace. We had a remarkable example of this type of confused thinking from members of the "ginger group" when it was suggested that the Government would introduce legislation to give the people of Brisbane the same rights relative to Sunday drinking as those enjoyed by people in the rest of the State. Members of the "ginger group"—the hon. member for Clayfield and others who, I hope, were not incorrectly reported—said that they would cross the floor of the Assembly and vote with the A.L.P. to bring down the Government if this democratic legislation was introduced to give Brisbane the same drinking rights on Sunday as apply to the rest of the State.

I do not care what the members of the "ginger group" do—they are masters of their own destinies—but I will say that it is good for members to stand up in this Chamber and disagree with the viewpoints expressed by their leaders. Unfortunately, A.L.P. members cannot do that. It is a good thing that members on the other side of the Chamber can do it, and frequently do so. It is good, too, that Government members who feel that their conscience is affronted by a particular measure can walk out of the House and not vote on it. But if any member of the Government walks across the floor and votes with the A.L.P. in order to bring down the Government, he will be branded forever as an odorous and scabrous rat, and he will deserve that appellation.

A Government Member: He should be thrown out.

Mr. AIKENS: He should.

If any Government members want to vote and speak as I do, that is, from their hearts and consciences, they should either form a little party of their own, go to the A.L.P. and ask for admission and be received with open arms, or come over and sit with me as Independents. To continually hold a threat over the Government that if any little thing does not suit them they will cross the floor and vote with their A.L.P. enemies to bring down the Government and end this Parliament is inexcusable and indefensible.

Mr. Bennett: What has this got to do with liquor?

Mr. AIKENS: I will deal with something in which the hon. member for South Brisbane might be interested because he is a rather incongruous type. I should say that from external appearances he has always impressed me as perhaps the cleanest man physically in this Chamber. It is a pity that he does not pay as much attention to his stomatological cleanliness as he does to his outward cleanliness and his sartorial elegance.

While talking about liquor—we heard the Leader of the Opposition talking about how we should not train young people to drink liquor—I understand that we are to introduce a Bill very shortly to establish the Townsville University College as a completely autonomous body. I have been asking questions about a house that is to be erected there—perhaps I should say "mansion"—with wash-basins and toilets inlaid with mother of pearl.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: I am coming to liquor, Mr. Hooper. I will deal with it; leave it to me; I will not strain your patience or go too far.

Part of the job done by the man who is to get this house free of rent—he gets \$12,000 a year plus perks as a professor—is to look after the hall of residence, and he regularly holds what he is pleased to call "sherry parties" at which grog of all sorts is available in abundance. Young boys and girls are incited, blackmailed, bullied, and threatened to induce them to attend these sherry parties and learn to drink sensibly, as they are told, as a social essential and so that they will not go under the table. I assure you, Mr. Hooper, that it is not a very elevating sight to see a young girl of 17 or 18 running from one of these sherry parties towards the nearest ladies' retiring room with her hand clasped across her mouth and vomit squirting out between her fingers. When we are talking about liquor, let us get some idea where young people today are learning to drink it.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: They are being trained to drink liquor. I do not know what goes on at the university in Brisbane, but if the hon. member for South Brisbane cares to ask the young boys and girls, he may find out for himself.

A deputation from the Townsville University College, comprising students and staff members, was at my home nearly all Sunday afternoon. I also receive deputations in the "broom cupboard" here and I am told what is going on at the university. Sometimes there is not enough room to fit all the members in. So that when we talk of young people being taught to drink liquor, let us have a look at these so-called sherry parties. Incidentally, this gentleman gets an entertainment allowance of \$300 a year out of the taxpayers' pockets, and I suppose this is how he uses it.

When we are talking of discrimination and sectional liquor legislation, let us deal with perhaps the most monstrous and shocking piece of sectional legislation in the liquor laws in this State. I fought it tooth and nail and exposed it on the public platform when the A.L.P. Attorney-General of the day, the Honourable Bill Power, introduced it. We all know that he was interested in the establishment of Lang Park as the headquarters of Rugby League football, and it is not a bad centre either. It has many facilities. But to get the money to establish and run Lang Park, Mr. Power introduced an amendment to the Liquor Act—it still applies as this Government has not had the guts to amend it—so that only the head centre for each sport in Queensland shall be granted a liquor licence. Of course, we know that golf clubs and bowling clubs are automatically granted liquor licences, but all the other sporting bodies in Queensland—hon. members can probably think of more than I can name—such as Rugby league, Rugby union, Australian rules, soccer, cricket, hockey, basketball, and all the rest of them, are limited to one liquor licence each for the whole of Queensland, which must be granted to its head centre in Brisbane. When I fought the legislation as it was going through the Chamber I was told that that was the A.L.P.'s idea of democracy. So when we talk of sectional legislation, for goodness sake let us place all the blame where it belongs.

This Government has been in power for 12 years, and, despite my frequent appeal to it to remove this obnoxious blot on democracy as it applies to the sporting bodies of Queensland, it has not done a damned thing about it. I know that party politicians have to play their own cards to get as much political propaganda out of the other side as possible. That is axiomatic. But as far as I am concerned I try to put a plain, unvarnished and, I would say, quite clear and clean exposition of the facts before the Chamber and into the pages of "Hansard".

Let us end this sporting club rort. I ask the Minister for Justice now if the Bill contains, or will contain following my remarks, a provision that a sporting club in another part of Queensland can obtain a liquor licence. Today the North Queensland Rugby league people are taking over the sports reserve in Townsville. How wonderful it would be if they could get a liquor licence to help them pay for the improvements and amenities necessary at that reserve, just as Lang Park got a liquor licence to assist it to pay for the amenities necessary there. Will the cricket clubs, Rugby league clubs and rowing clubs in the North, the Far North, and the Far West be given liquor licences? Why are these licences confined to the A.L.P.'s and the Government's beloved Brisbane? We know, of course, that the policy of the A.L.P. was,

"Duck for beloved Brisbane and crow for the rest of the State." In this regard, that is also the policy of this Government.

Very few members of the Country-Liberal Government, and only a handful of the members of the Australian Labour Party, know what goes on outside Brisbane. The other day I was out at a place in the bush that was 70 miles from the nearest pub. About 50 men were working on a job there and they were running their own canteen. The profits made at the canteen went back to the men. One fellow got the sack for being a loafer, and he immediately went to the nearest police sergeant, who was some distance away. The police sergeant came along and told these people that they would have to close down the canteen because they could not get a licence for a workers' canteen. Now they have to go through all the ducking and diving and legal loopholes of buying their grog and stacking it in the fridge and all that sort of thing. Why can they not get a licence for a canteen in the bush when they are 70 miles from the nearest pub? They are decent, hard-working people.

Mr. Bennett: They can, under the Liquor Act.

Mr. AIKENS: I am quite open to advice from anybody. If the hon. member for South Brisbane can tell me how a group of men working right out in the bush can get a liquor licence for their own canteen I will be happy to hear it. I know that certain favoured people can get them, so why not workers out in the bush? I am not going to speak for long on this matter, as I think that I have let the Committee know where I stand. I have let the Government know that if the proposed Bill does not contain the basic principles of democracy, I think it stinks and I will oppose it.

I listened to the Leader of the Opposition, who is a man whom in many respects I hold in high regard, and I noted that he could not resist the opportunity to "sound off" about the need to train young people, and to give money from this and that source to youth clubs. That is a very estimable suggestion, but I wonder if he remembers what happened at the last Labour-in-Politics Convention held on the South Coast. Some hon. members, because of certain circumstances, have forgotten that they were ever there, and some were not aware of it even two days later.

Does the Leader of the Opposition remember how all the delegates were escorted in by skimpily-clad go-go girls? Does he remember the resolution that was carried that a casino be established on the Gold Coast? Does he remember the resolution that the profits from the casino be ploughed back into a nudie-cutie vaudeville show for the benefit of the people at the casino? That is all contained in the records; let the hon. member read the minutes of that conference and what the Labour Party

decided there. Members of the Labour Party should therefore be the very last in the Chamber to talk about discriminatory and sectional legislation.

So far as I am concerned, this legislation will merely fiddle with the issue. If, as a keen student of the Bible, I may use a biblical quotation which comes to my mind, the government is "straining at gnats and swallowing camels". There is a job to be done with regard to liquor—I am not using the word "reform" because it is impossible to please everybody—and I know of no subject ever debated in this Chamber or anywhere else on which there is such a diversity of opinion. I do not, of course, give very much thought to what hon. members on both sides of the Chamber are going to do on this issue, because I know that they have on their backs the whip marks inflicted by their party bosses. What I am going to do is vote according to what I consider to be the interests of the majority of the people whom I represent.

Mr. Baldwin: Would you have a referendum on it?

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member for South Coast was bellowing and squealing like a brumby stallion while the hon. member for Townsville North was speaking, and asking him what he thought of the result of the referendum in New South Wales on Saturday. I will say what I think of it. I think that if such a referendum were held in Queensland, the result would be exactly the same. Let no-one make any mistake about that. I think that if the people of this State were given an opportunity to vote on the issue, they would vote against Sunday drinking, and, till they are given that opportunity, I have to exercise my mind and conscience on the matter. I was speaking to Ted Walsh today, and on these things he has an elephantine memory. Right back in the 1920's, when the Labour Party put the liquor issue to the people—I think one party advocated a 2, 3, X vote—it was soundly defeated, too. It is not only the Government that is not game to put the issue to the people; the A.L.P. is not game to do it, either.

Mr. Baldwin: It was put to the people in our policy.

Mr. AIKENS: The A.L.P. did not put it to the people at all. How could it be put to the people safely? I do not know how much the Government receives from the liquor interests, but when the A.L.P. was in power, S.P. bookmakers and liquor interests supplied all their electioneering slush funds. I am not going to be diverted; if political parties are going to crush the liquor interests, that is a problem for themselves.

Mr. Bennett: You can tell the men who are having trouble obtaining a canteen licence to apply under section 5 in the form of No. 3 on page 208 of the pamphlet copy of the Act and they will get their licence.

Mr. AIKENS: If that is sound legal advice, it is the first piece of sound legal advice that the hon. member has ever given to anyone. On the law of averages it is quite possible that it is sound, and I shall have a talk with the hon. member on the matter afterwards. I am a pretty tolerant sort of fellow. I hope that his advice on this question will be offered gratuitously. Hon. members know, of course, that when the hon. member for South Brisbane was called to the Bar and found the little pocket in the shoulder-piece of his gown, he had it taken out and a sugar bag put in its place. I hope he will not "slug" the workers. If he tells me the section of the Act to which he is referring, I shall look it up and apply my deep and profound legal knowledge to it.

The proposed Bill is a little bit of flim-flam and floss. I know that the Government found itself in a fairly invidious position. The Minister for Justice returned from Hong Kong, Tokyo, and other places, and made a statement to the Press. Unfortunately, he makes too many statements to the Press before he is ready to go off; consequently, he has a reputation for going off half-cocked. But his heart is in the right place, and he has done much for Queenslanders, particularly women. I mentioned that in one of my telecasts during the recent election campaign.

I do know that the Government parties struck a good deal of trouble in discussions on the proposed Bill for the very reason that I mentioned—that it is impossible to get unanimity of opinion in any party on a question such as a liquor Bill. Surely to goodness no-one will try to tell me—again I do not wish to embarrass the hon. members—that the hon. members for Sandgate and Port Curtis are of the same mind and have the same views on questions involving liquor.

Mr. Bennett: They may agree.

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member for South Brisbane does not know anything about liquor from the viewpoint of the actual physical consumption of it. On the other hand, I am qualified to speak about the consumption of liquor because, during my long, colourful and useful life, I have been in all stages of intoxication, from the mildly hilarious to the horrors. Therefore, I know everything about the consumption of liquor.

Mr. Bennett: I am told that they used to take you home on an end-loader.

Mr. AIKENS: They used to take me home in quite a lot of things. When I was in the horrors, I used to see some very hideous things, but never anything as hideous as the hon. member for South Brisbane. At least that mental turmoil no longer afflicts me.

Hon. members should be honest and admit that this is a problem that no party can solve on a broad basis. If the Labour Party was in power, it would be in just as

big a pickle and a fix, just as big a quandary, as the present Government. As a former member of this Assembly would have said—I do not wish to mention his name—they would be “on the horns of Emma.”

This is where I stand on the proposed Bill, Mr. Hooper. I was down in my room doing some work when the Minister introduced the Bill, but I shall study it carefully. If I think it is in the interests of the majority of the people who have sent me to Parliament, I will vote for it, either wholly or in part; if not, I shall oppose it.

Mr. CORY (Warwick) (12.53 p.m.): The hon. member for Townsville South said that he would say where he stood on this question. I think that every hon. member who takes part in the debate will wish to express where he stands on it.

I approve of the proposed Bill and what it is attempting to do, particularly as I realise that it is only giving effect to one of the promises that the Premier made in his policy speech at the recent election. It is only right and proper that an amending Bill should be brought down at the earliest opportunity, and I commend the Minister for Justice for introducing the Bill now under consideration.

Mr. Aikens: The Premier's policy speech, unlike the law of the Medes and the Persians, is not unalterable.

Mr. CORY: It is not unalterable, and I think that the hon. member will find that before very long much more will be done in this direction.

It is true that the Government has a responsibility to every section of the community. It is not the purpose of the Government to go overboard for any one section, and every taxpayer and citizen in Queensland has an equal right to have his views considered when legislation is being framed. That is what the Government has done and will continue to do.

Mr. Houston: What evidence did you get from people in Brisbane that they do not wish to be included with the rest of the State?

Mr. CORY: The Government received as much evidence from Brisbane as it did from anywhere else. As I said in my opening remarks, I intend to state where I stand on this and other matters.

The proposed Bill will bring into force as quickly as possible promises made in the Premier's policy speech, just as other promises in that speech have been implemented. I agree with the previous speakers that many anomalies in our present Act are as yet untouched. Regardless of how the law is amended, unless all parts of the State are given equal opportunities, privileges, rights and conditions, there is a weakness in it.

From time to time much stress has been placed on areas considered to be tourist areas. In tourist areas where population density is high, certain amenities are sensible and necessary, but this does not mean that similar amenities would not be legal or should not be provided in other parts of the State if the need became obvious. I feel that all parts of the State should be considered in the same way and that no section should operate under laws different from those applicable to other sections. In saying this I refer mainly to the provision of restaurant licences, motel licences and, if anyone wants to include them, casinos. At this stage I am not referring to the 40-mile limit which, of course, means exactly what it says. That is a bigger and different issue that I will mention later on.

To a large extent our present Act is outmoded, particularly as it refers to restaurant licences and the hours and conditions of operation of many of our clubs, both sporting and licensed. The whole Act is in great need of review and, while I do not agree with hon. members who criticise the Government for not doing all these things at the one time, the interests of the hotel-keeper have to be considered, particularly where his capital investment is at stake.

Hotel-keepers have large capital commitments, most of them determined by the Licensing Commission through continual requisitions on licensed premises. Hotelkeepers have been asked to spend large sums of money to meet the standard of accommodation and drinking facilities expected by the public, which standard, in recent years, has risen considerably. I agree that they should be served with requisitions, but they have committed themselves to high capital expenditure and their rights cannot idly be passed over. The Government must consider their present position and their return on the capital they have invested. This must be taken into account whenever amendments of the liquor laws are being considered as they are at the present time.

Mr. P. Wood: What is the condition of hotel lounges?

Mr. CORY: In the main, hotel lounges are very good. I do not know whether that answers the hon. member's question. I am not sure what he is driving at. There are certain instances in which I think lounges could be used for a different purpose, but hotel lounges, in the main, are very good and adequate for normal week-day trading. Sunday trading is another matter.

The most obvious anomaly in the present Act is the injustice perpetrated by the restriction on the transfer of licences. I am referring particularly to a situation where, for various reasons, a licence becomes somewhat redundant in a particular area. This might occur when a new highway bypasses premises previously situated on the highway.

That licence, in fact, becomes almost unsaleable because of restrictions as to where and in what situation it can be used.

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

Mr. CORY: Before lunch I referred to further amendments that I thought should be made to the Act in the very near future and to the obvious injustices in the law that made it impossible to transfer redundant licences. I had in mind main-road resumptions and re-routing of main roads that resulted in the newly constructed road by-passing licensed premises. It is impossible in those circumstances to get a licence transferred to a site other than one adjacent to the new road. In many places and for various reasons it is not practicable to do that, so it is only right and proper that licences should be transferable over a much wider area.

It would be desirable to introduce a system similar to the one that operates in New South Wales, under which licences in country areas can be transferred to any areas outside Sydney and Newcastle. This has a twofold benefit. The first is that a licence can be used to the greatest advantage in an area where it is needed most. The second, and perhaps the more important, is that the owner of the licence retains its sale value. At the present time the sale value is very much restricted and, in many instances, has been eliminated because no need exists in the immediate locality for a licence. I feel sure that that type of scheme could be implemented by further amendments to the Act. It is important that the sale value of a licence be retained so that the equity of the licensee is protected.

In addition, it is necessary to look at the provision of hotel accommodation in particular areas. Both sides of the problem have to be looked at, that of the person who seeks accommodation and that of the owner of the accommodation.

Mr. Bennett: Your Government is looking at it from the side all the time. Why not face it square-on?

Mr. CORY: It is facing it square-on. There are two sides to the problem, but the hon. member would not know the second one.

In many areas the accommodation that is provided is far in excess of the need. This is particularly so in towns where motels cater for a large percentage of persons who seek accommodation. At the same time many of the older hotels are required to maintain a large number of rooms, sometimes as many as 20 or 30, for guests who never arrive. The provision of tavern licences would help overcome that problem. However, it must not be forgotten that in areas where no motel accommodation is available a hotel licensee is required to provide accommodation in case it is required. In that instance the licensing fee would be adjusted accordingly. The cost to a country hotel-keeper of providing accommodation is very high, and usually is

not a paying proposition. In addition, the employment of staff to maintain accommodation at all times is a matter of some magnitude. An adjustment in the licence fee is obviously important, and, when there is no accommodation need, obviously the issuing of tavern licences would be excellent.

Hotels today provide a bottle department service that is needed and appreciated. Certain restrictions and requisitions are imposed as to their standard. In the main, hotels have done a really good job in providing attractive bottle departments, and while they are available to the public I cannot see any need for further outlets for bottle sales. In areas where hotels with bottle-department facilities are not available an obvious need exists for a different type of outlet. In such areas stores could be given a licence to cater for the public's requirements. Most centres have plenty of hotels that provide a bottle service and, in such circumstances, I do not think other facilities should be provided.

Mr. P. Wood: Earlier in your speech you said that no section of the State should have covering it legislation that is not effective in other sections.

Mr. CORY: This idea is to meet a vital need in a particular area. People living in a small town in which there is no hotel to supply liquor would be covered in this way. That is not sectional legislation; it is merely overcoming a need in a certain area.

An Opposition Member: Isn't that a contradiction?

Mr. CORY: It is not a contradiction, because I do not think it is a fair analogy.

I hope that, before long, booth licences will be issued for Sundays. In Warwick the future of some of our sporting fixtures depends on whether or not booth licences will be issued for Sunday. I refer specifically to the Warwick Rodeo. Over the years we have not been able to hold the rodeo on a Sunday because of the restriction on booth licences. It is held on Saturday and Monday, but with modern-day transport it would be possible to hold it on Saturday and Sunday, because the transport facilities can cope quickly with the movement of horses and cattle. However, it is not practical to run the rodeo on consecutive days without a booth licence on the Sunday. This is a major event in Warwick, and in my view it is only common sense and civilised practice to issue a booth licence for it on a Sunday.

Mr. Davies: The Premier is a country man. Have you put this to him?

Mr. CORY: Yes, and I think we will get somewhere with it.

The prohibition on Sunday trading in hotel bars affects hotels in country areas with only one lounge. It is not fair that womenfolk and families should be denied the right to

enjoy a quiet drink on Sunday, or on any other day. As it is not legal to drink on Sunday other than in a hotel lounge, the lounge facilities of the smaller hotels are overcrowded with men who come in to enjoy a couple of drinks during the session. In this way women are denied accommodation which I believe all hon. members feel they should be able to enjoy, and which they have every right to expect.

Mr. Houston: Why are people forced into the lounge and not allowed to go into the bar?

Mr. CORY: I know of no logical reason for it. That is what I am saying. I say it should be changed.

Mr. Houston: What is the Government's reason? You must have been given some reason in your party meeting.

Mr. CORY: We have not introduced such an amendment now because we are only fulfilling the promises that were made in our policy speech. When it is done, it will be done properly and to our satisfaction.

Drinking in hotel bars is reasonable because of the facilities provided as a result of requisitions being put on hotels. There are cold-room facilities and toilet facilities adjacent to the bar area. It is only reasonable that, if the job is to be done properly, those facilities must be used. I feel that this is something that should be included in any future amendment.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made what I thought was a very good speech on a matter that I did not have to be convinced about, namely, the 40-mile limit around Brisbane. He covered this subject very well and spoke a good deal of common sense. However, I do not feel that he was truthful when he said that it was only because of the gutless attitude of the Government that this restriction has not been lifted. Nothing is farther from the truth. The reasons he gave for lifting it were quite good and I commend him on the way he put them. It is absurd to have these two different laws operating in Queensland. I, as an individual, would be the last person to try to justify this situation.

I am harping on these future amendments because I feel they are very important if we are to have normal, civilised drinking in Queensland. There should be a period of grace after the legal closing time in which to drink the final glass of beer. If the legal closing time is 10 p.m., it is only reasonable to allow 15 or 20 minutes for the consumption of the liquor that a person has before him. A person who buys a drink at one minute to 10 cannot be expected to simply open his throat and throw it down. That does not lend itself to civilised drinking; nor is it common sense. If a law is to be effective, it must be common sense. Obviously, nobody throws a drink down like that; everybody takes a few minutes over his drink. So let us have a law that allows a reasonable approach to normal, human, sensible living.

Mr. Davies: Can't you get the Minister to adopt this common-sense attitude?

Mr. CORY: The Minister has a common-sense attitude, and I commend him on the work he has done in this regard. I feel sure that we will get these very things purely because of his common-sense attitude.

Clubs and hotels should be allowed to install entertainment machines. I can see nothing wrong with pinball machines and other small machines in clubs and hotels. I am not in favour of poker machines because I do not think they are a good thing and they are certainly not fair to the public. However, clubs should be allowed to install these other entertainment machines because, firstly, they reduce the feeling that a person goes there to drink, and to drink only, and provide a more social atmosphere because there are other interests, and, secondly, they provide the club with a little extra money which, particularly with smaller clubs, helps them to be successful financially. In the country, many clubs are just big enough to keep ticking, and every little bit of finance counts and makes a big difference to their success financially so that they can continue to provide a service to the people in those areas. I can see no reason why clubs should not have these machines in their bars.

Mr. Davies: You want to put them in as a wedge for the introduction of poker machines.

Mr. CORY: No, I do not. Poker machines are quite unnecessary, and I am totally opposed to them. What is needed is more civilised and sensible drinking.

I commend the Bill. As I have tried to point out, it does not go nearly far enough, as anomalies remain that will be considered in the next session of Parliament. What is to be done is very good, and will assist in no small way to bring about more sensible drinking. I certainly look forward to a consideration of all the other issues that need attention, and I hope they will be the subject of amendments in the next session.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (2.31 p.m.): I recall that some years ago Sir Thomas Hiley, in deprecating some efforts of the Australian Labour Party, made the observation that "the lion laboured and was delivered of a mouse." Today the same observation might well be applied to the amendments now proposed to the Liquor Act. We have had over a long period a succession of reports of Cabinet consideration of a major review of the Liquor Act; of individual Country Party and Liberal Party caucus meetings; and of joint Government caucus meetings. All that I can say, from what the Minister has produced this morning, is that the introduction of the Bill is just another vote by Government members of no confidence in themselves. They have no confidence to face up to a major issue and to deal with it decisively in the interests of the people, who

are the consumers of the product, and in the interests of the many types of industry associated with the trade at one level or another.

Like earlier amending Bills, this one merely adds a few hotch-potch amendments to the patchwork quilt that is at present the Liquor Act. The only remarkable thing about the few amendments mentioned is that the Government has waited so long to do anything about them. The Government regarded 32 restaurant licences as the logical number for a State the size of Queensland. Nobody at the time understood why the Government chose to fix the number at 32, with the addition of two per annum. The hon. member for Warwick, who has just resumed his seat, was asked by way of interjection how that number was arrived at. The only conclusion ever drawn was that it was fixed because that was the number of wine-saloon licences cancelled at that time. What relationship there is between a wine saloon and a modern restaurant, I do not know, but that was apparently the thinking of the Government.

Since 1960, Queensland has waited for the Government to face up to a major review of the Liquor Act. Today the Minister has told the Committee that the proposed Bill contains a few interim amendments arising from the Government's policy speech, and that there will be a full review early in the New Year.

Mr. P. Wood: We have heard that before.

Mr. HANLON: We have heard that before, as the hon. member for Toowoomba East interjects. We have heard it time and time again, which reflects the fact that the Government is unable to make up its mind on a major issue.

Since 1960, when the Government made its first review of the Liquor Act, there have been many changes in the distribution of liquor. There has been a marked change in the emphasis placed on entertainment at the points of distribution of liquor, particularly cabarets and beer gardens. It is becoming increasingly common for people, even in family groups, to seek their entertainment at places of retail distribution of liquor.

In addition, there has been a changing emphasis on accommodation, with the inflow of tourists creating a need to construct a number of major motels in many places, particularly the metropolitan area and some of the bigger provincial centres.

There is a difference, too, in the relationship between liquor and sport since the introduction of recognised Sunday sport. All these things have resulted in changes in the established pattern of affairs over the last 10 or 12 years, and they all involve not just ad-hoc amendments to touch up something here and there, but a complete review and reconsideration of the principles of the Liquor Act.

Let me deal with accommodation, for example. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out, I think quite rightly, that it would not be reasonable to expect that a restaurant licence, and not a full liquor licence, would be given to all motels that reach a certain standard. As he said, that is the common-sense attitude that everybody other than the Government would take. It seems to draw some distinction between a restaurant in a motel and an ordinary restaurant of a similar standard. I do not think that a motel restaurant should be regarded in any way differently from a licensed restaurant that reaches a similar standard.

If one accepts the quite different proposition that because motels have been constructed in a period when they were not licensed, they can just enter the hotel field, a major upheaval in the principles of the Liquor Act is involved. That is the sort of thing that the Government must consider and on which it must reach some conclusions. A person who wishes to establish a new licensed hotel now has to run the gauntlet of a local-option poll and tender to the Licensing Commission not only his plans and specifications for the building and services that he intends to provide but also a significant amount of cash if he secures the licence. In the case of some of the hotel licences granted in the metropolitan area in the last few years, that could be of the order of \$50,000 or \$60,000. Obviously, it is not fair to ask people to tender such amounts for a liquor licence in a hotel providing a liquor bar, accommodation and a restaurant and at the same time give a licence to sell liquor to a person who, without tendering, has constructed a building to his own design. If the Government intends to change the provisions of the Liquor Act, it should sit down and take all the changed circumstances into account.

I am not suggesting that if a liquor licence is granted to motels of the type that are in close proximity to this building the proprietors would be expected to tender such a large sum as would be tendered by, say, The Homestead at Zillmere, where both liquor bars and the general distribution of liquor are involved. However, in my opinion, one should not accept the principle that motels, simply because they provide accommodation, should be able to come along and obtain a liquor licence for room service and other facilities that formerly were connected with a hotel accommodation licence in Queensland. The Government must face that situation.

It must also face problems arising from a combination of motor vehicles and liquor and the present problems in the community relative to tavern licences. I believe that ultimately, both in the metropolitan area and some of the populous provincial areas, tavern licences will have to be issued. It is quite obvious that persons who conduct hotels privately and personally are a dying race.

If we look at the hotels that have been constructed in Brisbane in recent years, we find that they are major complexes costing up to about \$500,000 or \$600,000. They have to incorporate, if they are to operate economically, a wide variety of services. Even small hotels have to provide not only bar and lounge accommodation but also entertainment centres and drive-in liquor centres. This makes them more or less company propositions. Although the licence is not initially granted to a brewery, a pattern has been developing of one brewery or another acquiring the licence within a matter of only a few years. We had such a case recently. We have seen instances of the successful tenderer for a licence disposing of it to a brewery after a comparatively short time and then tendering for new licences in other areas. These are factors that I think have to be faced up to by the Government in a review of the Liquor Act.

Dealing with sporting clubs, here again the Government, by its inactivity, has allowed a position to develop whereby people could be unfairly treated by amendments to the Act. Future amendments to the Act, if they are ever made by this Government, will have to take into consideration the activities of sporting clubs that have filled a void created by the Government's inactivity in regard to the Act. I am wondering just what emphasis the Minister will place, in this legislation, on the lifting of the numerical restriction on approved clubs. Does this mean that the clubs will be pressured into seeking a licence or deciding whether or not they will apply for a licence? There is no doubt that, because of the situation that has arisen, many clubs are operating to provide a service to their members even though the Government has not proceeded to set down within the Liquor Act exact provisions relating to them. I hope that any alterations to the Act envisaged in this or future legislation will take into account the contributions these clubs are making and the facilities they are providing, and will not unduly prejudice them.

This, of course, is another of the awkward situations that arise through this hotch-potch legislation. It poses quite a question for some restaurateurs as to whether or not they should apply for licences, because, unless some reality is established between what is licensed and what is not, people very often apply for licences and find that they are not terribly advantaged by securing them. Indeed, in some instances, they might be considerably disadvantaged under one section or other of the Act. First of all, in applying they have to meet the specifications laid down by the Licensing Commission as to facilities available at the site and, secondly, once they are licensed their operations are subject to the scrutiny of the Licensing Commission—and perhaps more so to the scrutiny of the Licensing Branch of the Police Force than they would be if they were unlicensed.

This is another anomaly that has grown up because of the failure of Governments to logically face up to licensing under the Liquor Acts. Under many sections of the Liquor Act the advantages or otherwise of being licensed are matters for some consideration.

I mentioned the impact of accommodation changes. I think the Government has failed to face up to this matter in the current legislation. It only applies to the licensing of restaurants of approved standard which will, of course, include motels that qualify. The Government has not faced up to the question of making a licence actually beneficial. Too much of a gap remains between the benefits of a licence under the Act and what is involved in having one. Reference has already been made to the failure to bring the Act up to date in regard to sporting clubs.

The Minister made very few comments in introducing the Bill. He spoke for only a few minutes this morning and I was rather taken by his comment that the Government was anxious to introduce the amendments to the Liquor Act that the Premier had indicated in his policy speech. I, in common with most other members, have received a considerable amount of correspondence about amendments to the Liquor Act. Much of it does not deal so much with the concern of these people or with what the Premier said he would do in his policy speech as with the assurances he gave as to what he would not do.

The decision of the Government parties to fall back behind the goal line and introduce the few minor amendments that were promised in the policy speech leaves many of the questions raised by people on the proposed amendments to the Liquor Act hanging in the air. One that has already been mentioned today is the elimination of the 40-mile limit to permit Sunday drinking within 40 miles of the General Post Office. I should have thought the Minister would do more to answer the queries put to members of all parties and take the opportunity at this introductory stage to indicate the Government's decision on allowing Sunday drinking within the 40-mile limit, either to justify the existence of the present ban on drinking within the 40-mile limit or indicate that the Government had found that the limit was anomalous and was looking at ways to correct that anomaly.

In the Press the Minister has been quoted indirectly as saying that he had approximately 70 amendments to the Act. It is not uncommon for a Minister, when introducing interim legislation, to indicate, as the Treasurer did when introducing the Succession and Probate Duties Bill, that he will be introducing major amendments in the future and indicate his line of thinking. The Minister has received submissions from persons engaged in the liquor trade as well as from persons who have voiced concern about an extension of the liquor facilities, so surely at this stage

he could announce to the Parliament and the public the nature of the 70 amendments that he is considering.

I point out that Sunday drinking outside the metropolitan area was introduced in 1961 by the Nicklin Government. On that occasion the Australian Labour Party in Opposition opposed the Bill on several grounds, one of which, namely, the sectional nature of the legislation, was clearly stated by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan. The A.L.P.'s attitude has been consistent right through. Prior to 1961 travellers clauses existed in the Act.

Mr. Lee: You weren't game to tackle it yourself, were you?

Mr. HANLON: It is not a matter of not being game but of being able, once having tackled it, to deal with it effectively. I have already pointed out that this Government has not been able to deal effectively with the Liquor Act. It has made about 17½ tries and has received 17 knock-downs. This is the first occasion on which it has got half up off its knees, but even now it keeps backing away and dancing around, shadow-sparring and throwing a few paper-weight punches, as it has with this Bill, and hurriedly going back to the corner and collapsing on the stool, where it is given water by the Liberal-Country Party executives in an endeavour to get it up again for the next round.

It is true that in 1961 Sunday drinking was permitted in the country areas of Queensland and that, probably, the travellers clause was being breached more frequently than observed. People in country areas, and particularly those who worked during the week outside of the country towns, were able to obtain liquor or Sunday illegally. The Government said, "We will do away with all this hokey-pokey business and make it legal. We will introduce established Sunday drinking sessions in Queensland." The Government did that, but not within 40 miles of the Brisbane G.P.O. By its decision it created an anomaly.

At the time, Opposition members pointed out that legalisation of Sunday drinking between certain hours in country areas would not necessarily get rid of illegal drinking. Everyone in this Chamber knows that that statement is true. Anyone who visits country areas knows that any number of country hotels still trade outside legal hours on Sunday. I have travelled throughout the State and I have frequently seen people drinking in hotel bars at times well outside the legalised hours. It is ridiculous to say that, by introducing legalised Sunday drinking sessions in 1961, the Government overcame illegal trading. The Government merely provided four hours of legalised drinking, and illegal drinking still takes place on Sunday in every part of Queensland. In some places, depending on the

attitude of the local policeman, it may be for only half an hour or so, but in other places, illegal drinking hours are extensive.

In some places motorists can pull up at a hotel at 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the afternoon and find the midday session still continuing, and running into the evening session. In other areas people can leave a hotel at 7 o'clock on Sunday morning knowing that the bars have plenty of people in them. They come back to the hotel at 8 o'clock or 9 o'clock on Sunday night and find the same conditions prevailing. Let not the A.L.P. be charged as it was in 1961 with countenancing an illegal operation relative to the sale of liquor in this State. The illegal trading hours still operate in country areas even though legalised hours have been set for Sunday.

In 1961, Labour Party members pointed out that this position would arise. We said that the Government could not escape the insinuations that were made in former days, namely, that policemen were being bribed to let hotels operate outside legal hours; that the Government could not get away from the reflection cast on the previous A.L.P. Government. If it was fair enough for the present Government to cast reflections on the A.L.P. Government, it is fair enough for the Government to cop it on this occasion from the Opposition. What is happening must be aligned with police administration and the policing of the Act. We also pointed out that it was completely sectional legislation, as has been reiterated time and again today, in that it allowed drinking in areas 40 miles from Brisbane, but not within that distance. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the Government, in administering the Liquor Act, has not satisfied the five edicts established by the then Attorney-General, the late Sir Alan Munro, when he introduced the first amendment in 1961. The Leader of the Opposition enumerated those edicts today. I do not say there is any greater respect today for the law relative to Sunday drinking in Queensland than there was in 1961 when the amendments were introduced. I do not think that more consideration is given today to the changing elements of accommodation, sport and all matters that are interwoven in the consideration of services provided under the Liquor Act than was given when the Government first started to tamper with the Liquor Act in 1961. On the contrary, the Australian Labour Party, at the last election, through the agency of the Leader of the Opposition, was forthright about its proposals under the Liquor Act.

I do not have the time to enumerate those proposals but they are in the speeches of the Leader of the Opposition made during the election campaign. He stated that Labour would abolish the 40-mile limit because it was sectional legislation. He also pointed out that Labour would give the Licensing Commission the responsibility

of determining hours of trading, taking into account the needs of shift workers and the varying needs of people in different parts of the State.

On principle we do not believe that there should be a distinction between people on whether they may drink or not on Sunday. Queensland has such a wide variety of geographic conditions and a wide dispersal of population that rigid hours cannot be set down that will be suitable in all parts of the State. Decisions on matters of principle, such as drinking on Sunday, must obviously apply throughout the State if we are to be in any way fair. We believe that the Licensing Commission should have the authority to work out the different licences and trading hours according to the needs of the community in a particular area. The sooner the Government faces up to a complete review of the Liquor Act, as the Labour Party did in its policy speech, the sooner we will have a sensible Liquor Act in this State.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (2.55 p.m.): I am quite satisfied, having listened to the debate so far, that the Government has become intoxicated by its own weakness in this matter. I fully expected that the Minister, with his reputation and his attitude to the liquor question, and following the announcement he made previously in conjunction with the esteemed leaders of his Government in the persons of the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Mines and Main Roads, would have entered this debate full of confidence and apparently fairly fit. However, he looked rather weak in morale and lacking in his usual confidence in liquor issues and, in relation to this matter, like a defeated man. I fully expected, judging by his earlier enthusiasm and the pronouncements made by his Government committee on 30 October, 1969, when it rushed into headline publicity in the Press saying that the Government supported Sunday hotel-trading for Brisbane, that he would introduce legislation along those lines. But apparently this committee, led by the Minister for Justice under the Premier and other Government leaders, has had its knuckles well and truly rapped in party meetings by the "ginger group" and the hon. member for South Coast, who apparently do not want any liquor reforms. Like the lions in Bullen's lion park, they have obviously become tranquillised. In the circumstances, I expected the Minister to appear with decorum and dignity today in his "Bundaberg Rum" shirt, which he has made famous throughout the State, but then I realised that he wears it only in places where the liquor laws are different.

I listened with interest to the contribution made by the hon. member for Townsville South, particularly his references to me. Quite frankly, I do not claim to be, nor do I pose as, the expert toper he once was, because I know that that was a phrase he developed in days when he was surrounded by liquor amni.

I had been particularly interested to see the method and fashion in which new liquor licences are granted in this State. One could be pardoned for believing that there is a wholesale racket going on in the granting of new licences and their immediate resale, when they are sold in indecent haste for colossal fortunes by men who have no bona-fide intention of entering the liquor trade or of carrying out the conditions of the licence. Their applications to the Licensing Commission appear to be perfectly ludicrous, a waste of the time of the Commission, and a thwarting of the will of the licences that are given, because they immediately dispose of the licences that have been granted through the agency of the Commission for a colossal fortune, without turning a sod or without even investing any money.

I am prepared to name the coterie that is abusing the structure of the Liquor Act in this fashion. Its activities are no doubt being condoned and acknowledged by the Government. It is headed by a man who runs what might be regarded as a type of Government instrumentality, namely, the manager of the Brisbane T.A.B., Mr. Sakzewski. One would think that his time would be taken up fully in the particularly important task that he has, even though the funds he handles are not audited by the Auditor-General. Why that should be, I do not know. I strongly exhort the Government authorities to see that it is done. Every other Government instrumentality that handles millions of dollars of the people's money is subject to audit by the Auditor-General. I see no reason why the T.A.B. should not be, instead of being audited by somebody chosen by Mr. Sakzewski.

However, I was rather astonished—in fact, I was disgusted—to see the fabric and structure of the Liquor Act abused by a small coterie of wealthy, opulent businessmen in this State, led by Mr. Sakzewski, who applied for the licence of the Sunnysbank Hotel. The licence was not obtained with any intention of carrying out its terms, but as a sham formality so that it could be sold.

Mr. Lee: They have to put up some money. Don't forget that.

Mr. BENNETT: It is quite easy to put up some money if it is going to be quadrupled within a week. It is also quite easy to put up money when it is to be advanced through another Government instrumentality, namely, the State Government Insurance Office. That is where the racket is creeping in. I thank the hon. member for Yeronga for saying that those taking over the licence have to put up money. What is being put up is State Government Insurance Office money—the workers' money, paid to cover compensation should they ever need it. Yet these people are investing State Government Insurance Office money in their own private enterprise. That is disgusting and revolting.

This small coterie of influential and opulent businessmen obtained the licence for the Sunnybank Hotel and within a very short time resold it to Bulimba Brewery at an astronomical figure. In other words, the Licensing Commission apparently merely sits to determine who is to get the benefit of retailing licences to the big brewery interests. I respect the views of all on the liquor issue, and I do not pretend for a moment to be a temperance man or a teetotaler. But I do frown on rackets, racketeering, and racketeers who fatten on the liquor industry, and it is time that the Government, with its manifold endeavours to amend the Liquor Act, did something to curb the activities of people who act like parasites on those unfortunate enough to be unable to control their consumption of liquor, and who, because of deficiencies in the Act, are able to make fabulous fortunes.

This same small coterie of businessmen, not satisfied with the return received from the disposal of the Sunnybank Hotel licence, negotiated for the licence of the Colmslie Hotel. Incidentally, that whole transaction stinks to high heaven and smells even stronger than the Sunnybank Hotel deal because these people were only the third highest tenderers. However, the same few who obtained the Sunnybank Hotel licence also obtained the Colmslie Hotel licence. They are opulent men, but for that venture they did not use their own money, nor did they decide to obtain the necessary finance from a private insurance company, as private businessmen would ordinarily exhort others to do since we are supposed to be living under a free-enterprise system in which any Government instrumentality is supposed to be Communist inspired. Nor did they go to a private bank or financial institution. These people who are making a fortune by trading in liquor licences obtained their security and finance from the State Government Insurance Office, on a long-term basis.

Mr. Lee: They would have to put up collateral, so what are you grizzling about?

Mr. BENNETT: It is all very well to say that they would have to put up collateral, but I do not know what the collateral security was. It may have been the Sunnybank Hotel, which they were about to sell. However, they certainly did obtain finance from the State Government Insurance Office, and I, as a public man, do not believe that the funds of that office should be used in such a manner to swell the fortunes of private businessmen. Obtaining the assistance of the State Government Insurance Office is better than acquiring oil shares such as those held by the Premier, because a quicker return is obtained. Not only that; I suppose the Premier might have to put in a few dollars before drilling commences. However, as far as I have heard to date, he has not received any advance from the State Government Insurance Office.

These privileged few in the community, who are also regarded as the leaders of social sections of the community, having got their long-term loan from the State Government Insurance Office, again with indecent haste, in their greedy desire to grab all the fortune that they could, sold the licence, in spite of all of the conditions attached to it, to another brewery, Castlemaine Perkins Ltd., for the princely sum of \$1,600,000.

What do you think of business transactions such as that, Mr. Hooper? I am sure that you would not condone them. That is the very type of thing that leads ordinary men to argue against private enterprise and big business. It is conduct of that type that meets with the justifiable scorn of the decent, honest people in industry. Comment has appeared in the Press as a result of my altruistic association with certain individuals. I will guarantee that if certain persons with the reputation that has been attached to the individuals with whom I associated had engaged in activity of the type to which I have been referring, they would have found themselves at the end of a serious charge under the Criminal Code. I depends who does it, what one's name is, and the circumstances under which these things are done.

Mr. Lee: That is completely untrue.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not know whether the hon. member for Yeronga should retain his Christian name. Perhaps he should change it to "Hi". He speaks on this subject in the Chamber only when he is trying to advocate that his own company interests should be given more Government contracts. I fully appreciate that the hon. member would disagree with me on that point.

An Opposition Member: He thinks that is all right.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Yeronga thinks that that standard of conduct is perfectly justifiable. If he was given the opportunity tomorrow to do something similar, he would do it believing it to be correct.

Mr. Lee: So would you.

Mr. BENNETT: I concede that that is the standard that the hon. member would adopt.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: As I have been reminded by the hon. member for Salisbury, the hon. member for Yeronga was involved in a somewhat similar business venture with a former member of this Assembly, Mr. Dewar, when Mr. Dewar was a Minister in the Government ranks. He was prepared to use Mr. Dewar to make money on one occasion, but he did not show much friendship when the tide ran out on Mr. Dewar.

Finally, this same group, still confident in the financial power that it had and the influence it could exercise, was not satisfied with the fabulous fortune it had already gained by just getting two lumps of paper

from the Government's Licensing Commission; it was not satisfied to let others share in the fortunes that could be made. One does not have to go out and pioneer these days to make a fortune. One does not have to draw in one's belt and eat salt beef out in the wilds of Western Australia to pioneer the country. The plunderers who are pioneering licences under the Liquor Act do it while sitting in plush hotels or motels, and they turn the licences over so quickly that they are not satisfied with making only one fortune in a lifetime; they want to make three or four.

A coterie of the same type applied for the licence at The Homestead. Governmental authorities then became anxious about the effect that transactions such as this were having in the business world and thought that they had better remember the old expression about justice not only being done but also appearing to be done, and in the case of The Homestead they decided not only to do justice but also to make it appear to be done.

Mr. Lee: Why don't you condemn The Homestead?

Mr. BENNETT: I have said what I wanted to say relative to the coterie who retailed two of the biggest licences that have been granted in recent times—certainly two of the biggest that have been granted under Country-Liberal Governments—with indecent haste and without doing a thing for the industry. They just fattened on the industry for their own personal wealth.

I listened with interest to what Government members, particularly the Minister for Justice, said in relation to restaurant licences. As my colleague the hon. member for Baroona has pointed out, when the 32 spirit-dealers' licences in this State were cancelled, it was decided, for no logical reason, to reconstitute them as restaurant licences. What association wholesaling in spirits had with the conducting of restaurants I would not know, but it was alleged to be a genuine desire to deal sanely with drinking when people are eating. These licences replaced the 32 spirit-dealers' licences but they have now grown in number to 80 in a very unfair, illogical and mushrooming fashion.

Last year, for instance, in keeping with the stupid legislation that this Government has so far introduced on liquor, two new restaurant licences were granted. That was all that could be granted. We did not hear hon. members opposite talk about the parched Outback and the lack of facilities there. We did not hear the Premier and his team justify the Government's attitude to the people in country areas whom they represent. Not one blow was struck to get a restaurant licence for the West or, for that matter, for any country area. In typical fashion this "big business" Government, whose tail is wagged every time these opulent businessmen want to make some money, obviously had its tail wagged again, because in spite of the fact that very concrete and

convincing evidence was advanced to the Licensing Commission for a restaurant licence at Longreach, the application was refused. The nearest licensed restaurant to Longreach is at Charleville, about 300 miles away, and there is no other within a radius of 300 miles. The Longreach restaurant is first-class, with good facilities except for toilet facilities, which would have to be improved, and it serves first-class meals.

Again two of these licences were handed out this year, and again the Country Party was told to go jump in the lake. The Government said, "We can get country people to vote for Country Party members whether or not we kick them in the guts." That is the attitude. We know how much guzzling goes on on the Gold Coast. As earlier speakers have said today, one can always get a drink in Brisbane at any hour of the day or night, including Sunday. Do not try to dispute that with me. I might be prepared to indicate to hon. members where it is possible to do so, but they all know. One can get a drink in Brisbane at any time of the day or night. As a matter of fact, one can go to the Playboy Club and drink with a policeman, and that club has not a licence to sell even during ordinary liquor-trading hours. That is what goes on in this city.

What happened with the only two licences granted this year? Not one went to the country. One went to the Gold Coast, where all the guzzling in the world goes on at the moment amongst certain sections. I am not suggesting for a moment that decent people who visit that place engage in these activities, but the people who are screaming, the people for whom the hon. member for South Coast speaks, are able, one way or another, to gain access to liquor when they want it. I concede that the other one was granted—I did not ask for it—to a Kangaroo Point motel, again owned by those interests to which I have already made reference. How, then, can the Government say it is genuine and sincere in relation to liquor licences?

I can, and will, quote from an authority. It is a case that went on appeal to the Full Court of Queensland and indicates this Government's lack of bona fides in regard to what it says about restaurant licences and drinking sensibly with meals. The Government really does not intend to introduce fair, just and decent legislation. It hounded a woman on the Gold Coast named Mrs. Anna King—and the hon. member representing that area has not said a word about it, whereas I like to speak on behalf of the decent people in the community. The Government hounded her unfairly and indecently by using sneaky and lousy police tactics. Her case is reported in Q.J.P.R., volume 57, at page 135. She was a restaurant-keeper who did not have a licence to sell liquor, and she gave a bottle of wine gratuitously to two diners who had ordered an expensive meal. They ordered the meal at the taxpayers'

expense; they were two policewomen. For the purpose of inducing the customers to return, Mrs. King gave them the wine without charging any more than the ordinary cost of the meal as shown on the a la carte menu. There was no evidence that it was other than an isolated transaction on her part. She honestly believed that she was legally entitled to supply the wine.

The Government's attitude to bona fide drinking in a sensible fashion is revealed by the fact that not only did it prosecute her but when the case came before the magistrate and was dismissed also it subjected her to indignity and colossal expense by appealing to the Full Court, which dismissed the appeal. That case shows how this Government has proved its bona fides and sincerity. It took her to the Full Court for gratuitously giving two girls in their twenties, who she thought were decent girls, a bottle of wine to drink with their meal. She was trapped in a very lousy fashion. The case would be different if she had been doing this regularly or if the police had walked in and found her selling liquor; however, she did it as a kind and decent gesture to two women who she thought were visitors to the Gold Coast. The Government took her to the Magistrates Court and then to the Full Court. That shows how "fair dinkum" the Government is.

Mr. Chinchin: I cannot identify yet whether you are for or against an extension of licences to restaurants.

Mr. BENNETT: When the hon. interjector has the guts to say what his Government is doing I will be prepared to listen to him. The Government is shilly-shallying and has not the nerve to say what its attitude is. Our Leader has expressed our policy, and we have published it in the Press. And I fully subscribe to it. I am pointing out the dishonesty of the Government's legislation and its lack of bona fides. The hon member has a timorous attitude to the Government since it tranquillised him.

The Government alleged that on 12 November, 1961, at 6.35 p.m., Policewoman Warnick and Policewoman Conaty went to the restaurant portion of Surf Riders Private Hotel, Main Beach, and on entering were met by the respondent and shown by her to a table in the restaurant. The respondent produced an a la carte menu which showed all prices against meals and other items. The two policewomen ordered according to the docket, and, without going into what they ordered, I point out that they "ordered up big". The total of their order came to £1 10s., or \$3. It was agreed that the prices charged on the docket were the prices on the a la carte menu. After the soup had been ordered, Policewoman Warnick asked the respondent if she could have a bottle of Barossa Pearl. The respondent replied, "We haven't any Barossa Pearl, but I have two small bottles of wine of my own. I will give you one."

That evidence was accepted by the court. Policewoman Warnick said, "Thank you." The respondent then went to the refrigerator in the restaurant and brought back an unopened bottle of Sauterne. She opened the bottle and poured wine out of it and left. Shortly after, she returned and gave the docket to the two policewomen. Policewoman Warnick said, "You have not charged us for the wine," still trying to trap her, and the respondent replied, "I didn't charge for the wine, as you have had such a good dinner and the wine was with the compliments of the management." The policewomen had consumed the dinner and part of the wine. Policewoman Warnick then gave the respondent two £1 notes, and the respondent returned with 7s. They then charged her.

(Time expired).

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (3.20 p.m.): We have heard a series of speeches from Opposition members this afternoon, most of which have been given in much the same vein, except for that of the hon. member for South Brisbane, who seemed to get away from the main line of the Opposition's contention to make some charges about trafficking in hotel licences.

By and large, we have witnessed a very extraordinary and poor performance by the Opposition. We have had quite frenzied and violent denunciations of the Government's proposals.

Mr. P. Wood: We have not had any sort of a performance from your side.

Mr. PORTER: If the hon. member will possess himself patiently, he may get a little now.

All the Opposition's comments have been in such violent terms, invoking as it were basic human rights, elementary justice for all, and so on, that one would be pardoned for believing that in this debate the Opposition was talking about threats to, say, freedom of speech, freedom of lawful association, or freedom of religious worship. So passionate and so violent have been the Opposition's screams in this matter that the casual observer would be forced to believe that we were talking about one of the great, inalienable, human rights.

It is salutary to ask ourselves just what this debate is about. Certainly Opposition members have not been talking about the inalienable right to worship as we please, or to talk freely provided that we are not talking treason, or the right of lawful assembly. What they are screaming about is the inalienable right of unlimited access to liquor, seven days a week, in hotel trading. That is exactly what it is all about. We are not talking about—and certainly the Opposition does not try to say that we are—seven-day-a-week access to life-saving drugs or essential groceries, or to food that infants

and children might need. The sole concern is that, on Sundays, there should be unlimited access to liquor.

Mr. Hanlon: Why do you do it in the other areas?

Mr. PORTER: I did not do it in the other areas. Let me talk for myself and the Government of which I am a member.

The Opposition is in a sorry plight indeed if this squalid, petty issue warrants from them such high-flown and artificially noble attitudes. We do not hear Opposition members express similar attitudes when real individual rights are threatened, such as when the right of entry of officials under the various Acts comes into play. But on this matter of Sunday access to hotel trading we are getting a fantastic performance from them.

The hon. member for Barooka suggested that the Government had not made up its mind, and the hon. member for South Brisbane said that we had shilled and shallied. But, precisely speaking, the Government has made up its mind. After long and careful consideration of this very sensitive issue it decided to implement precisely what was promised in the Government's policy speech, and it has decided that it will not implement precisely what it said in its policy speech it would not introduce. I remind the Opposition that the Government won the election with these as basic pledges.

Mr. Bennett: The Government won the election on gerrymandered boundaries.

Mr. PORTER: If the hon. member thinks he can do a better gerrymander than the one I faced when I was secretary of the Liberal Party many years ago, he is welcome to try.

There is so much hog-wash in what the Opposition has said—I suppose it would be better to refer to it as “suds wash”—that it is important to bear in mind exactly what the Government has promised and what it now proposes to do. In the policy speech on behalf of the joint Government parties, the Premier said—

“We propose—

(a) To remove the numerical restriction on the number of restaurant licences granted each year;

(b) To grant restaurant licences to those motels which have dining facilities of an acceptable standard; and

(c) To remove the numerical restriction on the number of licences granted to approved clubs.”

The legislation introduced by the Minister does exactly that. This rubbish of suggesting that the Government has not made up its mind falls to the ground on even the most superficial examination. Of course, the Premier then said that the Government did not propose to vary Sunday hotel-trading arrangements. At this stage, this is precisely what it does not propose to do.

It is very important for this Committee, and for the community at large, to get quite clear in its mind what the screams of protest from Opposition members are all about. It is not whether Sunday drinking is to be permitted. Nobody suggests for a moment that a person cannot drink on a Sunday. If anybody in this day and age, in an urban area, cannot ensure that he has a drink on a Sunday, in these days of refrigeration, Eskys and clubs, there is something very much wrong with him. So let us be quite clear about the fact that we are——

Mr. Houston: Silvertails.

Mr. PORTER: Silvertails? Does the Leader of the Opposition not have a refrigerator? I feel sorry for him. Perhaps we should hold a testimonial for him and get him one.

Mr. Houston: Rubbish!

Mr. PORTER: The fact is that we are not discussing Sunday drinking. All we are concerned with is the Opposition contention that there should be unlimited access to beer-swilling in hotels on Sundays. This is a very different matter.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already warned both sides of the Chamber that I do not intend to allow a barrage of interjections.

Mr. PORTER: I thought that the chorus was rather helpful.

Mr. Tucker interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Townsville North knows quite well that it was during his speech that I made that request. If the hon. member continues to interrupt, I shall deal with him under Standing Order 123A.

Mr. PORTER: Perhaps we could give him a drink—of water.

I believe that the Opposition does itself no service and it certainly does not help this difficult issue by suggesting that we are concerned with the right of people to drink on Sundays. This does not come into the picture at all. I repeat that the only matter at issue here is whether there should be a right of unlimited access, in trading hours, to hotel drinking in metropolitan Brisbane. I have made a few inquiries, and I know of no reputable hotel within the city limits that wants Sunday trading.

Mr. Houston: Is that who you are supporting with your legislation—breweries and publicans?

Mr. PORTER: I can only assume that the hon. gentleman has a peculiar sense of humour to suggest that we, who do not want drinking encouraged simply for drinking's sake—and he does—are the ones who are encouraging brewery interests. Surely he should think again and be careful before he says too much.

The Minister indicated a series of amendments which will be introduced next year, so that the Government, quite properly, is taking this in two stages. We are doing what was promised in our policy speech—these are major amendments—and what may be termed more sophisticated changes will be introduced next year. There is no onus on this Government to disclose now what it proposes to do, as the hon. member for Barroona suggested. We are the Government, and it is our right and obligation to set our own time-table on this.

So this legislation, covering as it does the abolition of the numerical restriction on restaurant licences, the granting of licences to motels with approved standards and the removal of the numerical limitation on club licences, goes a good 80 per cent. of the way towards the liquor reforms that most people want, and the others that will come later—as I call them, the more sophisticated changes—will cover, without doubt, the other 19 per cent. of what is wanted. There will always be the 1 per cent. that cannot be satisfied.

I want to make my own general attitude to this matter quite clear, because we had some twitting from Opposition members that certain Government members were not prepared to stand up and be counted. I will always support reforms which attach drinking to eating, and I will always oppose anything which encourages drinking only for drinking's sake. I regard that as a pretty safe general rule. I believe that it is as plain as a pikestaff that the Government, in the way it is handling this question of liquor reforms, is much more in sympathy with the mainstream of public opinion than is the Opposition.

I do not think that there is any doubt that the Government's action reflects what most people are thinking. Last year a Gallup poll taken throughout Australia revealed that 67.2 per cent. of the people were opposed to Sunday bar trading. That was also borne out by the recent poll conducted in New South Wales where, despite a question posed in very simple terms which I thought played into the hands of those who wanted Sunday hotel trading, 58 per cent. voted against it. I am told that when the final figures are available it is expected that the vote against it will be over 60 per cent.

Mr. Houston: Are you going to do away with the Sunday opening of hotels in the rest of the State?

Mr. PORTER: I should like to know if that is what the hon. member is advocating.

Mr. Houston: That is what you are advocating.

Mr. PORTER: No, I am not. The only issue at the moment is whether there should be Sunday trading in the metropolitan area

of Brisbane. I am against it, and the Government does not propose to do anything about it at present. Without doubt the overwhelming majority of people are against it.

I believe that before moving to the questions that the Leader of the Opposition would like to raise, there is a great deal to be considered. It may well be that a 40-mile limit is an artificial limit. It should be reconsidered, and something other than a 40-mile limit might be more effective.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I appeal to the hon. member for Maryborough to discontinue his loud conversation across the Chamber. He is interjecting and conversing with a member on the other side whom I have not been able to identify. I warn him, too.

Mr. PORTER: The role that taverns can play in sensible and sophisticated metropolitan drinking has yet to be examined here. The Australia-wide Gallup poll to which I have referred showed that 55 per cent. of the people were prepared to consider Sunday drinking in taverns; in other words, drinking associated with the eating of meals under proper circumstances. I believe that there are fields that must be looked at before we consider what I regard as the raw and primitive aspect of trading in liquor, and simply making bar trading available to those who might want it on Sunday as well as every other day. I am quite certain that wives generally would not be in favour of Sunday trading.

The Opposition presents a very sorry spectacle indeed when it tries to equate unlimited opportunities for Sunday bar trading with great moral issues and vital aspects of human rights. On the face of it, that is absurd. It demeans Parliament, and helps to put the Opposition a little further from being the effective Opposition that some of us might hope it would be.

Mr. B. WOOD (Cook) (3.33 p.m.): The Minister announced that the Government proposes to amend the Liquor Act as promised in its policy speech. He went on to say that the Bill was the immediate implementation of those promises. If the speed with which the amendments have been brought to the Committee is to be taken as an indication of the meaning of the word "immediate", it is no wonder that it takes so long to get responses from the Government.

The member who has just resumed his seat said that A.L.P. members made a sorry spectacle of themselves. I think he endeavoured to divert attention from himself and the members of his little group and their criticism of the Government. He tried to divert attention from himself to us. Traditionally for many years, hotels have provided accommodation and liquor. Hotels have been established in every corner of Australia, and they have provided a very important service to Australians. They have for many years taken the good with the bad. In many cases they have been established in

areas where licensees have been hard pressed to make a living. At other times, of course, they have picked the right spot. Now that there is a great deal more travel, with motor-cars much more common and with tourism playing a very important part in Australia, I believe that the hotels deserve to share the good times, just as they have, in some areas, had to put up with the bad times. In recent years hon. members have seen the development in Queensland of many fine motels. The expansion in the tourist industry would not have been possible without them; they have done a great job for the State. But the work that has been done in the past by hotel interests should be remembered also.

I wish to make some comments now about restaurant licences. I think that most hon. members will agree that such licences are quite desirable. In my opinion, the best way to drink is in the relaxed atmosphere of a restaurant where a person is having a meal and is not required to hurry. Licences granted to restaurants will overcome the foolish position that has existed for some time in the case of many restaurants that a person has to carry in his own liquor. I have done it myself; probably most other hon. members have done it.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Or the attendant ostensibly runs across the road to get it.

Mr. Houston: Your Government started that.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. B. WOOD: That foolish position was brought about by the Government, and it is a wise step to change it.

I wish to speak in particular about restaurants in motels. As I understood the Minister's introduction, he outlined the minimum standards required for motel restaurants.

Mr. Davies: He is clearly not happy with the introduction of vacillating legislation of this type.

Mr. B. WOOD: He certainly did not elaborate on it at any length.

Mr. Davies: Frustrated in every way.

Mr. B. WOOD: That may well be so. The hon. gentleman said, as appears in the Act, that there must be seating for 40 persons, sufficient floor space, and compliance with certain requirements relative to staff, fittings, and toilets. I wonder whether seating accommodation for 40 might be a little high for some motel restaurants in remote areas. Having regard to the population in some areas, I think 40 is a fairly large number.

The Government must take care to avoid motels simply becoming hotels without a public bar. I am sure the Minister is aware that in some places at present motels do have what is virtually a private bar. I have seen

them; I am sure that many other hon. members have seen them. If not in all motels, certainly in many motels, liquor is provided in the rooms by the management. That is different from instances in which a guest takes liquor to the room himself. You know, Mr. Hooper, that liquor is in the motel room, if you wish, when you move in. A position could develop whereby motels have a status very similar to that of hotels, with liquor freely available throughout motels.

As I understood the Minister's introductory remarks, he said that the liquor licence would be granted only to the motel restaurant. I did not hear him state that it would be applicable to the whole of the motel. He did not say whether the whole of the motel would come under the control of the Licensing Commission or whether it would only be that part of the motel where the restaurant is situated. I think this important distinction needs to be drawn.

The amendment will make the Act rather hard to police. I have already said that liquor is now consumed in motel rooms. Surely the amount of liquor in rooms would increase when licences are granted to restaurants. Also, the consumption of liquor in what are virtually private bars will increase, yet the position might develop where the Licensing Commission has control only over the restaurant and no control at all over the remainder of the motel where a good deal of trade in liquor may be going on. I believe that the Government should seriously consider granting a licence over the whole motel provided that this does not in any way set the motel up to resemble a hotel.

It would be interesting to know whether the restaurants in motels would be subject to the same police scrutiny as hotels are and whether all liquor outlets will become subject to that scrutiny. At the moment, hotels are carefully examined by police, but many other liquor outlets are virtually ignored. Hotels have to close at 10 p.m. I understand that, strictly speaking, the people should be out of the bar at 10. In some places they are required to follow this practice, yet in a restaurant, liquor can be consumed up to 11 p.m. It might be reasonable to incorporate in the Act a provision that in hotels liquor can be purchased until 10 p.m. and consumed until 10.30 p.m. This could be strictly policed. At the present time a person who buys a drink at one minute to 10 has to finish it and be out of the bar by 10.

Hotels are required to maintain certain standards of accommodation which are strictly laid down and strictly policed. Hotels are constantly being inspected and forced to bring their accommodation to required standards, if, by any chance, they slip or the standards are raised. I think this is quite correct and proper, but I wonder whether there will be any check of motel accommodation. The situation could develop where a motel begins to make money out

of liquor sales and allows its standard of accommodation to slip. Will any check be made on this? I hope the Minister will say quite clearly whether motels will be inspected for this purpose.

It is well established by now that hotels are, indeed, entertainment centres. Many hotels provide entertainment on one, two, three, or more nights each week. In order to do this they are required to pay \$4 a night for a permit and to obtain one permit for every portion of their entertainment. In some hotels this can amount to quite a sizable sum—\$300, \$400 or \$500 a year—depending on how many nights they provide entertainment. At present, restaurants do not have to do this. They can provide entertainment and, as far as I can find from the Act, are not required to pay any fee. This certainly gives them some advantage over a hotel. I think it might be reasonable to grant hoteliers licences for their entertainment on a yearly or half-yearly basis. Perhaps they could be charged a fee of \$50 or \$60. That would be fair and would obviate a great deal of paper work by both the hotelier and the people responsible for issuing permits. It will be necessary to ensure that motels, or any restaurants that serve liquor, are brought into line with the requirements imposed upon hotels. Broadly, what I have been saying is that the same conditions should apply to motels and hotels.

During the debate it has been pointed out that it is not easy to establish a hotel, whereas a motel can be established quite readily. It would be very unfair if a motel were able to achieve hotel status quite easily. The situation could well develop in which motels would perform many of the functions of hotels without incurring the same expense. I am sure that following the dithering in introducing the Bill there will be a need for future amendments to correct a number of injustices that will arise. I hope that it will not take as long to introduce them as it took to introduce the rather simple ones contained in the Bill.

Mr. LEE (Yeronga) (3.47 p.m.): It was not my intention to enter the debate—

Mr. Davies: Well, why did you?

Mr. LEE: Basically because certain facts have been stated about a certain gentleman.

Mr. Davies: If they are facts, why are you replying to them?

Mr. LEE: They are a misrepresentation of facts. The hon. member for South Brisbane will attack anybody, whether his allegations are correct or not, and today he personally attacked Mr. Sakzewski, who he claimed was disreputable and was using State Government Insurance Office money to make great profits, particularly in relation to the Sunnybank Hotel-Motel. In reply, I point out that the State Government Insurance Office would not lend money if it did not think that applicants for loans were worthy of them. Mr. Sakzewski

had nothing whatever to do with the Sunnybank Hotel-Motel; yet the hon. member for South Brisbane attacked him and alleged that he had done terrible things. All I can say is that the hon. member condemns businessmen for doing what he would like to do. However, he has neither the ability nor the reputation to be able to borrow money from any finance organisation. He would be treated as a very great risk. And that was even before the Darcy Dugan wedding! I would hate to think what his reputation now is. We know that he broke the parole order when he brought Dugan up from the South. Yet he attacks Sakzewski, who has had nothing whatever to do with the Sunnybank Hotel-Motel, and denigrates him to the lowest in this Chamber. It is for that reason I enter this debate. I cannot stand by and see an hon. member abuse his privilege by running down the character of a reputable businessman.

Mr. Bousen: Tell us something about the Bill.

Mr. LEE: I will tell the hon. member something about the Bill. The Government is doing exactly what it promised in the policy speech.

Mr. P. Wood: What are you going to do next year?

Mr. LEE: If the hon. member had listened he would know that we have said that further amendments will be introduced at a later date.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. LEE: There is no doubt that the first thing the Opposition would do would be to nationalise them.

Mr. P. Wood interjected.

Mr. LEE: I have told the Chamber the whole truth about the hon. member for South Brisbane.

The hon. member for Baroona referred to the hotchpotch amendments that the Government is introducing. I can only say that the A.L.P. has certainly had to do a lot of changing around since the results of the referendum held in New South Wales last Saturday became known. I understand that Mr. Stanaway has hardly slept since then because he has had to change the speech notes of hon. members opposite. They were ready to try to cut us to pieces on this legislation, but when the New South Wales referendum went as it did they had to put their tongues in their cheeks.

Mr. Miller: It was wishful thinking.

Mr. LEE: That is true. They thought they were going to play havoc with us in this Chamber but they suddenly found that, as usual, their thinking was not in line with that of the people. In our legislation we have always tried to keep in line with the people's thoughts.

The hon. member for Baroona said that we have had about 17½ tries at changing this legislation. I emphasise that that is 17½ times more than Labour did; it did nothing all the time it was in Government. It was too frightened. This issue was too much of a hot potato for the A.L.P. to touch at any time, yet A.L.P. members criticise the Government.

Mr. Bousen interjected.

Mr. LEE: The hon. member was not here; he would not know.

Hon. members opposite criticise the Government when it is making good, solid attempts to give the people exactly what they want. As the Minister said, we intend to examine the legislation and introduce further amendments. The Government has never failed, and never will fail, to honour its policy speeches. We are now honouring our policy speech; we are not rushing headlong into doing things that the A.L.P. would like us to do so that Opposition members could try to disgrace us by attacking our efforts.

Because we are proceeding cautiously and slowly with these amendments, I support the Bill to the hilt. I believe that they are essential and that they will cater for most of the needs of the public by removing the numerical restriction on licences for restaurants and clubs. I agree with the hon. member for Baroona that a charge should be imposed for motel licences. As is the case with hotels, the Licensing Commission has not said, "You shall erect a motel of a certain standard." The motels have been erected to meet motel standards. If it is good enough for The Homestead, Colmslie, Sunnybank and Mitchelton Hotels to tender for a licence, it is good enough for the motels to do likewise. The proposed amendments will attract tourists to Queensland.

I hope that the Minister will take heed of my next remarks. I believe that the 40-mile limit should be abolished. However, I would not like to see Sunday drinking in hotels within a 40-mile limit of Brisbane. I consider that bottle departments should be permitted to open for two hours in the morning and two hours in the evening so that a person could buy bottles to take home. I believe that he is entitled to that consideration.

It is easy for many A.L.P. members to obtain beer on Sundays. They say they represent the workers but they are members of sporting clubs where they can go on Saturdays and Sundays and, illegally, through the back door, buy bottles to take home. Unlike them, I do not like to break the law. I believe that a working man or any other person is entitled to be able to go to a hotel on a Sunday and buy bottles. This should apply throughout Queensland.

Mr. R. Jones interjected.

Mr. LEE: I understand that Marty Hanson sells it, but that is a bit too far to go.

Why should we deprive people who cannot afford to be members of clubs the right to take bottles home to their wives? I believe that the average housewife would favour this. What she is against is her husband going to a hotel on a Sunday, with good intentions of having only one or two beers, meeting a few mates, getting into a school and, quite often, getting home two or three hours later quite sozzled. A wife does not want this. However, I believe that she would not mind her husband buying half a dozen bottles of beer at the bottle department and taking them home.

I had no intention of rising in this debate, but when the hon. member for South Brisbane made his shocking accusations, I felt that I should. He may know a lot about criminal law, but he certainly knows very little about our liquor laws. He probably does not even know what liquor he drank at the wedding reception attended by Darcy Dugan. I am told that the grog there alone cost over \$2,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Maryborough apparently has no intention of heeding my warning and appeal to him. I once again ask him to discontinue his persistent interjections and his conversation across the Chamber with the hon. member for Ithaca, whom I also ask to refrain from conversing across the Chamber.

Mr. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Hooper. It was a terrible thing for the hon. member for South Brisbane to make such an accusation against a prominent businessman in the community.

Mr. BOUSEN (Toowoomba West) (4 p.m.): In rising to take part in this debate, I say very earnestly that the Bill is a damp squib. As it is to be placed before us now, it contains absolutely nothing, and it is obvious that the coalition parties were directed by outside sources not to present the Bill in the form in which the Opposition hoped it would be presented. The Government has failed miserably to meet the needs of the people of Queensland in the matter of liquor reform.

Speakers on this side of the Chamber have dealt thoroughly with licences for motels and restaurants, and for that reason I wish to address my remarks to some other parts of the proposed legislation.

There is legislation providing for drinking on Sunday, and my first point is that it should be done in the bars of hotels and not confined, as it is now, to small rooms and passageways. I ask the Minister to give consideration to making provision for drinking in bars when further attention is given to this matter, as we are told it will be, early in the New Year.

The other point I wish to raise concerns the hours of drinking on Sunday afternoons—4 p.m. to 6 p.m. I think the Act should be

amended to allow those who want a drink on Sunday to meet their friends in hotel bars as they do during the week, and that is from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. If that were done, I believe that the needs of the people who wish to have a drink during the week and on Sunday would be met. To conform to the Act, men are now jammed into passageways and small rooms that take the place of lounges. Congestion occurs because the lounge space in many old hotels is insufficient to meet present-day requirements.

All members will agree that in earlier days women did not frequent hotels to the extent that they do now. We are living in a changing and so-called affluent society, and today women go with men, and on their own, to hotel lounges on Sunday for drinks before lunch and dinner. The small rooms used as lounges and passageways are taxed to overflowing, and there is insufficient room for the customers of hotels. If people are to be allowed to drink on Sundays, there is only one place for them, and that is the bar. The older hotels were not designed to cope with the number of women who are using their lounges today. I know that in exceptional circumstances application can be made under the Act to trade in a bar.

Present-day lounges in most hotels are so small that they cannot cater for all the people who wish to use them. Ill-feeling is created by the lack of good lounge facilities, because people are jostled together in conditions that really are not acceptable to them. People who have hotels on lease over a period of years or who are renting on a weekly basis have appealed to the owners of the hotels to make modern facilities available so that people may drink in the lounge as they can in more modern hotels at seaside and bay resorts. Provision is made as follows in section 69 (8G) of the Liquor Acts 1912-1965—

"Where having regard to the size and location of the licensed premises situated in the permitted area and the special circumstances of the case the Commission in its absolute discretion deems fit so to do, the Commission, upon application by a licensed victualler, may, from time to time by order, authorise the drinking and consumption of liquor by persons during the permitted hours on any Sunday in a bar on those premises and so long as an order under this subsection remains in force subsections (8D), (8E) and (8F) of this section shall be read as if the words '(not being a bar)' and 'which is not a bar' were deleted therefrom. The Commission at any time may vary or revoke any order made pursuant to this subsection."

I have personal knowledge of cases where licensees have made application to the Commission for permission to allow drinking in bars only because their lounges, as I said earlier when referring to some of the older hotels, are not big enough to meet the demands at present imposed upon them. Unfortunately, permission has been refused

and, as a consequence, people who wish to have a couple of drinks on a Sunday are confined to small rooms and passageways round the bar.

As hon. members know, in some country areas permission has been granted for drinking in bars instead of hotel lounges for the very reason that I have mentioned—that lounges are too small to cope with present-day needs—and in other instances where the bar is air-conditioned and the lounge is not, permission has been granted for people to drink in the bar. What is the difference between drinking in the bars of hotels in the larger provincial cities and drinking in bars of hotels in far-western areas of the State that are granted that privilege?

I wish to deal now with the Act provision on trading hours during the afternoon session. It lays down that the hours shall be from 11 in the forenoon till 1 in the afternoon and again from 4 p.m. till 6 p.m. I could quote cases in Toowoomba in which application was made to vary the trading period to 5 p.m. till 7 p.m., which is the most suitable time in the areas concerned. I think hon. members will agree that most of our sporting activities do not cease until about 6 p.m. If no provision is made on the grounds for obtaining a beer or light refreshments, people who have been on the cricket field or on a tennis court, or have been taking part in other forms of sport, are denied the right to have a drink. I strongly recommend that the Minister give serious consideration to implementing the variations I have suggested when, in the New Year, he again amends this Act.

Men do not wish to frequent hotel lounges because, when they are in casual dress, they do not like to fraternise with women in this form of dress. A man may be dressed in sports clothes or, after working in the garden during the morning, or cutting the wood for Mum, or doing other chores around the house, he may still be in his working clothes. Before cleaning up for lunch he might like to go to the local for a couple of drinks. Others, after working in the morning, may wish to load rubbish from the garden or other refuse around the house, and take it to the dump. Although they are still in working clothes they may wish to slip into the local for a few drinks before returning home to clean up. These points all need consideration when the Act is being amended and I trust that when dealing with the Act early in the New Year the Minister will give serious consideration to what I and other members have said. I believe that at least all male persons who want a drink on Sunday would prefer to have it in the bar as they do during the week.

I should like now to deal with a couple of other aspects. One is the provision for the opening of hotels situated outside a 40-mile radius of the metropolitan area. I regard this as purely sectional legislation, which is what one would expect from the Government. People as near to Brisbane

as Redcliffe—only 20 miles away—can obtain a drink on Sunday while people at Ipswich—24 miles from Brisbane—are unable to do so. People at Wynnum are also denied the right to drink on Sunday.

The provision for travellers to obtain a drink on supplying their names and addresses is nonsense. Anybody can give a fictitious name and address, write it in a book and then go into the lounge and have a drink. This provision is used solely to defeat the legislation as it stands.

The failure of the Government to legislate for limited drinking facilities within a 40-mile radius of Brisbane contributes greatly to the road toll about which we hear so much from this coalition Government. The Government pays only lip-service to measures to reduce the road toll and road fatalities that occur every week-end. Is the Government not contributing to the road toll and fatalities by the ill-conceived legislation now before the Committee? If hotel bars in Brisbane and nearby suburbs were opened, those who want a drink on Sunday would not be forced to travel 40 miles to get a drink. I ask the Minister to take this into consideration when he is drafting his Bill in the New Year.

I agree with the hon. member for Yeronga that bottled beer should be available also. I suggest that the Minister consider this in view of the fact that the legislation provides for the sale of liquor. What is the difference between buying liquor in a lounge or a passageway and over the counter, or a bottle from the bottle department? If a person is seen leaving a hotel with a bottle under his arm he is convicted for a breach of the Act and is dealt with severely.

I notice that in Roma the hours of the afternoon session were altered from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. to 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. No doubt that alteration was the result of representations made by the hon. member for Roma. It is known that the inspector in charge of the Roma police enforced the law rigidly, with the result that he incurred the hostility of people who could not continue to drink in the manner that they were used to. They appealed to the hon. member for Roma, and the local law was amended. I am given to understand, but I have no proof, that, as well, the police inspector was transferred. In places like Pittsworth, Oakey and Dalby the afternoon session has been altered to 5 p.m. to 7 p.m., so I ask the Minister to amend the legislation and give consideration to the submissions that I have made.

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (4.17 p.m.): Owing to the importance of liquor and the effect that it has on the lives of a great many people, I wish to enter the debate and go along with the Minister's remarks.

Mr. Davies: Do you think it is right that the hotels should be open on Sunday?

Mr. WHARTON: I believe that—

Mr. Davies: You are not prepared to answer that?

Mr. WHARTON: I will answer it quite ably in a minute, if the hon. member wants me to do so; but I do not think he does.

The amendments contained in the Bill were an election promise of this Government, and, having made those promises to the people and been guided by the people's wishes, the Government should do what it promised. Many anomalies will arise, but although the Government will look at them, it does not necessarily follow that all of them will be corrected.

I go along with the remarks made by many members; however, a few members of the Opposition have gone off the rails and condemned the Country Party and the Liberal Party for what they have done and what they have not done. Members of the Opposition have paid no real regard to the motion. The great thing about this Government is that it has sincerely endeavoured to respect the wishes of the great majority of the people. That is what comes of good government.

Mr. Davies: Are you saying that the majority of the people want hotels open in Biggenden, Maryborough and Bundaberg on Sundays?

Mr. WHARTON: We have not had a poll yet. I am not concerned with what happens in Maryborough. Many things are done in Maryborough that would not be done anywhere else. However, I shall let the hon. member for Maryborough look after the problems in that town; I have my own to look after, and I look after them very well.

I agree with some extension of restaurant licences. In these changing times a great number of restaurants have attained a very high standard and should qualify for liquor licences. Not only should the standard be taken into consideration; so also should the areas in which the restaurants are situated. At Bargara in my electorate, the Galleon Cove restaurant is a beautiful restaurant with modern facilities, but it is unlicensed. It is off the beaten track, which is one reason why it should be licensed. But I should not like to see licences given willy-nilly because I do not think we should build our State on grog. That is an important aspect.

Mr. Davies: What do you mean by that?

Mr. WHARTON: I am referring to what the A.L.P. think and what the hon. member and the Opposition spokesmen seem to think. They want the whole State to be built on grog; they believe that licences should be given here and there, with drink served all day and all night. That is not the Government's attitude. If the A.L.P. want to build the State on grog, I can only say that we will not do that. I agree that

liquor is quite necessary in our daily life, but it is not the sole ingredient. From listening to the hon. member for Maryborough, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Deputy Leader, one would think that all that is needed in this State is an ample supply of grog 24 hours a day. I do not agree with that.

Mr. Davies: When I went to Biggenden they said, "This is Claudie Wharton's grog."

Mr. WHARTON: That is fair enough, and the hon. member got a drink, too.

Ample opportunities are available for getting all the liquor that is required. I believe that the legislation needs some modifications to enable liquor to be drunk in a more civilised way. We as the Government will look at the problems again—and I agree that many problems are involved. When we considered introducing amendments to the Act, we looked at the problems and could not reach general agreement, just as any other party could not reach complete agreement. We therefore decided to introduce the proposed amendments, and we will make further investigations into the problems. That does not mean that we will accept everything put before us. We will consider the position fully, vote for certain proposals, and vote against others. That is how it should be in a democracy, and that is how the Government, with its democratic attitude, will continue to represent the wishes of the great majority of the people.

Mr. R. Jones: Did you say a "demochronic" attitude?

Mr. WHARTON: I did not say that, and the hon. member knows that I did not. Only a member with brains like the hon. member for Cairns would raise something like that.

In certain instances motels should be licensed. I ask the Minister once again to consider the nature of the area as well as the quality of the restaurant or motel. I do not believe that hotel people, who pay licence fees and render a reasonable service to the community, and comply with certain standards of the Licensing Commission, should have to meet competition through the willy-nilly granting of licences to motels and restaurants.

The Colosseum Motel on the Bruce Highway in my electorate is a high-standard motel-restaurant without a licence. I believe it qualifies for a licence, but I do not believe that every motel in the State should qualify. Each application for a licence should be fully considered by the Licensing Commission relative to the standard of the premises, the area, and the needs of the community, rather than mere set standards. People in my area are well served by motels, hotels and hotel-motels. There are not a great many motels, but I should hate to think that the hoteliers, who are doing a fine job in the community and meeting all the requirements under the Act, could find that,

virtually overnight, people could build a motel and qualify for a licence. I hope that the Minister will ensure that justice is done so that drinking habits will not be extended willy-nilly in the State.

As hon. members appreciate, bowling clubs are not public drinking places, but are restricted to their members. In this day and age, members of clubs should be entitled to drink at their clubs during hotel trading hours.

Some bowling clubs apply for function permits. One club in my area, namely, the Moore Park Bowling Club, requires more permits than can be granted to it. It is situated on the seaboard in an isolated area and is an admirable building in which to hold wedding functions. I suggest that more permits be granted to it.

I support the Bill. I suggest that it goes as far as we should go at this moment. It is being introduced because times have changed and conditions have changed. However, we should not base our whole economy on liquor. When this Act is next considered, we should sit around the table and approve or disapprove of the various suggestions that have been made in an endeavour to have civilised drinking laws in this State.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (4.27 p.m.): The contributions made by Government members this afternoon have been very interesting. The hon. member for Burnett said that the Government's action meets the wishes of the majority of the people. What he says is like a psalm; we hear it so often that we do not take notice of it. He endeavoured to have "two bob each way" and wound up supporting the contributions made by the Opposition members. He said quite openly that a modification of the present system is necessary, that there are many problems associated with the liquor laws in this State, that agreement could not be reached on a number of these matters, that that is why they are not dealt with in the Bill, and that he would like to see justice done instead of the willy-nilly approach that has been made.

The hon. member for Warwick adopted a different attitude. I got the impression that he expressed the views of back-benchers other than those who oppose the Premier and Cabinet on this matter. He openly supported the submissions made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tucker) and indicated many liquor law amendments that he felt should be considered by the Government.

The hon. member for Toowoong demonstrated the opposition to this legislation that exists between the Country Party and a certain section of the Liberal Party. Never in my born days have I heard such a weak and timid speech from the hon. member for Toowoong. He endeavoured to smear the A.L.P. Opposition as he usually does for propaganda purposes. On this occasion he used the very weakest of arguments. He

spoke of human rights and elementary justice. All that the Opposition is doing is appealing for the removal of the sectional aspects of the present liquor laws.

The hon. member for Toowong is out of touch with common issues, because he said in effect, "You do not hear the Opposition speaking about household commodities." He even brought the requirements of children into the debate. I say to the hon. member for Toowong that if he is not a family man, he had better start being one. At least all household articles can be purchased seven days of the week. All that the hon. member attempted to do was smear the Opposition.

Mr. Porter: The hon. member is all at sea.

Mr. NEWTON: Not at all. If anybody is at sea, it is the hon. member for Toowong. At no time during this debate has the Opposition been guilty of the charge made by him that we are in favour of unlimited access to liquor seven days of the week.

Mr. Porter: What is it, then, that you want?

Mr. NEWTON: We have made it clear that we are opposed to sectional legislation and that we believe that people throughout the entire State should have equal rights. That in no way indicates that the Opposition supports unlimited access to liquor seven days a week. All that the Opposition asks is that the people throughout the entire State be given their human rights.

It is quite clear that, since the election, the Government parties have, on contentious legislation, accepted peace at any price. The sooner the public wakes up to that, the sooner they will realise that it is time to put a better party on the Treasury benches.

As has been indicated by the hon. member for Baroona, there are many problems associated with illegal drinking in this State. In my opinion, legislation should tackle the problem on that basis rather than the piecemeal approach to it now adopted by the Government. Since 1960 there have been many rumours of inquiries to be held and amendments to be made to the legislation; some of them have eventuated, and on occasions they have produced repercussions in the community. The Minister knows quite well that what is being said is correct, as he has had to face up to the position before. In my electorate I have received approaches from the Salvation Army, the Holland Park circuit of the Methodist Church, and another organisation of some standing in the community. Those organisations represent sections of the general public and are important to me.

Mr. Miller: What did you tell them?

Mr. NEWTON: They were the people who arranged the big meeting at the Princess Theatre before the recent State election and invited the candidates for the seats of Mt. Gravatt, Belmont, Chatsworth and Greenslopes to appear before them and address

them on this very important question. On that occasion, as has happened in this Chamber today, all but one of the Liberal sitting members and candidates ducked the issue. The hon. member for Chatsworth was the only one who attended the meeting.

Mr. Chinchin: You must be fair. I received only six days' notice.

Mr. NEWTON: Whether the hon. member had six days' notice or two days' notice, he had an obligation and a duty to appear before those people and tell them what his policy was on this question.

Mr. Chinchin: I have written 120 letters on the subject and they know what my attitude is.

Mr. NEWTON: On this occasion only 19 people have got in touch with me on the matter now under discussion, and it has been made quite clear to them that anything that can be done to overcome the illegal trading that is taking place in the State at present will have the support of the Opposition, and that is the very point the Committee is considering at the present moment.

The question of Sunday drinking in the metropolitan area has been raised, and most of the argument has been based on the premise that if a person wants a drink in the metropolitan area on Sunday there are plenty of clubs to which he can go. There is no difference in country areas, because similar clubs provide most of the liquor there. As a matter of fact, in many towns in country electorates there are more clubs than one finds in a metropolitan electorate. In effect, there should not be any difference between what can be done in clubs in the metropolitan area and what can be done in those in country areas.

Mr. Porter: The sole basis of your argument is that we should do exactly the same in Brisbane as we do outside Brisbane.

Mr. NEWTON: No, the hon. member is quite wrong. What I am saying is that any legislation introduced should not be sectional in its effect. It should cover the State and put the whole of the State on the one basis. We are not asking for more; all we are asking is that everyone should be treated equally.

Mr. Porter: You have just answered in the affirmative. I have another one yet.

Mr. NEWTON: The hon. member has taken up too much of my time already.

The point is that, in the metropolitan area, no consideration is given to those who are in the low-income bracket. The decision given by the Federal court yesterday indicates what a shocking situation exists in this State. Queensland is still the low-wage State. What about the people who cannot join clubs? Have they not the same right to a drink on Sunday, if they desire it, as a member of a club or some other organisation?

Mr. Porter: Who stops them having a drink?

Mr. NEWTON: There is nowhere for them to go, unless, as was said earlier in this Chamber, one wishes to drive them into the field of illegal liquor sales. Members of the Opposition are completely opposed to doing that. If we do something, we will do it on a basis that will give equal rights to all members of the public.

Mr. Porter: You live in a world of make-believe.

Mr. NEWTON: The most important feature of any legislation in this field is the safeguarding of the young people of the State against illegal trading, and that is the issue that most organisations that approach members of Parliament raise with them. Hon. members opposite should not be "Blind Freddie's". If they do not know what is going on, there is something wrong with them. Quite a bit of illegal trading is taking place, and that is what concerns the Opposition.

Mr. Hinze: Would you be prepared to accept the decision of a referendum if one were held?

Mr. NEWTON: If it were the feeling of members of this Chamber to hold a referendum, of course we would accept the decision. But a good deal depends on the terms of reference for the referendum. You would not simply go out and say, "Are you in favour of this or that?" Terms of reference would have to be laid down and people would either accept or reject them. However, this should not have prevented the Government from introducing legislation to clean up the many anomalies now existing in the liquor legislation.

I mentioned safeguarding our young people. The Minister knows my feelings in this matter because a personal approach has been made to him that whenever he amends the liquor legislation, he might consider covering aspects of clubs that are not already fully licensed. In my opinion, this is one way of stamping out the problems that exist with our young people. How one would overcome teen-age drinking at the border of Queensland and New South Wales, I do not know. Young people from Queensland can cross the border into Tweed Heads and obtain as much liquor as they want providing they are over 18 years of age. They can then come back into Queensland and bring bottles with them. This is a matter that should be seriously looked at.

One of the Opposition's reasons for requesting equal rights for the people of Brisbane is, of course, the impact it would have on tourism. We make no apology for doing this for the capital city of our State. Quite often one is visited by people from interstate or from other parts of the State and it is only natural to show them some

of the wonderful sights around Brisbane. If one is a lucky parliamentarian and has no function set down for Sunday afternoon after attending devotions in the morning, this is the only time one has to take visitors around the city. Imagine driving around on such an afternoon, talking and pointing out various sights! After showing the visitors the marvellous attractions around Brisbane, why should one not have the right to pull into one of the hotels that had opened voluntarily at the stipulated times and quench one's thirst?

Reference has been made to discrepancies between conditions at various areas adjoining the metropolitan area. If anyone can tell me that a trip from Brisbane to Redland Bay is not a tourist attraction, I will go "he". Visitors to Brisbane and people living in the metropolitan area like to travel through the Salad Bowl when the crops are in full bloom. It is a wonderful sight. People who have been used to farming big crops like to look at small crops growing. They present a wonderful sight with their many and varied colours of green. Thousands of people do this every Sunday.

Mr. Armstrong: What has this got to do with liquor?

Mr. NEWTON: I will tell the hon. member in a moment. He does not even know the place that I am talking about. That is why the Country Party lost it in the State election. It did not know where these places are.

Apart from being the Salad Bowl, Redland Bay was at one time the main flying-boat base for Brisbane and it is still used in emergencies when flying-boats cannot land at Sydney. In addition, people who own pleasure craft or hire boats can take very scenic trips around the channels and islands of the southern part of Moreton Bay.

Mr. Davis: It's better than Redcliffe.

Mr. NEWTON: I do not want to create an argument with the hon. member for Redcliffe, but the southern part of Moreton Bay has more attractions than the Redcliffe area has.

At Redland Bay people can obtain first-class meals equal to those obtainable in the metropolitan area. Anybody who knows Mrs. Gladys Cox, the hotel licensee, and has enjoyed her hospitality over a meal would agree that no better meal could be obtained throughout Queensland. However, because she believes in attracting tourists to Redland Bay and endeavours to do those things that she considers to be in their best interests, she falls foul of the law and is taken to court.

Mr. Houghton: You can drink a beer with your meal there, can't you?

Mr. NEWTON: No, because it is inside the limit. It is true that in Redland Bay travellers can obtain liquor, provided they have travelled 40 miles. Even if they have

been boating around the islands in the Bay they are required to sign the book stating that they are bona-fide travellers and have travelled 40 miles. In fact, Mrs. Cox was charged for having served liquor to people who had been out on a boat.

Mr. Houghton: You had better have a yarn with the hon. member for South Brisbane and get him to put you right.

Mr. NEWTON: There is no need for me to do that. The hon. member for South Brisbane and I entered Parliament at the same time and we know how to represent our electors. Representations were made on behalf of Mrs. Cox to the Minister for Labour and Tourism, who very smartly returned the letter, saying, "It is not a matter for me but for the Minister for Justice."

The Opposition asks the Government not to continue with its sectional approach to liquor but to get down to amending the Act and bringing it up to date.

On 21 May, 1968, under the headline, "Chalk tips drink law changes" the Treasurer is reported in "The Courier-Mail" as saying, when opening the Australian Hotels Association annual conference—

"Changes in State liquor laws, particularly in tourist areas, were forecast yesterday by the Treasurer (Mr. Chalk).

"In his capacity as Deputy Premier, Mr. Chalk opened The Australian Hotels Association annual conference at Q.H.A. rooms, Edward Street.

"He said that in view of tourist trends and growing sophistication in drinking habits, the Government would have to give 'close consideration' to the licensing laws.

"He said the Justice Minister (Dr. Delamothé) had suggested publicly there was every likelihood that several amendments to the liquor laws would be put forward in the next session of Parliament."

I emphasise the words "several amendments"; he did not refer to just the lousy few that have been presented to us today.

The article then continues—

"Mr. Chalk set the atmosphere for the conference by remarking on Queensland development. 'We are going modern. We are no longer in the backwater of world affairs, and as a consequence we have had to jolly ourselves out of the comfortable "she'll be right, mate" attitude of 20 or 30 years ago.'

What are we doing today? Nothing but trying to lift ourselves out of the position described by the Leader of the Liberal Party in this State. It is a pity that the hon. member for Toowong and other Government members could not take the lead and live in our modern age instead of in the past.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (4.51 p.m.): As the hon. member for Townsville South said, I doubt that any subject is so creative of a

controversial attitude, or an emotional outburst, as the liquor question. In the debate today we saw a great deal of emotionalism without too much attention to fact or truth.

Mr. P. Wood: You are talking about the hon. member for Toowong, of course.

Mr. RAMSDEN: If the hon. member who interjects has the patience he will hear what I wish to say.

I am referring to the attitude adopted by the Opposition to the amendments introduced today by the Minister for Justice. It is true, as the hon. member for Toowong pointed out adequately, that the Premier, in issuing the first part of the Government's joint policy speech, made certain positive statements, namely, that if and when the Government was returned it would do three things in relation to liquor. He also said at that time that he saw no need to change the law on Sunday drinking. Those are the statements that were made in the policy speech.

In introducing the Bill, the Minister made it patently clear that, at this stage, he is merely implementing what the Premier and the Deputy Premier promised if we were elected. In other words there are certain matters that demand immediate attention. Those matters were referred to in the policy speech and they are covered by this legislation. They relate to the limitation of licences issued to clubs and restaurants and the licensing of motels. No-one can say that this is not becoming an urgent matter when it is realised that, under past legislation, there was provision for only two more licences a year throughout Queensland.

Ample evidence exists just down the road of a first-class motel which, under the present law, cannot obtain a licence even though the Licensing Commission would certainly be convinced it is up to standard, and that there is a positive need for a licence. At this time the Minister has put before the Chamber a very simple Bill containing only three clauses which, we say, fulfil our election promise to the people.

It appears that hon. members opposite think that an election promise limits the Government's action. This is not so. I record my whole-hearted agreement with what the hon. member for Warwick said about further legislation which he hopes to see introduced in the New Year.

The hon. member for Belmont quoted the remarks made by the Treasurer in opening the Australian Hotels Association conference. He read, I believe quite factually, that the Liberal Leader said that we were coming out of the horse-and-buggy days and that we would introduce legislation in the present session. The hon. member has claimed that we are letting down our Liberal Leader in that regard. However, we are still in the present session and we will be when we resume after Christmas, when there will be ample time for the Treasurer's forecast to be put into operation. I am hopeful that,

after the Christmas recess, there will be a comprehensive review or a consolidation of the Liquor Acts. This Bill merely gives swift fulfilment to our election promise.

I am partially inclined to agree with the hon. member for Toowong that liquor has become a vital issue in the minds of Opposition members. What is it about liquor that makes it more important than any other commodity sold in the community?

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am quite sure that the hon. member for Baroona is a fairly good-thinking fellow. I took the trouble to read his speech when the Act was last amended. I take it that he will go along with sane thinking on this matter. Liquor, of all the commodities sold, has become so important in our minds—not in fact, but in our emotional outlook on life—that we let it threaten Governments, split parties and divide families. We have let it become such an important commodity that it overshadows every other commodity sold.

Where do Labour Party members stand? They have told us today quite bluntly. I presume that they will vote for the introduction of the Bill although they have not said they will. Their main bone of contention is that it does not go far enough. I note that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is nodding his head, not in sleep, but in agreement. Where are Opposition members going? They say that the sale of liquor is so important that we must open the hotels on Sundays. This matter is not covered in the Bill; the only three proposals are those I mentioned. I want to pursue this only because it was so widely canvassed during the debate. The hon. member for Barcoo is shaking his head the other way, in denial, indicating that this is not what they are saying.

Mr. O'Donnell: We want hotels open in Brisbane as they are in the country. You opened them, but only in part of the State.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member for Barcoo has clarified the position. He does not want them open. He simply wants them open in Brisbane as they are in other parts of the State.

Why on earth did not the Labour Party vigorously oppose the opening of hotels in other parts of the State? Why, when that amendment was passed, did the Labour Party not divide the House and say it would not have trading on Sundays.

Mr. Hanlon: We opposed the second reading.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I know.

Mr. Hanlon: One ground being that it was sectional legislation. We are entirely consistent now.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member for Baroona states that to be consistent we should provide the same hours for drinking in Brisbane as apply in the country. I hear no cry from the A.L.P. that trading on Sunday should cease, and that country areas should have the same trading hours as apply in Brisbane.

Mr. Tucker: That is jumbled thinking, surely.

Mr. RAMSDEN: No, it is not. It is only a week or two since the trade-union movement and the A.L.P., through the Shop Assistants' Union, went before the Industrial Commission and, at considerable expense to the union and the public, endeavoured to have shops closed on Saturday. There was an approach to the Industrial Commission to prevent the supply of essential goods and services on Saturday. Yet A.L.P. members here rise in righteous indignation because hotels in Brisbane are not allowed to open on Sunday as they are in the country. If anyone is guilty of woolly thinking, it is hon. members opposite.

Before leaving that point, I appreciate that I will be challenged on where I stand in the matter of Sunday trading. I think it was the hon. member for South Brisbane who said this morning that he respects the opinions of all members on this matter. I lay my position on the line. As the member for Merthyr, which is a closely built, high-density area, I cannot in all conscience justify opening the Brunswick Hotel in Brunswick Street on Sunday whilst the owner of the little corner shop opposite is fined, as he has been, \$300 for trading in essential goods on the same day.

Mr. Tucker: Did you support the previous legislation?

Mr. RAMSDEN: What I said when I started to speak this afternoon was that I wanted to rethink the whole issue. Again I ask: what is it that makes liquor such an important item that the Legislature must legislate on hotel trading hours, whilst the Industrial Commission has to decide the hours of trading in other goods? What is the difference? Let members of this Legislature, irrespective of their party allegiances, try to tell me what makes grog so much more important than shoes, clothing, food and other essential items.

Mr. Tucker: You want to have "two bob" each way.

Mr. RAMSDEN: No, I do not.

Mr. Tucker: I am asking you if you voted for the previous legislation. Answer "Yes" or "No".

Mr. RAMSDEN: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition cares to refer in "Hansard" to the divisions mentioned by the hon. member for Baroona, he will find how I voted. Of course I voted for it.

Mr. Tucker: What are you trying to do now?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Never have I heard so much shifting of grounds as I have heard today. It is all very well to refer to what happened in the past, but it is the present that matters. I do not care what I did three or six years ago. From what I have learnt, and from seeing a shopkeeper persecuted for selling essential goods, I ask, "What is it about liquor that makes it of such importance in the community?"

The hon. member for Belmont, in speaking of tourism, said that Brisbane was the greatest tourist centre in the State, and that when visitors come here we like to show them round. I agree with him. However, I should like the hon. member to conduct a survey of the first-class tourist hotels in Brisbane, such as Lennons, the Majestic and the Gresham, and tell the Committee how many would open in the trading hours on Sundays.

Mr. Tucker: I will tell you—every one of them.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Not one. They will not open because of union demands for penalty rates, and so on. Not one first-class hotel in Brisbane will open its doors on Sundays.

Finally, the hon. member told the Committee the tragic story of the publican at Redland Bay who, poor thing, was being persecuted because of her interest in tourism. People were going down there because she provided a marvellous table in a first-class dining room; their tongues were hanging out, but she could not serve them with liquor. What rot! I can walk into any hotel in the heart of the city on Sunday and have liquor with my meal. The same could happen at Redland Bay. Do not let us fool ourselves, Mr. Hooper, that this is in the interests of tourism. The only interest in cases such as that is in making a quick "quid", and that is all there is to it.

Mr. Davies: Why did you open the hotels in the country? You should have opened them in Brisbane, too.

Mr. Miller interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Once again I appeal to the two hon. members who have already been warned for talking across the Chamber, the hon. member for Maryborough and the hon. member for Ithaca. I warn them both that I shall deal with them under Standing Order No. 123A if they interrupt again.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Let me get back to the question raised by the hon. member for Maryborough, because I believe that if the Government made a mistake in its liquor legislation, its biggest mistake was to introduce Sunday trading without reference to the people. I have said before and I will say again—it is no secret in my own party room—that I support a local option poll in Brisbane to decide this question. If the people convince me that they want it, they can have it. If they indicate that they are

against it, no Government and no Opposition has the right to force it down their throats.

An hon. member on this side of the Chamber—I cannot remember who it was—said that the Opposition is not in touch with public opinion. On the question of Sunday drinking, it certainly is not. I recently returned from a week in Sydney. I was there just prior to the referendum on Sunday drinking and I spoke to a number of people who were interested in the liquor question. The amazing thing is that those who wanted to trade on Sundays assured me that the referendum would be carried by an overwhelming majority, and those who were opposed to it assured me that it would be defeated decisively. When the referendum was held on Saturday last over the length and breadth of New South Wales, the "No" vote had a resounding majority of nearly 500,000. I say without any fear of contradiction that the people of New South Wales are far more sophisticated than the people of Queensland. At least for the last six months they have been seeing "Hair", which was banned in Queensland; at least "Norm and Ahmed" can be shown down there. Yet these people, who are so much more sophisticated than Queenslanders, gave "No" a majority of almost half a million votes.

If the Government and the Opposition want to decide the question of Sunday drinking and what the people of Queensland want, there is only one way to find out. If that is done, sectional legislation can be eliminated. I agree with the Opposition—and it is about the only thing on which I do agree with hon. members opposite—that sectional legislation is in itself wrong.

Mr. Hanlon: Quite a number of people who vote "No" do so because they do not want hotels open near their homes, but they will go somewhere else and have a drink.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That may be perfectly true, but the point is, if my memory of the figures in New South Wales is correct, that out of the sum total of electorates throughout New South Wales only four country electorates and two city electorates voted "Yes" on an electorate basis.

Mr. Hanson: Did you take part in any campaign down there?

Mr. RAMSDEN: No.

Mr. Hanson: You did not go down there especially for that?

Mr. RAMSDEN: No, I am not as important as that, but, had I done so, whichever side I had advocated for would have won.

I feel that the Government is under most unfair attack from the Labour Party. First of all, the Opposition has not said that it is going to reject these three amendments so I assume they are going to vote for them. Secondly, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, earlier today, said that the Government had dabbled with the question

of liquor for 12 years without any results. How untrue that is! This is the third time we have amended the Liquor Act since 1957, whereas for over 15 years prior to our becoming the Government, Labour was not game to burn its fingers with the liquor question.

The Labour-in-Politics Convention passed a resolution adopting 18 years of age as the legal age for drinking. I am not sure whether it was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition or the Leader of the Opposition, but one or the other stood up and wept insincere crocodile tears about our attitude towards youth. Yet the Labour-in-Politics Convention decided that should Labour become the Government it will reduce the legal drinking age to 18.

To deal with one final point, I think the personal attack on the Premier by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, which was made by way of innuendo, was very unworthy. I think it was an attack because he pointed out that we had a certain policy under the late Jack Pizzey and that, all of a sudden, due to circumstances beyond anybody's control, the death of Mr. Pizzey, the policy was changed.

Mr. Tucker: I believe in telling the truth.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member said that when Jo Bjelke-Petersen came into office there was a complete change in Government thinking. This is part of the attempt to denigrate the Premier of this State by implying that he is a wowser. I want to put it on record that on the day he took office as Premier of this State he made the statement, in answer to a direct question, that in questions of liquor, gambling and moral issues he would be guided by and accept the majority decision of the joint Government parties. I give the lie to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who stands up and, with sneering, snide tactics tries to denigrate a man whose feet he is not fit to wash.

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (5.14 p.m.): The best I can say about the amending legislation is that it appears to me that the three matters referred to by the Minister are brought into the Chamber solely to honour an election promise. I have indicated earlier, in debates in the Chamber, my thoughts on amendment of the liquor laws and I would have thought that we could have had an over-all look at all necessary amendments. However, in the circumstances, I am prepared to accept the old axiom that half a loaf is better than no bread.

This morning the Minister told us that it is the Government's intention to introduce further amendments of the Liquor Act in the March-April session next year.

Mr. Hanlon: You'll have some great old caucus meetings before then, won't you?

Mr. HINZE: I have no doubt that we will have our good old caucus meetings, as they were called by the hon. member for Baroona. But I believe that if the A.L.P. were in Government and were discussing this matter in caucus, it would find itself in much the same position. Having listened to the debate all day, I am like Little Audrey and still wondering what the A.L.P.'s attitude to the Bill is. For the life of me I still cannot understand whether or not the A.L.P. is opposed to its provisions. Are members opposite opposed to the amendments?

Mr. Tucker: I would like to tell you.

Mr. HINZE: Members opposite are not opposed to the amendments, but in favour of them?

Mr. Tucker: They are only crumbs.

Mr. HINZE: I think I have made my point; members of the Opposition are not opposed to the three amendments but contend that the Government is not going far enough.

I have said that I do not think the Opposition took advantage of the situation. If I had been in Opposition representing my electorate, I would have given the Government something to think about. The Opposition has been more or less tolerant. In fact, the arguments that have emanated from both sides of the Chamber have been constructive and have suggested things that should have been done for the benefit of the liquor industry, which is a major industry in this State.

Mr. B. Wood: You don't support Mr. Porter?

Mr. HINZE: I was not in the Chamber to hear his speech. I suppose I differ from the hon. member for Toowong, but there is nothing new about that. We differ politically in the party room, in the Chamber, and everywhere else, and I do not suppose that we will ever agree; however, that does not worry me.

During the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, I directed three leading questions to him. I asked him what his attitude was to the drinking age, to room service at motels, and to the 40-mile limit. Of course, he is a very capable politician, he did not answer clearly any of the questions that I put to him. Obviously it is his duty to ward off the questions that are put to him. I was trying to ascertain from him the official A.L.P. attitude to those three very important matters.

The Minister indicated that it is the intention of the Government to introduce further amendments to the Act in the March-April session. I go along with that intimation, so, as I have said, for the next two or three months I will be content with half a loaf as being better than no bread,

on the understanding that the Government will in the March-April session introduce amendments that I believe are so necessary.

Recent Press statements referred to the granting of 60 or 70 restaurant licences. I do not know whether those statements were attributed to the Minister, but I should like him to clear up the matter. If no restriction is to be imposed, that fact should be made known. If I apply for a liquor licence on behalf of a constituent, I would not want to find that 60 have been issued and that the person for whom I act has to wait. I hope that the Minister will clarify the situation, because it has been made public that there could be a waiting list of 60 to 70.

The liquor industry is closely connected with tourism. I know that hon. members are sick and tired of hearing me talk about the Gold Coast and the tourist industry, but obviously tourism and liquor are closely interwoven. It is expected that hundreds of thousands of overseas visitors will come to Australia, and people have said that we want to attract them to Queensland. When they come here, we do not want them criticising what we are trying to sell them. We know that overseas tourists will demand better facilities. They do not rise until 10 a.m. or 11 a.m.; then in the evening if they go to a show and meet their friends they do not get comfortably settled till 10 p.m. or 11 p.m., only to find that the liquor is off. That is too silly for words. It is essential that the amendments to be introduced, I hope, in March or April next, contain provision for the issue of late licences, until about 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. for night clubs and selected restaurants.

These days we must provide the best of entertainment for visitors and tourists. But entertainment is very costly. Anyone who has any appreciation of the cost of shows, bands and artists in the entertainment field well knows that it is a very costly business. The expense can be covered only if the establishments can stay open legitimately to gain the benefit of longer trading hours. I hope that the Minister, in discussing this matter with his subcommittee, considers that longer trading hours are essential. In Brisbane there is no night life.

An Opposition Member: What life do you want?

Mr. HINZE: The only night life available in this city is to be found in darkened, dim-lit "discos".

Mr. Casey: What about the Pink Pussy Cat?

Mr. HINZE: I do not know anything about the Pink Pussy Cat. Most probably the hon. member has been there; he would know more about it than I. Which State is it in?

I want to talk about Queensland, particularly about the Gold Coast area. Sometimes Brisbane is referred to as the tourist capital

of Queensland. What a laugh! What a joke! Fancy trying to tell overseas visitors that this city is the tourist capital! If a person were to take overseas visitors out tonight at 10 o'clock he would have to take a sugar-bag of liquor with him, or buy it illegally, or go to one of the dingy, dim-lit "discos" that I referred to.

An Opposition Member: Tell us about them.

Mr. HINZE: I have four or five of them in my area—one step above a brothel; that is the only way I can describe them. They are "touching" the public—and they are charging about a dollar for a small can of beer. When a person is "half-shot" and the lights are out, he does not know what he is paying anyway.

An Opposition Member: Is that all they want?

Mr. HINZE: That is not all they want.

Queensland has wonderful tourist attractions, which we refer to continuously. I often hear the Opposition's adoptive shadow Minister for Conservation talking about the Cooloolo sands. That is fair enough but on the Gold Coast we have the mountain hinterland, the beaches and various other tourist attractions.

I thought that, in this debate, all members of the Opposition—

Mr. Sherrington: While you are referring to this matter, don't you think that Cabinet pulled a confidence trick in the announcement that was made yesterday?

Mr. HINZE: No.

We know that Queensland has not a night club like Chequers, which, as anyone who goes to Sydney knows, attracts the world's best entertainers. That is possible only because of the operation of the two-licence system, by which people go to Chequers at 7 p.m. and have dinner and see a show, and then the late show comes on at 11 p.m. or 12 midnight. In this way two shows are staged in the one evening. That is how they pay for the top-line entertainers to visit New South Wales. We must adopt the same policy in Queensland, particularly on the Gold Coast.

The Leader of the Opposition pointed out the similarity between a restaurant licence and a motel licence. Frankly, I cannot see much difference between the two; I suppose we could have called them "restaurant licences". But there is a demand by major motel owners who will expend large sums. Last Sunday week I attended the opening of a place called "Ten, The Esplanade", which cost \$1,300,000. The same company will build another place on The Esplanade at a cost of \$2,300,000, with a restaurant on the top of the 17-storey building.

These people are bringing in this capital. The private-enterprise sector is providing the funds and is saying to the Government, "If

we provide this high-class motel accommodation, we must give to the people who come here the same service they can get overseas, and they are asking for room service." I can see both sides of the argument. How can we expect a person who comes to a high-class motel and pays for that accommodation to be satisfied if he does not also get room service? He will not go down in the lift and down the street to a hotel to get some liquor and bring it back. He does not want to carry it in a sugar-bag. I introduced to the Minister four or five months ago a gentleman who said, "I will build, in the Surfers Paradise area, a \$5,000,000 motel provided I am allowed to give room service." I am not talking about a casino now. We cannot knock back capital of this type.

The argument is that this Government, and the Opposition when it was in Government in days gone by, made the hotels do certain things in return for licences. I do not know how we will do it, but we must give the hotels some sort of protection. I have suggested that the motels and restaurants in a certain zone or area buy their liquor supplies wholesale from the hotels in that zone or area. I do not know whether that will get around the problem, but I want to give some protection to the already established hotels that we have made do certain things. We have charged them high licence fees.

However, if we are to spend millions of dollars on motels, we must give to our visitors the type of room service they are used to and are entitled to. There is a problem, and a conflict of interests, which the Government must overcome in the legislation to be introduced in March or April next year.

I believe that, in any amending legislation, it is necessary to approve of mixed drinking in all bars except public bars. An attractive lounge bar is a very pleasant setting for a man and his wife to have a drink in comfort, but at present this is illegal in Queensland. I do not think that any man would want to take his wife into a public bar, and she would not want to go there. The men who drink in a public bar regard it as their domain.

Mr. R. Jones: Don't you think you are wasting the time of the Committee in canvassing legislation that will be introduced in March?

Mr. HINZE: It is no use the hon. member trying to bring me in on that, because he knows my attitude. I would have done it all now. If I could have convinced the other 45 members of the Government, it would have been done now, not in March.

Mr. Hanlon: You do not object at this point of time to the Government caucus rejecting it for the present and promising to give it further consideration in the future?

Mr. HINZE: The Premier and the Deputy Premier indicated in their policy speech that the Government would do three things, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. Hanlon: According to the Press, a Cabinet subcommittee was appointed and came out with certain recommendations that are not being put into effect.

Mr. HINZE: I would be prepared to go on and amend the whole damned lot. I can see no opposition from the other side of the Chamber. Admittedly, there is a bit of opposition from the "Buderim boys". We got that on the margarine question and we got over it. I would prefer to get into it now because there is nothing wrong with it.

This debate gives hon. members an opportunity to put forward suggestions for further amendments to the Act. An industry in my area makes pool tables, and it employs 200 people, but it cannot legally put pool tables into licensed premises in Queensland. They can be sold all over the rest of Australia, but not in Queensland. The manager has said that if he cannot sell his tables, he will have to close his industry down. Every time we get five minutes to spare, we go out and play a game of billiards. I cannot see anything wrong with that, any more than playing darts or quoits. If people go into a hotel for a few drinks, particularly in country areas, I can see nothing wrong with them going to a small billiard table and enjoying a game. I can see nothing objectionable in that.

Mr. Newton: Darts is a popular game now.

Mr. HINZE: The hon. member would know more about darts than I do. I can see, from the look and shape of him, that he would be a good darts player.

I must, of course, take great credit for the number of bowls clubs in my area. I have more in my electorate than any three or four other members would have in theirs combined, and during the winter carnival these clubs entertain up to 1,400 visitors from all over Australia. Problems are experienced when clubs have used up the number of permits that they are allowed each year. In general, bowlers are more sedate people who could scarcely get themselves into trouble if they tried.

Mr. O'Donnell: Do you remember the Bribie Bowls Club a few years ago?

Mr. HINZE: No, I do not know anything about that. Those who play bowls are in the main sensible people, and I should like to see the number of permits granted to bowls clubs increased from the present 12 or 13 a year. If a bowls club wishes to conduct a social gathering, it should not be subject to any restriction imposed by the Government or the Licensing Commission. What a dreadful thing it would be if the police went to a bowls club and charged people with drinking illegally simply because

the club did not have a permit for its function. Many bowlers, particularly at the Gold Coast, are older or retired people, and what a shocking thing it would be if that happened to them.

In Cavill Avenue, there are a number of "clip joints" that I want to see closed down. They seem to cater for people who have nowhere else to go, and who get "touched" in the dimly lit dungeons. Liquor is available at any old price at all, and patrons know before they go in that they will be "touched". There are no lavatory conveniences; if there are, I could not find them when I was there. I make it clear that I was there on an investigation, and that I do not frequent such places. However, I prefer to find things out for myself; I do not like getting information second-hand. I think I know what goes on round this town, and I can certainly tell the Committee what goes on at the Gold Coast.

I now wish to make brief reference to the referendum recently held in New South Wales, at which the people voted against the opening of hotels on Sundays. I pose the question: would the same result be obtained in a similar referendum in Queensland? Frankly, I do not think it would be. I believe that the great number of clubs that there are in New South Wales influenced the result in that State. Those clubs, which are financed by poker machines and which can be joined for a couple of dollars a year, must surely have had a very marked effect on the result of the New South Wales referendum. Brisbane people do not have the access to clubs that their counterparts in New South Wales have.

There are a number of other matters to which I wish to refer. The hon. member for Belmont mentioned the problems that arise in the border area of Coolangatta and Tweed Heads. In New South Wales the legal age for drinking is 18 years. A person of that age can have a few drinks in New South Wales, then cross the border into Queensland and be picked up when walking past a hotel in Queensland. The hotel owner will then get the blame for supplying liquor to a person under the legal age for drinking. I suggest that the solution to the problem is a uniform drinking age, particularly in the eastern States. I am not saying that 18, 19, 20 or 21 is the correct age; that is something that can be debated later. However, I should like to see some uniformity achieved so that in places such as Coolangatta, on the border between two States, the problem would not arise.

The hon. member for Toowoomba East was kind enough to allow me to enter the debate at this stage, and I indicated to him that my contribution would be very brief. Although there are a number of other matters that I wish to deal with, I shall leave them till a later date. I say to the Minister through you, Mr. Jones, that I have entered the debate merely to say that half

a loaf is better than no bread, and I hope the Government will do as it has said it will do and introduce in the March-April session all the amendments it believes are necessary and clean up the liquor problem.

Mr. P. WOOD (Toowoomba East) (5.36 p.m.): Queensland's liquor legislation has been described during the debate this afternoon as outdated, and ridiculous in some respects. I do not know that any of the liquor legislation is more outmoded than the convention that hon. members have to sit in this Chamber all the afternoon, in century heat and high humidity, swaddled in coats and ties.

Let me deal now with the Bill that has been introduced. It became obvious early in the debate that the Government had decided that its tactics were to be that Government members should not enter the debate. It believed that it might best handle a very difficult situation by limiting the debate. However, it soon became clear that those tactics had failed. Speakers from the Opposition benches, capably led by the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, made points requiring answers, and no effective answers have been received from the Government side of the Chamber. Of course, the history of the legislation is such as to make Government justification of it very difficult indeed.

Very great play has been made by the Minister and the hon. members for South Coast and Merthyr of the fact that the Government is fulfilling its election promise on liquor legislation by introducing the proposed Bill. That clearly is so, but the great stress that has been placed on that fact by speakers on the Government side is significant. They conveniently seem to forget that, since the promises were made in the policy speech at the last election and before this debate, the Government was quite prepared and happy to abandon its election policy and bring in wider-ranging amendments than the ones the Minister outlined today. Had those proposed amendments, which have now disappeared, been introduced, no doubt some hon. members opposite would have attempted to justify in some way or other the abandonment of the proposals in the election policy speech.

Mr. Porter: You are going to see some more next year.

Mr. P. WOOD: It is a very curious situation indeed.

Mr. Porter: Why?

Mr. P. WOOD: The hon. member for Toowong is indicating a very curious morality. He and other members of the Government have alleged that it is quite in order to introduce legislation of a certain kind in a couple of months but not in order to do it today.

Mr. Chinchin: We have not got it prepared.

Mr. P. WOOD: They cannot do it today, but it is all right to do it in a couple of months. To me, that is a very curious morality, a very strange argument to follow. There is no substance in the argument that it is to be done in a couple of months because the Government wants to consider it. That argument has been used over and over again. I cannot count the number of years and months that the Government has had an opportunity to do something about liquor legislation. The Committee has been told—and there is no doubt about it, because a number of Government members have stated it definitely—that a very comprehensive review of liquor legislation will be made next year. It is immoral to do it now; for some strange reason it is quite moral to do it next year. This excuse of election policy and further investigation is poor justification of Government indecision. In this one measure, we have seen very many examples of Government indecision, uncertainty and poor sense of responsibility. This has been public indecision and insincerity and it makes me and many people outside this Parliament wonder about all the unknown cases of indecision, confusion and uncertainty. If this is an example of so-called dynamic Government, then Heaven help us!

On one particular point of view I can agree with most members who have spoken. This is, no doubt, very controversial legislation because many different opinions are held on the matter of liquor. I think most of us will agree that the immoderate use of alcohol causes more distress and disturbance to family and social life than anything else. Our hospitals are full of the results of immoderate use of alcohol, as are our courts of law and our prisons.

Two avenues are open to Governments on the liquor question. They can make liquor available, as is generally done, or they can prohibit trading in liquor. I think prohibition has already been sufficiently tried in the United States where it proved to be quite disastrous. Its validity has been entirely disproved. Many competent people in the United States trace the alleged lawlessness in that country back to the days of prohibition when disregard for this law was almost total. Under this and earlier Governments, legislation to make liquor readily available has been passed and I do not think that this or any other amendment of liquor legislation will more than marginally affect its availability.

If we accept—and some of us do so perhaps reluctantly—that liquor is to be made readily available, then we have a responsibility to see that its availability is in such form as to reduce to a minimum the possible ill effects of its immoderate use.

Mr. Miller: Do you believe in having food with drinks?

Mr. P. WOOD: I certainly do. If we are going to make liquor available, I believe that it should be made available——

Mr. Miller: In restaurants?

Mr. P. WOOD: Yes. If the hon. member gives me time to go ahead with my speech, he will learn my views on this matter.

Mr. Porter: That is already in the Bill. You are obviously supporting the Bill.

Mr. P. WOOD: If the hon. member allows me to make my speech, he will learn my ideas. We ought to provide by legislation for the consumption of liquor in the most congenial circumstances. The consumption of alcohol should be a secondary consideration to other activities. We should aim to provide facilities not merely for the consumption of alcohol but for social activity, the enjoyment of food or meals and the enjoyment of being with friends in such circumstances as will enable those who desire it to also partake of liquor.

This legislation is an advance but it does disregard a whole range of problems. There is no point in my repeating them. They were very capably outlined by my leader, my deputy leader, the hon. member for Baroota, the hon. member for Cook and other members on this side of the Chamber.

All sorts of problems arise in the relationship between hotels and motels when an attempt is made to amend liquor legislation; however, these matters have been canvassed already. I suggest that, whilst the Bill achieves a little towards providing congenial surroundings for the consumption of alcohol, it is nonetheless merely a manoeuvre to save the Premier an embarrassment. To elaborate. I believe that the history of this legislation shows clearly that the hon. member for Toowong and a number of his supporters, aided and abetted by their Parliamentary Leader, attempted to embarrass the Premier.

Government Members: Rubbish!

Mr. P. WOOD: Despite earlier caterwauling of the hon. member for Toowong in one of the most amazing pieces of political hypocrisy that I have heard in this Chamber, he seemed to believe that attack was the best form of defence. However, his attack was simply a confusion of wishful thinking and humbug, because he had no real defence. In fact, he highlighted, as does this legislation, the lack of strength in the Government leadership.

The amendments that were previously suggested and adopted by Cabinet committee included Sunday trading in Brisbane, and they would have been supported by the Australian Labour Party. Despite the attempt by the hon. member for Toowong and others to boycott the legislation, it would have been passed in this Chamber, and there would have been no possibility of the Government's defeat on this issue. There is no substance in

the argument that those proposals were withdrawn because of the fear of their defeat in this Chamber. The hon. member for Toowong, firmly planting his tongue in his cheek, said that he could not, in conscience, vote for legislation to allow Sunday trading in Brisbane because it had not been foreshadowed in the policy speech. According to the Business Sheet, another matter will come before the House shortly in which the proposals of the Government during the election campaign have been altered considerably, yet we have not heard any protest from the hon. member for Toowong that on that issue his conscience will not allow him to support the legislation and that he will have to vote against it. The hon. member for Toowong and others took the attitude that they could not, in conscience, vote for the proposal to allow Sunday trading in Brisbane. In this matter he had the rare co-operation of his Parliamentary Leader, who said that he would not ask any member of the Liberal Party to vote against his conscience on it.

Mr. Miller: Is yours a democratic party?

Mr. P. WOOD: The hon. member knows better than I do how, on a host of other issues, the Treasurer has jumped heavily on the consciences of his back-bench members.

The alleged situation was that a number of Liberals voted in conscience, and with the approval of their Leader, against legislation to allow Sunday trading in Brisbane, whereas the Premier, by virtue of the stand that he adopted previously, voted for Sunday trading in Brisbane. I respect the Premier's attitude towards many matters involving liquor. It would seem that a few Liberal members of Parliament deliberately attempted to embarrass their Premier, but it was a clumsy and clodhopping attempt. In any case, the proposed amendments were dropped, and we see nothing of them today. We might see them—we will certainly see others, if we are to believe what has come from the Government side—in a couple of months' time. These amendments were prepared after the election date and were, for a time, accepted by the Government, despite what was contained in the election policy speech. A lot has been made by Government members of the issue of Sunday trading in Brisbane and, to some extent—

Mr. Miller: A lot has been made of that by the A.L.P.

Mr. P. WOOD: I think a lot should be made of it. I cannot see that the Government can justify the present situation. An alteration has to be made: either we have Sunday trading throughout Queensland or we do not. I believe that we cannot have a situation in which Sunday trading is allowed in certain areas but not in others. It is not for me to say what the decision will be because I am not the Government, or a member of it.

Mr. Miller: What is your party's policy?

Mr. P. WOOD: My party's policy has been made clearly known.

Mr. Miller: What is it?

Mr. P. WOOD: The hon. member knows very well what it is.

Mr. Chinchin: I do not know what it is.

Mr. P. WOOD: The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, as usual, is showing his complete ignorance of any point of view other than his own narrow one because our policy has been oft expressed by members of the A.L.P. during election campaigns and at other times. The hon. member is again showing that he is prepared to think only of his own narrow point of view because he has not considered any arguments other than those that come into his narrow mind. He seems to believe that he has a divine right of opinion and accepts no opinion other than his own.

Mr. Chinchin: What is it?

Mr. P. WOOD: For the hon. member's edification I tell him that the A.L.P. policy is to allow Sunday trading within the area in which it is not presently allowed.

Mr. Hanlon: It is to take away the 40-mile limit.

Mr. P. WOOD: Yes, it is to take away the 40-mile limit.

Mr. Chinchin interjected.

Mr. P. WOOD: I tell the hon. member that this policy is not in accordance—

Mr. Chinchin interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. P. WOOD: Thank you, Mr. Hooper.

This policy is not in accordance with my own desires on this matter. I do not have any position of responsibility, but I do not think that any person in a position of responsibility can legislate to suit his own personal desires.

The Government has a responsibility to make decisions and, relative to Sunday trading, it has shown that it has not the ability or the wish to make a decision one way or the other. Surely the Government cannot avoid this issue much longer. We have been told that, in a couple of months, we might see some more amendments.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Nor has it the strength.

Mr. P. WOOD: I agree with the hon. member for Tablelands that the Government has not the strength to make a decision. It has shown in many fields that it lacks the strength to make decisions.

Government members have made much of the New South Wales referendum on the issue of Sunday trading, the results of which became known last Saturday. They seem to be using the result as an argument against the introduction of Sunday trading

in Brisbane. If it is valid to argue in that way, the Minister should be introducing an amendment to abandon Sunday trading throughout Queensland. That argument, of course, is not logical, but, irrespective of our views on Sunday trading, we must agree that uniformity, one way or the other, is absolutely necessary, and it is the Government's responsibility to make a decision. I suspect that we will find in a couple of months' time, when we are told what decisions have been made, that the Government has shelved the issue again.

I repeat that the Government has a responsibility to legislate, or to take other action, to reduce the ill effects of alcohol. The immoderate use of alcohol is a very grave social problem. I have already said that, in considering legislation relative to the consumption of alcohol we should provide other amenities so that the consumption of alcohol is not the first activity but the second.

Mr. Miller: That is what we are doing.

Mr. Chinchon: That is the purpose in licensing restaurants.

Mr. P. WOOD: That is so with the licensing of restaurants, but we have a long way to go. Much more can be done. I do not believe that the liquor interests will do much to promote the ideas I have put forward.

This morning, the Leader of the Opposition made a very practicable suggestion that some of the profits which come to this Government from the sale of liquor should be diverted to youth sporting groups.

Mr. O'Donnell: Some of the funds that go to the Commonwealth Government, too.

Mr. P. WOOD: That is so. They could come back in the same way.

Individual hoteliers throughout Queensland often give very generous assistance to local sporting bodies, but I do not think that the same could be said of brewery interests.

Many hon. members, by virtue of their positions as members of Parliament, are asked frequently to accept, in sporting clubs, positions such as patron or vice patron or those involving more activity. Therefore, many hon. members know very well the great problems, such as raising finance and the provision of suitable facilities, which face sporting groups. I commend the Leader of the Opposition on his suggestion that some of the profits from liquor be diverted to sporting organisations in an attempt to counter the influence exerted by powerful advertising campaigns conducted by liquor interests. We have all seen the type of advertising on television and in the other media which is aimed at glamorising the consumption of alcohol, particularly in the eyes of younger people. I think this is entirely wrong.

The Health Education Council does make some attempt to counter this propaganda but, with all due respect to the Minister for

Health who happens to be in the Chamber, the efforts of that council are rather hopeless against the great weight of propaganda disseminated by the alcohol interests. We see no lead given in other fields.

I hope, when the further amendments foreshadowed by Government members are considered, that we will see some positive action by the Government to counter the effects of alcohol on young people and provide them with facilities that will encourage them to participate in active sport and so spend their time in places other than those where liquor is consumed.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr. CHINCHEN (Mt. Gravatt) (7.15 p.m.): It was not my intention to enter this debate, as the proposals outlined by the Minister have been well canvassed from this side of the Chamber. It seems to me quite clear that the majority of members are in complete agreement with the proposed Bill. The three points of the Bill are quite clear: the removal of the numerical restriction on the number of restaurant licences granted; the granting of restaurant licences to those motels that have dining facilities of an acceptable standard; and the removal of the numerical restriction on the number of licences granted to approved clubs. I do not think there is any question that the majority will welcome such amendments.

I am speaking this evening because the hon. member for Belmont took the opportunity during his speech to say that any member who was invited to a gathering organised by a church in my electorate prior to an election, and who did not turn up, was evading his responsibilities. He knows as well as I do that on the occasion to which he refers short notice of the church meeting was given, and that I had already accepted an invitation to another gathering. As a matter of fact, when the gathering arranged by the church was being held I was attending the Sunnybank Boy Scouts annual meeting, which I do every year.

When the hon. member for Belmont receives an invitation to a function, he may cancel any other invitation that he has already accepted. I do not do that; when I accept an invitation I regard myself as committed, and apologise for being unable to accept later invitations. I explained to the reverend gentleman who called the church meeting that I did not think that a church should enter the field of politics prior to an election and subject parliamentarians and other candidates to questioning. However, had I been free to do so, I would have attended that meeting.

I now return to the matter before the committee. I was interested to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak on the possibility of helping youth organisations by the provision of money received in licensing fees. He may not be aware of it, but the Government is helping youth organisations with moneys allocated for the purpose of

youth leadership training. The State handles this matter on a State-wide basis, and it is an excellent way in which to support such work.

Although I agree with the granting of assistance to the youth movement, that is essentially a responsibility of local authorities. At Wellers Hill, for instance, Scout and Guide huts will have to be removed because part of the gully in which they stand is apparently to be sold by the Brisbane City Council. After the Scouts spent \$12,000 on their hut, the last part of which was completed only in February of this year, it appears that on the expiration of the lease in 1972 the hut will have to be moved because the Brisbane City Council has decided to declare as residential land the area used by this youth organisation. I think that it is a shocking situation.

I shall deal now with the liquor question. The hon. member for Toowoomba East seems to have a strange attitude to party policies. All that the Government is doing by this legislation is carrying out exactly what was contained in the policy speech of the Premier. But there is no reason why we should not go beyond that promise. For some reason or other, the hon. member for Toowoomba East seems to think that that would be a denial of policy. That is ridiculous thinking, because time and time again throughout the years changes are made as necessary. We are moving forward all the time. As has been explained by the Minister, it is the intention of the Government to bring down further amendments to the Act in March or April next year. That is reasonable.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. CHINCHEN: The hon. member for Belmont talks about living in the past, and there have been a certain number of queries about the reason for delay in the introduction of the legislation. Therefore, I think it is interesting to look back to 1954, when the Labour Party was on the Government benches and it decided to amend the Liquor Act.

Mr. Newton: You are on dangerous ground now.

Mr. CHINCHEN: I ask the hon. member to listen to the editorial in "The Courier-Mail" of Monday, 29 November, 1954. It said—

"Though Parliament has been sitting for nearly four months, it looks as though it has been left with barely a week to examine, debate, amend and pass through all its stages, the Government's Liquor Bill. This, with the Racing and Betting Bill, is the most important social measure of the session.

"Whatever may have been the Government's reason for holding back the Bill so long, they cannot justify the hasty passage that scampers debate because many

members on both sides of the House may have been anticipating release from their parliamentary duties this coming weekend."

That is understandable, because it is very difficult, as the hon. member for Townsville South pointed out, to get a consensus on the matter.

Hon. members opposite have said, "We know where we stand on this." I do not know how they know that. I have been endeavouring for many months to assess the attitude of my electorate and I have found it very difficult to do so.

Mr. Houston: Capable people assess it very quickly.

Mr. CHINCHEN: Hon. members opposite do not have to assess anything. They have to obey dictates, and they all have to toe the line. Those who do not agree with the extension of the liquor laws must toe the line when a vote is taken.

Government members have been endeavouring to assess the attitude of the people whom they represent, and I have endeavoured to do it conscientiously. However, it is a very difficult matter on which to come to a definite conclusion. Hon. members may wish to know my attitude towards Sunday drinking in the metropolitan area. I have come to the conclusion that the majority of people in my electorate, and I think the majority of people in the metropolitan area, do not want Sunday drinking in that area. I say that advisedly.

Mr. Houston: Why?

Mr. CHINCHEN: Because of the contacts I have been able to make. As I said, it is very difficult to assess, but I think that the final figures in the referendum held in New South Wales last Saturday will reinforce my opinion. I do not think that the people of Queensland are any different.

Mr. Houston: Are you going to hold a referendum throughout Queensland?

Mr. CHINCHEN: It is rather strange that the Leader of the Opposition should mention that. When I pressed the hon. member for Toowoomba East to give the policy of the A.L.P. on Sunday drinking, he eventually said, after saying, "You know it; everybody knows it. It has been expressed.", "It is to have drinking in the capital city on Sundays." On referring to the decision of the Labour-in-Politics Convention I see that they say "... sale of intoxicating liquor, subject to local or State option". No such option has been taken, but hon. members opposite have made up their mind. Therefore, they are adopting an attitude contrary to the agreement reached at the A.L.P. convention.

Mr. Houston: Aren't you worried about our convention!

Mr. CHINCHEN: The hon. member is a little bit worried. He has stated a policy that is not in line with the policy laid down by convention.

Mr. Houston: That is where you are so wrong. I gave the policy of the A.L.P.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Houston: What is the policy? Is it the one that the hon. member gave, or the one that I gave?

Mr. CHINCHEN: That is very interesting. I shall go a little further. The Leader of the Opposition has just declared that he decides policies. The same document to which I referred earlier says—

“The State Parliamentary Labour Party to introduce during the next term of Parliament succeeding Conventions, all legislation covering decisions of Convention.”

In other words, the Leader of the Opposition cannot decide policy. If the A.L.P. is in Government, he must put into effect, within the next three years, everything decided by convention.

Mr. Houston: You cannot even read.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CHINCHEN: I cannot accept for a moment that the Leader of the Opposition decides policy. He is in agreement with what we are now doing so I do not know why the debate from the Opposition benches has taken so long. In “The Courier-Mail” of 2 April, 1969, a report from Surfers Paradise says that the Leader of the Opposition allegedly undertook to extend more liquor licences to more motels and clubs. He then goes on with a lot of other matters in regard to extension of trading hours, but he is obviously in agreement with what we are now doing. The Opposition is in total agreement with the Bill so I cannot see what the problem is. The Bill appears to me to be extremely straightforward. It is carrying out our expressed policy.

Undoubtedly, anomalies which must be corrected do exist.

Mr. Houston: Why don't you correct them now?

Mr. CHINCHEN: These things take time.

Mr. Houston: How long: Twelve years?

Mr. CHINCHEN: The hon. member has been assured that in the March-April session, after due consideration, other amendments will be introduced.

Mr. Hanlon: You said in 1968 that you would have a comprehensive policy for the election but has not yet arrived.

Mr. CHINCHEN: The hon. member for South Coast expressed his views on this rather controversial matter. I can understand his attitude. The main problem in connection with liquor is the education of people. I do not for one moment feel that people should be denied liquor with their meals. We have grown up and are moving forward and this is one of the things being corrected at this stage.

The hon. member also mentioned motels. I do not think that Queensland is any different from anywhere else in the Commonwealth. I had the pleasure of being in Darwin last year and I stayed at a motel there which had a very nice bar and restaurant. I saw no problems there. It had a very quiet little bar for those who were having a meal, and room service was available. If problems arise they are the responsibility of the person in charge.

Admittedly we have some responsibility towards hotel-keepers who are paying enormous licence fees. I, for one, do not subscribe to these large, majestic hotels spaced several miles apart. I prefer the more intimate type of drinking conditions to be found in Great Britain to the great chromium and tiled bars that seem to be making their appearance here purely because of the closed franchise that they enjoy. In the United Kingdom a person can walk a few blocks to the local, where he knows everybody, have a quiet drink and then go home. To me this is the sensible and proper way to drink.

We are breeding this sort of thing, so I feel we have some responsibility in the matter. We have created this problem for ourselves by granting restricted franchises covering very large areas and demanding a very big investment of capital. There must be some form of protection for them although, as the population grows these places should not be increased in size. Something else should be imposed and any growth taken off into the new area.

Mr. Houston: I take it you want to put a pub on every street corner.

Mr. CHINCHEN: That is the sort of inane interjection we get from the Leader of the Opposition. If he has travelled he will understand what I am talking about and will not need any further explanation from me.

Another question I wish to pose is why the necessity for haste? What is the problem? The important thing is to allow people to drink with meals at these enormous motels where overseas and interstate visitors, and our own people, stay. I think it is right that they should be licensed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have appealed to hon. members throughout the day to discontinue audible conversation while the debate is proceeding. Conversation is taking place as loudly as ever at the moment and if it is not discontinued I will deal with those responsible. There is nothing worse

than to sit here and try to hear an hon. member speak while hon. members immediately in front of me are talking in loud voices.

Mr. CHINCHEN: I think there is some urgency in these matters. Time and time again visitors and other people who enjoy having meals at these places have expressed this opinion.

I do not think that other amendments to the legislation should be made hastily, but that due consideration should be given to them. Liquor legislation will be introduced again in a few months' time.

A good deal has been said about sectional legislation. That term is dug up and thrown about to create the impression that something is not right. It is very hard to find legislation that is not sectional in some form. For example, the pasture improvement legislation is sectional, and it is meant to be. It is designed to assist only the dairy farmer. All legislation is sectional in some way or another, so it is not valid to throw up certain words as if they mean something of importance.

I am very happy to support the proposals outlined by the Minister. The Bill is a step in the right direction, and I look forward to the correction of other anomalies in March or April. I am quite convinced that what comes before this Chamber then will be of benefit to this State.

Mr. BALDWIN (Logan) (7.32 p.m.): Until I heard the names of Redland Bay and Mrs. Gladys Cox, the licensee of the Redland Bay Hotel, bandied about without full information by members on the opposite side of the Chamber, I had not intended to enter the debate. In the early stages of this debate members went far beyond the terms of the proposed Bill, so I hope that the same liberty and tolerance will be extended to me. I do not want what I am about to say about liquor laws and proposed amendments or others that should have been introduced at this stage to be misconstrued as implying that I am an ardent devotee of Bacchanalian delights. Like almost 70 per cent. of the people of this State, I take a glass of beer when I feel like it and when the company stimulates me. Of course, I do not drink with some people. Certain people will drink with anyone.

Many suggestions have been put forward in this Chamber about what liquor laws should be and about what should be done with some of the profits made from the sale of liquor. In the very short time that I have been in Parliament one thing has become clear to me: quite a large number of the problems that I am called upon to solve for my constituents have arisen from the misuse of liquor. There is no doubt that the misuse and wrongful use of liquor is a great social disease that is spreading rapidly over the face of the Western World. Its cure is not to be found in liquor legislation. It

would not matter two hoots whether the pubs were opened for one day or for one week, 24 hours a day, the spread of the disease would not be checked.

Mr. Lee: What would you like?

Mr. BALDWIN: If the hon. member gets above his social immaturity and displays a little adult patience, I shall come to that. I have not yet spoken in this Chamber without letting Government members know where I stand, much to their consternation, and I will do the same on this occasion.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BALDWIN: Ethical and philosophical considerations must enter into any matter coming before this Committee that covers in its area of operation, after the passage of legislation, the general population of this State.

In trying, by specious logic, to demonstrate that there is some relationship between pasture improvement and the improvement in brewery profits, the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt showed the narrowness and the limitation of his thinking. He was talking about something that, economically, rightly concerns a very important section. The legislation before the Committee is a matter that affects all of us, no matter what industry we are engaged in, or in what city, town or outback plot we live. He was talking about a problem that he has admitted is being considered by a very important section of our society, namely, the churches. From what he said in the Chamber it appears that he has run away from that aspect.

Mr. Lee interjected.

Mr. BALDWIN: I have not run away from any problems, and I will not run away from this one.

Government Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BALDWIN: The problem will not be solved by this type of legislation, but I will say that we have a democratic principle to consider in relation to it, just as we have one to consider relative to going to church on Sunday, Wednesday, Thursday, at midnight, or at any other time. It is a matter of our exercising rights as members of a democracy, whether our judgment is right or wrong. The judgment of the misguided people who vote for the Liberal and Country Parties is wrong, but they still have the right to exercise that "wrongness". That "wrongness" does not cripple the State financially, morally or economically any more than the wrongful operation of their rights to drink or not to drink cripples this State economically, morally and socially.

Mr. Carey: Would you close the Beenleigh distillery?

Mr. BALDWIN: I would close up some of the Government members.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BALDWIN: The Government members have said that the Government is only implementing its election policy on cafe licences, etc. That means nothing. If the Government thinks its policy is justified because it was returned to office, it is guilty of specious logic just as the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt was. In the election, this question was a general one. I would accept the Government's argument if the question at the election related to liquor laws and nothing else. Otherwise it proves nothing, as it was a minor issue in many electorates. In certain centres there are no cafe licences, and none will be granted. There is no Sunday drinking. Whether people want Sunday drinking or not, I do not know, but that matter certainly was not in issue.

Mr. Carey: Did you ask the Beenleigh people?

Mr. BALDWIN: It was not an issue in the Logan electorate. If the hon. member cares to come to me some time I will show him everything I published in my election campaign. I did not once mention liquor licences or liquor drinking.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BALDWIN: For the benefit of the Government members who cannot get the cole and cabbage growth out of their ears, I repeat that, in my campaign, I did not mention this matter once. The limitation of Government members' thinking does not allow them to conclude from that that others might have. I am very much aware that they did, especially the local Press which tried to impute to me a campaign policy aimed at my own defeat. I repudiated it, and so did the people of Logan.

For the information of the hon. member who mentioned Mrs. Gladys Cox, she is an excellent business woman who runs a very good hotel on exceptionally good behaviour lines. The hotel has excellent cuisine, and it would be difficult to find better anywhere. She is a contributor to church, youth groups, sporting groups and all other groups in the area. She admits, as she would if she were called to the Bar, that she is wealthy, and that she does not want any more money. However, she demands the right to run her business in competition with the interests protected by this sectional legislation that are only 20 miles from her back door. Therefore, like us, she is arguing a democratic principle.

I have no doubt that if this legislation were put to a referendum in Queensland, the result would be different from that obtained in New South Wales. Yet Government members, who are guilty of a-priori thinking in everything they have said, use the decision in New South Wales, which they have stated time and time again is much more sophisticated than

Queensland in these matters, to show that we would get the same result in Queensland, neglecting entirely the fact that it was not a compulsory vote and that in New South Wales, with its far greater profusion of clubs of all sorts, including one-armed bandit clubs, the necessity for Sunday drinking or any legislation on it is far less. If there was any great need for it, it would have shown up in the legislation.

If, in Queensland, we were to put it to a compulsory vote, it would go through because the section of the Queensland population that does not like sectional legislation and does not greatly care about Sunday drinking, because alcohol can be bought on Saturday, would be made to take sides and cast a vote, and would cast a vote not for Sunday drinking but against sectional legislation. I would cast mine in that way too, although personally I could not care two hoots about Sunday drinking. But I do care about sectional legislation.

Of the 13 small hotels in the Logan electorate, five would open on Sunday if they could, and the other eight would not. But not one of those eight would do a thing to stop the other five from opening; they would even vote for Sunday trading to help the five who want to open. This is democracy at work. It has nothing to do with sectional, repressive legislation that the misled members of the Government have imposed upon the State.

I find the same thing when I speak to people in general. Most of them would vote along the same lines because they are anti-sectional. This does not mean that they would lie drunk in the gutters on Sunday evenings. They would drink no more or no less than they would at any other time. Again, I am not making a plea for Sunday opening, because I could not care two hoots. But again, I would vote for it, and I may or may not go into a hotel on a Sunday for a drink, because I do not know what circumstances might face me.

If a friend who treats me hospitably visited me and, perhaps through an oversight, I had no alcohol in my home, I would very much like to be able to say, "I will be back in a tick with a drink." There are many people in the same boat. That does not mean that they would drink in the hotel or drive on the road and be a menace.

However, this sectional legislation does mean this, and because of the diversion of traffic from the Pacific Highway down to the Gold Coast, there is in the Redland Bay area alone, an ever-increasing line of traffic down and back, and when they come back, some of them are not driving as straight as when they went down. If this continues, and it will continue, they will impose the results of this sectional legislation for the Gold Coast on the innocent and unwitting people of Redland Bay and the Logan electorate who have no say in it. That is obviously wrong. There are eight hours a week—sometimes 16 hours a week at holiday times—in which

the people of Logan cannot even cross the roads running through my electorate. I have been there and at times waited two hours to cross. (Government laughter.)

I am merely stating that that is one reason for the diversion of traffic. For the benefit of those who drive with blinkers on, or have bottles in front of their eyes, there are notices placed along the Pacific Highway advising motorists returning from the Gold Coast to divert through Mt. Cotton, Underwood Road, Rochedale and Redland Bay. Let those who do not believe me go there and read them for themselves. The Logan electorate is therefore being forced to put up with a situation which it had no part in making.

If in the Logan electorate Sunday drinking were allowed, there would be people who would not go to the Gold Coast. I suggest that much of the pressure for Sunday drinking comes from vested interest at the Gold Coast, and to say that the large hotels in Brisbane would not open is to mouth a truism. We know very well that they would not open, as they do not like paying double time on Sundays. But for the one-man hotels just over the border that are struggling to make a living, Sunday would be the biggest day, and the people who went to those hotels would not have to drive 40 miles under the influence of liquor. Legally, of course, anyone who has one glass of beer, even a thimbleful, is under the influence of alcohol.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BALDWIN: Hon. members opposite ought to talk to some of the police officers whom I know, who have made such arrests. The crystals turn green when only one glass has been taken. Is that not so?

Mr. Knox: No.

Mr. BALDWIN: Then the Minister should ask some members of the police force who have assured me that one glass is sufficient to turn the crystals green, and I have seen them pick up men on that evidence and cart them off to the police station. The Minister's trouble is that he does not get around enough. If the Minister does not believe me, I suggest that he make a few personal investigations, as I have.

As I see it, the position in the Logan electorate is quite a simple one. Let the people be allowed to have a say in the matter, and I am sure that they would vote in favour of it, as it would save them quite a lot of heartache and trouble. It would save many family men the necessity to drive a long distance if they want a drink. Let it not be forgotten that if they take liquor with them and drink it on the beach or in a park, they are drinking in a public place. They therefore cannot take it with them. They would very much like to drive a short distance and have a drink instead of driving a long distance on a crowded road. I have got out of my car

on the crowded Pacific Highway and approached the drivers of 20 cars down the line. I did not approach couples in cars, because they would go to the Gold Coast, anyway, drink or no drink. I asked those in 20 cars containing family groups, with wives and children, why they drive to the Gold Coast. I was told, "It's a day out, and when you get there you can get a drink." I said, "You are prepared to sweat it out here in 95 degrees of heat with your family, waiting two hours to go two miles?" They said, "There is nowhere else to go."

Mr. Sullivan: Are you saying that everybody who goes to the Gold Coast on Sunday goes to have a drink?

Mr. BALDWIN: I did not say that; I said that of the 20 I asked 18 replied in those terms. Perhaps I could have gone anywhere else down the road. I said that out of 20 that I asked 18 gave that reply.

Mr. Sullivan: That they went down to have a drink on Sunday, not to have a swim or to sun-bake?

Mr. BALDWIN: They could have gone to Redland Bay, Victoria Point, Wellington Point, or Wynnum. I will admit that they have only to drive across the Hornibrook Highway up the "death strip" of the Bruce Highway, if they can get there, and then, if they can get into the hotels at the end of their drive, they can have a drink. And they do not have to drive 40 miles. There is a slight exception there, and the point is well taken.

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (7.50 p.m.): Let me first make a few comments on the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I think I can dismiss them very quickly.

He described sectional legislation and said that he wants the right, if a friend comes to his place on a Sunday, to say, "Just a tick; I will be back soon. I will go and buy a few bottles." The hon. member does not know the existing law or understand what goes on outside the 40-mile limit, and I think he ought to get his facts straight.

It is interesting, too, to note that most of his attack was levelled against my colleague the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt when the question of Redland Bay was raised by his own colleague the hon. member for Belmont. Therefore, I give what he said the weight it deserves.

The Minister introduced three provisions that were contained in the Government's policy speech. Of course, most of the debate emanating from the other side of the Chamber—the Opposition opened up with its field guns; it is now firing popguns—was on the 40-mile limit and Sunday drinking. I realise that hon. members opposite are very disappointed that the Government did not see fit to proceed with the idea of extending

drinking to the area within the 40-mile limit, but that decision was for reasons other than those they have given the Committee today.

I observed on page 3 of "The Courier-Mail" of Saturday, 29 November, an article by the political reporter—of course, this may have been just Press speculation as to what would happen in this debate—in which he said, *inter alia*—

"The A.L.P. at this stage believes that any move by it to introduce Sunday drinking to Brisbane and areas nearby would be ruled out of order because of the limited nature of the Bill to be brought down.

"But it will play-up the statement by Mr. Lickiss (Lib., Mt. Coot-tha) that Sunday drinking in Brisbane is a dead issue.

"The statement by Mr. Lickiss cut across those by the Premier (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) and the Deputy Premier (Mr. Chalk) that there would be a further full revision of the Liquor Acts in March."

I think it is fairly obvious that the correspondent was referring to an article that appeared on page 2 of the Brisbane "Telegraph" of Thursday, 13 November, relative to that matter. I shall quote part of the article that was supposedly attributed to me. It is headed "Issue on Sunday drinking 'is dead'" and reads—

"Sunday hotel trading in Brisbane was a dead issue now, Mr. Lickiss (Lib., Mt. Coot-tha) said today.

"Mr. Lickiss said the Government in its policy speech on proposals to amend the Liquor Acts, said it would implement three main provisions.

"It did not say those proposals would be all that it would implement," said Mr. Lickiss.

"The policy speech, however, did quite clearly point out that in effect the Government would not vary hotel trading on Sunday.

"Consent Need

"Mr. Lickiss said that in his view this was a positive statement, and left no room for any manoeuvres without the consent of the people.

"Otherwise there would be a breach of political integrity to which I, and I believe others, could not subscribe," he said.

"I view the policy speech of the Government as binding on me to the extent that it was largely on this basis that I was returned by my constituents to represent them in Parliament, and I will honour that trust.

"It is all very well for the A.L.P. to rant and rave over the Government policy, which was clearly spelt out and returned the Government to office."

It is not unusual for some hon. members in the Chamber to consider that on occasions newspapers have reported incorrectly what they have said, or used out of context what they have said. Sometimes, of course, this might be so. However, let me make quite clear my position in relation to the statement I made, which was reported in the "Telegraph" of 13 November. I say quite categorically that I was correctly reported, that I stand up to what I said then and still stand by the statement. The accusation has been made that I said something in contrast to what was said by the Premier of the State and my Leader the Deputy Premier, in relation to these matters.

With the indulgence of the Committee, I propose to record in "Hansard" the full text of the policy on liquor amendments as announced by the Premier in Part I of the Government policy speech delivered at Too-woomba on 22 April, 1969. I believe that hon. members opposite know what is contained in that policy speech. It reads—

"Liquor amendments: The Government proposes to amend the Liquor Acts to bring about certain changes in keeping with modern social thought. We propose to—

(a) Remove the numerical restriction on the number of restaurant licences granted each year;

(b) Grant restaurant licences to those motels which have dining facilities of an acceptable standard; and

(c) Remove the numerical limitation on the number of licences granted to approved clubs."

It goes on to say—

"In all these proposals the Licensing Commission will determine, as it does now, whether any licence application should be granted bearing in mind the standard of service to be provided, the situation of the premises and any objections."

The most important part in relation to what I have already said reads—and I quote from the policy speech—

"The Government does not propose to vary Sunday hotel trading arrangements.

"I want to make it quite clear that this is a considered and collective decision by the Government parties. The majority opinion of members of both Parliamentary parties is that change at this point of time is not warranted.

"It is too easy for our political opponents to promise an 'open go' on the question of liquor trading, but my Government is not prepared to do likewise in the hope of gaining political advantage on the matter of Sunday trading."

That is the complete policy on liquor as enunciated by the Premier, formulated by the Premier and the Deputy Premier, to which I subscribed and on which I faced the people.

Mr. Carey: You want the best of both worlds.

Mr. LICKISS: I do not want the best of both worlds. I make it quite clear I support the Premier. I want to try to put the A.L.P. in its correct place and this matter in its correct perspective. Members of the Opposition are most unhappy this evening because, while they endeavour to blow the liquor problem up into quite unreal proportions relative to the State's over-all future and development, the Opposition fervently hopes that we will reverse our decision and our promise given to the people. They would wholeheartedly support the move to extend Sunday trading to include the 40-mile area but would then never let the Government up again. They would say, "Look what happened on the liquor question. Look what they promised you. They said they would not introduce Sunday trading, but they have introduced it." It is part of A.L.P. policy, but let this Government ever make promises again on any matter of great moment and its word would be in doubt. This would be the Opposition's attitude.

As a member of the parliamentary team that went to the people on that policy, I propose, to the best of my ability, to uphold it, and I do not want my integrity to be in doubt. It is quite wrong to say that I am at cross purposes with the Premier of the State or my Leader, the Deputy Premier. They were responsible for the policy speech. I uphold the promises made by them in that policy speech. That is where I stand at this moment.

I do not wish to delay the Committee much longer, but I took exception to the rantings of the hon. member for Townsville South this morning. One becomes prepared to accept the utterances of the hon. gentleman, ugly as they usually are.

Mr. Tucker: Why don't you have someone stand against him?

Mr. LICKISS: I am talking about the hon. member for Townsville South. Apparently he is able to come into this Chamber and seek to take the best of both worlds by adopting a sanctimonious attitude and then uttering the foulest things one would not expect to hear from a gutter, let alone the Parliament of this State. I am sick to death of the hon. gentleman's hypocrisy. He comes into this Chamber and, with all the airs of righteousness talks about his wonderful Townsville South and what he does and thinks, and in the next breath he makes the foulest utterances anyone can hear. A psychoanalysis of the hon. gentleman would prove very interesting indeed.

Mr. R. Jones: Why don't you say that tomorrow morning when he is here?

Mr. LICKISS: I would be quite happy to. I have already told the hon. gentleman what I think of his speech.

Mr. Hinze: You're the one who ought to be psychoanalysed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order: I do not know whether the hon. member for South Coast was present when I warned hon. members. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha is directly behind the hon. member for South Coast and it is very difficult for the Chair to hear what the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha is saying. Indeed it is very rude for any member to do what the hon. member for South Coast is doing.

Mr. LICKISS: I am not pleased to have to deal with my colleague the hon. member for South Coast, who, in a rather irresponsible way, makes statements that he knows are untrue. I was quite interested indeed to hear the so-called veiled threats about the "Buderim group" and how he would handle them. I have said before, and I say again, that I am not a member of any group in this Assembly, and I am not at all amused by certain irresponsible statements that are made by the hon. member for South Coast. It is only because I have a strong sense of decency that I would not tell hon. members why certain amendments of the Liquor Act which were appropriate and probably would have been implemented many months ago were not so implemented; the hon. member for South Coast might care to supply the details.

If the hon. member wishes to act in an irresponsible manner, I am quite happy to let him do so. His statement is about as truthful as his claim during the last election campaign that he was the person responsible for the introduction of the amendment to the Land Act in relation to the formula for the conversion from leasehold to freehold for the South Coast. Hon. gentlemen know that that matter was put forward prior to his entering Parliament and the exact formula was implemented—

Mr. Hinze: Ask the Minister for Lands.

Mr. LICKISS: I am quite happy to ask the Minister; he is in the chamber. He will know that the same formula was advocated in this Chamber by me previously and was tossed out but was adopted in that form in 1968. I do not ask for quarter, but when people attack me I do not give it.

In conclusion, I support the Minister on his introduction of the Bill. It is what was promised by the Government. I feel sorry for the A.L.P. in not being able to get us over a barrel and so brand us as a Government not to be trusted. We are adhering strictly to Government policy.

Mr. R. Jones: I don't know about over a barrel, but you're up the creek.

Mr. LICKISS: The hon. member from the muddy North!

In any statement that I have made, or in any statement that the Minister has made, neither he nor I have said that these were all the amendments that would be implemented. The Minister is acting correctly in introducing the Bill. No

Government statements have said that we cannot and should not implement further provisions to make the drinking laws of this State more civilised. I am sure that the Minister has this in mind, and he has my support. Again I am not disappointed that the A.L.P. could not embarrass us over this issue, and I am sure that the A.L.P. is disappointed and completely frustrated.

Mr. F. P. Moore: Mr. Hooper, —

The CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Minister in reply.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister called.

Mr. R. Jones: Gag!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the hon. member for Mourilyan, as I have told members so often in the Chamber, that he should stand and call. The Minister called, and he has the call. The Minister for Justice.

Mr. Hanson: You have gagged him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Hanson: Shocking travesty, gagging him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Port Curtis will withdraw that remark.

Mr. Hanson: I refuse to withdraw it.

NAMING OF MEMBER

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I name the hon. member for Port Curtis.

An Opposition Member: He was not warned.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! For the benefit of hon. members who are still listening and said that I did not warn the hon. member, the member disregarded the authority of the Chair and I am naming him on that ground.

Opposition Members interjected.

The House resumed.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBER

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that in Committee I named the hon. member for Port Curtis for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman reports that he has named the hon. member for Port Curtis for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.07 p.m.): I believe that the hon. member for Port Curtis reacted in the heat of the moment. Now that he has

had a few minutes to reconsider his situation I am quite sure that he will withdraw his remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member for Port Curtis prepared to apologise to the Chair?

Mr. HANSON: Certainly not.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: In view of the fact that the hon. member for Port Curtis is not prepared to take advantage of the generosity extended to him—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I move—

“That the hon. member for Port Curtis be suspended from the service of the House for 24 hours.”

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 35

Armstrong	Lickiss
Bird	Loneragan
Campbell	Low
Carey	McKechnie
Chinchen	Miller
Cory	Moore, R. E.
Delamothe	Newbery
Fletcher	Rae
Herbert	Ramsden
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Row
Hewitt, W. D.	Sullivan
Hinze	Tomkins
Hodges	Tooth
Hooper	Wharton
Houghton	
Hungerford	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones, V. E.	Ahern
Kaus	Lee
Knox	

NOES, 27

Aiken	Melloy
Baldwin	Moore, F. P.
Bennett	Newton
Blake	O'Donnell
Bousen	Sherrington
Bromley	Thackeray
Casey	Tucker
Davies	Wallis-Smith
Davis	Wood, P.
Hanlon	Wright
Hanson	
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Inch	Harris
Jensen	Wood, B.
Jones, R.	

PAIRS

Bjelke-Petersen	Jordan
Chalk	Marginson
Camm	Lloyd

Resolved in the affirmative.

Whereupon the hon. member for Port Curtis withdrew from the Chamber.

LIQUOR ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Mr. Bennett: The Gestapo again!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Unless the hon. member for South Brisbane wants to take leave of the Committee, he will withdraw that remark.

Mr. Bennett: You had not resumed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I had resumed the Chair.

Mr. Bennett: You had not resumed the Chair; you had not taken over.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for South Brisbane will withdraw that remark.

Mr. Bennett: You had not resumed the Chair, and I was talking to my colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN: I appeal to the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Bennett: No.

NAMING OF MEMBER

The CHAIRMAN: I name the hon. member for South Brisbane for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

The House resumed.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBER

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that in Committee I named the hon. member for South Brisbane for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman reports that in Committee he named the hon. member for South Brisbane for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.18 p.m.): I appeal to the hon. member for South Brisbane to reconsider his defiance of the Chair and withdraw and apologise to the Chairman. I appeal again to the hon. member for South Brisbane.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not mind being suspended fairly. This happened to me at this stage last year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister is appealing to me, and I am attempting to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no debate on a motion for suspension.

Mr. Houston: What is going on?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon. member prepared to withdraw?

Mr. BENNETT: I am prepared to answer the Minister if I am given some right of freedom of speech here. I am prepared to deal with the Minister but not with the Chairman, who took me up for a remark that I made before he resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: All right, I cannot say anything.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I appeal finally to the hon. member for South Brisbane.

Mr. BENNETT: It is no use appealing to me as I am not allowed to answer. You are making a farce of the whole show. You did this to me last year.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I move—

“That the hon. member for South Brisbane be suspended from the service of the House for three sitting days.”

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. R. Jones: There is no fairness in that. Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 35

Ahern	Knox
Armstrong	Lee
Bird	Loneragan
Campbell	Low
Carey	McKechnie
Chinchen	Miller
Cory	Moore, R. E.
Delamothé	Rae
Fletcher	Ramsden
Herbert	Row
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Sullivan
Hewitt, W. D.	Tomkins
Hinze	Tooth
Hodges	Wharton
Hooper	
Houghton	
Hungerford	
Jones, V. E.	
Kaus	

Tellers:

Lickiss
Newbery

NOES, 26

Aiken	Melloy
Baldwin	Moore, F. P.
Bennett	Newton
Blake	O'Donnell
Bousen	Sherrington
Bromley	Thackeray
Casey	Tucker
Davies	Wallis-Smith
Davis	Wood, B.
Hanlon	Wood, P.
Harris	
Houston	
Inch	
Jensen	

Tellers:

Jones, R.
Wright

PAIRS

Bjelke-Petersen	Jordan
Chalk	Lloyd
Camm	Marginson

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for South Brisbane will retire from the precincts of the House.

Mr. Bennett: I hope I am not molested on the way out.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will be molested if he comes in.

Mr. Bennett: Is that an invitation or a challenge?

Whereupon the hon. member for South Brisbane withdrew from the Chamber.

LIQUOR ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.29 p.m.), in reply: We have now been nine hours discussing the Bill. All that the Opposition has said could have been said in nine minutes. We have heard over and over again the same refrain that had nothing whatsoever to do with the Bill before the Committee. Speaker after speaker repeated the same old cry of pubs opening on Sunday.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I rise to a point of order. Tonight I have quite an unsteady voice because I have a sore throat, and I could not get to you earlier. Apparently the Minister makes it plain now that he has no claim whatsoever—

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

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Over and over again all day we have heard the same refrain: opening of pubs on Sunday. There is nothing at all in the Bill about that. I had hoped to receive some assistance from members of the Opposition as they claimed to have so many bright ideas about amendments to the Liquor Act. All day I waited in vain to hear one single member of the Opposition come forward with one single suggestion.

Mr. Casey: You must have been disappointed.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I was extremely disappointed.

An Opposition Member: You put the gag on us before we finished.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Members of the Opposition have been blathering all day. Don't talk about the gag. It should have been put on six hours ago.

Mr. Baldwin: The gag was applied.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: He should have been muzzled at birth. In 1957 this Government inherited, with many other things, a Liquor Act of shreds and patches. The very last thing that the Opposition did to the Liquor Act occurred in 1954 when, as the Government, it introduced that dreadful amendment that compelled a club to accept a rejected applicant or to take back into membership a member who had been expelled.

Today the Leader of the Opposition commenced his speech with these words—and I should like him to confirm them: "Let the people know where the A.L.P. stands." It has been said by members of the Opposition that they stood completely behind their leader in what he put forward as the A.L.P. policy on liquor at the State election. A few

members of the Opposition have said that they supported their leader's remark and the policy put forward. Let me recall the A.L.P. policy at the State election, because it is relevant. It was a rag-bag collection of every possible suggestion that might be expected to gain one or two rag-tag votes, whereas the Premier and the Deputy Leader put forward a short, succinct, clear and sensible policy of three principles, and they are now included in the Bill. The result was that the A.L.P. received roughly 44 per cent. of the votes in favour of its policy and roughly 56 per cent. against it.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: In all this rag-tag and bobtail policy on liquor put forward by the A.L.P. at the election, the A.L.P. did not say what its real policy was. I have here the official Q.C.E. report.

Mr. Sherrington: Where did you pinch that from?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I got it from the hon. member for Salisbury. Doesn't he remember giving it to me? This is the official Q.C.E. document.

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I will hold it up so that hon. members opposite can recognise it.

Opposition Members interjected.

An Opposition Member: Do you know what that is? That is the agenda!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call on the Minister.

Mr. Sherrington: I want the Minister to indicate what document he is reading from.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call on the Minister.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It says that the members of General Committee, chaired by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I ask the Minister to indicate what the document is that he is reading from.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out for the information of the hon. member for Salisbury that the Chair has no authority to ask the Minister to do that. I now call on the Minister.

Mr. Sherrington: I want to clear this matter up, because I think he has the D.T.'s at the moment.

Mr. Davies: He is pretending it is something that it is not.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: At page 18 of the general section—

Mr. Sherrington: Of what?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: This is the existing Labour policy. (Opposition laughter.)

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. Sherrington: You have been informed wrongly on this one.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I appeal to hon. members on my left to cease their persistent interjections.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am not saying that Opposition members are not entitled to interject, but I am saying that a continuous barrage of interjections is not permissible.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order! The Minister is deliberately misleading the Committee by reading something that is not in fact what he says it is.

Mr. MURRAY: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has charged the Minister with deliberately misleading the Committee. That is a very grave allegation indeed. I object to that strongly and I ask the Chair to do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Clayfield has drawn my attention to something that the Leader of the Opposition said. It was almost impossible for me to hear what he said for the uproar in the Chamber. If the hon. gentleman did say something that was disparaging to the Minister I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Houston: I said that the Minister was deliberately misleading the Committee by maintaining that that is the official policy document of the party. It is not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister for Justice.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I quote from the existing policy at page 18—

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. That is not the official document so far as policy is concerned. I want the Committee and the Minister to accept that denial.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that the Minister's remarks are not in accordance with fact and he has asked the Minister to accept his explanation.

Mr. Sherrington: The Minister has been briefed wrongly.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: If the Leader of the Opposition takes umbrage and wants to disown his own expressed policy—

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister does accept the hon. gentleman's statement?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman's statement has been accepted.

Mr. Houston: That is a statement with strings attached to it. When we have to withdraw something we have to do so unconditionally. I ask the Minister to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman's first request was that the Minister accept his explanation. As I understand it, the Minister has done just that. I call on the Minister.

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: An interesting inclusion in this document—

Mr. Sherrington: What document is it?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: An interesting inclusion is that hotel-keepers will have all their beer glasses stamped with the correct size.

Mr. R. JONES: I rise to a point of order. The Minister is telling lies.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Cairns to withdraw that remark. I am sure that he did not mean it.

Mr. R. Jones: He is conveying untruths to the Committee which are not in keeping—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. R. Jones: I withdraw the remark.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Another interesting item in this document relates to the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquor.

Mr. Sherrington: What is your authority for this document?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Does the hon. member want to disown this?

Mr. Melloy: You are misleading the Committee.

Mr. Sherrington: You do not know what document you are quoting from.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Another interesting item in this document is that the State Parliamentary Labour Party will introduce, during the next term of Parliament succeeding Convention, all legislation covering decisions of the Convention. Does the Leader of the Opposition deny that?

Mr. R. Jones: Of course we do.

Mr. Houston: That is only general, and does not bind anybody.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Davies interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Maryborough has already been warned today of action under Standing Order 123A. I appeal to him not to interrupt when the Chair is addressing the Committee.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: We are dealing with matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition. The "Telegraph" this afternoon reports the Leader of the Opposition as saying—

"... in country areas people were allowed to break the laws unless the word was out that an inspection would be made.

"People drank in rooms other than lounges and drank for longer than the two hours in the morning and two hours at night as specified by law.

"The same thing applied with sporting organisations."

I think that the Leader of the Opposition will admit having said that.

Mr. Houston: You are making the speech.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The Leader of the Opposition claims knowledge of these things; says that he speaks with authority on them; has gone on record in the Press as saying so; is the Leader of the possible alternative Government; takes part in the making of laws; and swears to uphold the laws; if he condones breaches of the law of which he has knowledge, and does not report them to the upholders of the law, I leave it to the Committee to judge how much reliance can be placed on what he says.

I said that we inherited a Liquor Act that was a thing of shreds and patches. In 1959, the first attempt was made to patch it. In 1961, and again in 1965, further attempts were made to patch it. The Opposition is never satisfied. When I come along with a long explanation of a Bill, Opposition members scream their heads off that it is too long. When I give a short explanation, it is too short. If the Government brings in an important Bill at this time of the year, it is accused of rushing it through. If time is taken to bring it in, to give Opposition members plenty of time, that again is a fault. What do they want? I do not think they know. The main reason for delay was that a decision had to be made on whether the decrepit old Act would stand another patch, or whether a completely new Bill had to be drafted.

Mr. Houston: According to your election promises, another old patch would do.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: That is right. We are putting a small patch on it, and I am saying that I do not think it will stand a larger patch.

The hon. member for Townsville South spoke about sporting club licences, and also canteen licences. I think the hon. member for South Brisbane put him right on that matter. The Act contains provision for the granting of canteen licences in industrial areas remote from licensed areas.

The hon. member for Warwick spoke of the need for the removal of anomalies of which, as I pointed out, there are many.

The hon. member for Baroona made the statement that the Government has not faced up to the accommodation impact. I wonder if he recalls saying that. I should like to remind him of the great alterations and increases that have been made in hotel accommodation in the last 10 or 12 years, and also the fact that since 1957 approximately 540 motels, providing thousands of additional beds, have been built in Queensland.

Mr. Hanlon: That is the point I was making. The principle of providing hotel accommodation and the requirements of the Liquor Act have been thrown out of balance, and you have not done anything to bring the provisions up to date.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Bigger and better hotels and more and more motels are providing an increasing amount of accommodation. The hon. member for Baroona is one Opposition member who supported his Leader in his policy speech, and must thus share in the ignominy of its defeat.

Mr. Hanlon: We got more votes than you did.

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: There is the same old story again. Why do not hon. members opposite get a new record? Whenever the Government brings in something that is popular, Opposition members claim it was their idea. That has been said so often by the Opposition that even the public is getting sick of hearing it.

I come now to one of the worst features of a not-very-good day. I am sorry that the hon. member for South Brisbane is not in the Chamber. I gave him—

Mr. Sherrington: The "Minister for Injustice".

Mr. F. P. Moore: You gave him three days.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I gave him three opportunities to withdraw, which I wanted him to do. I wanted him to be here. I believe that today the hon. member for South Brisbane put up the worst of many bad performances.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: When I hear hon. members opposite, I can understand why the hon. member for South Brisbane spoke this morning about cockatoos and galahs on his side of the Chamber. In his scurrilous, scandalous attack on the Licensing Commission today, the hon. member put up the worst of very many bad performances by him. He said that there were rackets in the disposal of hotel licences and rackets in the disposal of restaurant licences. We are all fairly thick skinned in this Chamber, but I do not believe that a member should use the cover of this Chamber to attack

highly reputable people such as members of the Licensing Commission without producing proof.

Mr. Lee: The man whom he attacked in this Chamber was not even in the Sunnybank Hotel matter, and that is the truth.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The hon. member for Yeronga is referring to the attack on an outsider, Mr. Sakzewski. I am dealing with the Licensing Commission and the hon. member's allegation of rackets in the disposal of licences. He said also that, in speaking thus, he spoke for decent people and that all he wanted to do was to criticise "lousy police action".

Well, one does not wonder at that, because as recently as 2 August last the hon. member for South Brisbane was present at a wedding reception in the company of four of the greatest criminals in Australia.

Mr. Jensen: He did not know that. Why bring that up?

Mr. Hanlon: He was showing charity, which you are not, the way you are talking now.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It is common knowledge that the hon. member for South Brisbane knew three days before the wedding that these people were going to be at the wedding. He knew that one of them was Darcy Dugan, who was the best man. He knew that the only way in which Darcy Dugan could be at that wedding was by breaking his New South Wales parole. In fact, it is reported—

Mr. Jensen: Is this in the paper?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Hanlon: He is not in the Chamber. You have just sent him out for three days, as you well know. Be a bit fair for a change.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HANLON: I rise to a point of order. I do not mind, and I am sure the hon. member for South Brisbane does not mind, the Minister levelling charges against him; the Minister has wandered off the Bill on to which he can reply; but I draw your attention, Mr. Hooper, to the fact that the Minister has wandered off the Bill on to another matter. He has already been a party to moving the suspension of the hon. member, and now he is attacking him. The hon. member will not be back here for three days to reply.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HANLON: I suggest to you that, in fairness, you ask the Minister to wait for three days.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Baroona has raised a point of order, but I should like to point out to the

hon. member that right throughout the debate today I have allowed hon. members on both sides to move into fringe areas. The hon. member knows that because he was one who was allowed to do that.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister has not made his point. Until he does, I have no intention of ruling him out of order.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It is relevant to the discussion because the hon. member for South Brisbane was making a scurrilous attack on members of the Licensing Commission on the introduction of a Bill relative to liquor. It is relevant because on 2 August he was consorting with well-known criminals—

Mr. HANLON: I rise to a point of order. Now the Minister is imputing improper motives to a member of this Assembly even though that member is not in the Chamber. Under the Standing Orders, it is highly disorderly to impute improper motives to any member of this Parliament. The Minister said that the hon. member for South Brisbane was consorting with criminals. He said that the hon. member knew that Darcy Dugan was breaking his bond by being in Queensland. The Minister is imputing improper motives, and I ask that you order the Minister to withdraw his statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Baroona has pointed out that he considers the Minister is imputing improper motives—

Mr. Hanlon: I am saying that he is.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Melloy: Standing Orders say he did.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Nudgee knows quite well that he must not interrupt when the Chair is addressing the Committee. Under my direction the Minister has no alternative to withdrawing the remarks, as they are indeed imputing improper motives.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Which particular remarks?

Opposition Members: Don't get smart with the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the Minister withdraw the remark?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Which one?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The remark that the hon. member for Baroona has objected to is that the hon. member for South Brisbane was consorting with criminals.

Mr. Hanlon: And also that he knew that Dugan was here unlawfully outside his bond.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: With pleasure I will withdraw the remark the hon. gentleman objects to.

Mr. Houston: And that he knew he was breaking his bond.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Even the Leader of the Opposition knew that.

Mr. Houston: I did not. Don't start imputing motives to me.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The only way he could get into Queensland was by breaking his parole.

Mr. Davies: You did not even know that the Premier had shares and built up a fortune in a few hours.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Maryborough has been warned.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I pay tribute to the hon. member for Gold Coast—the only member who made suggestions for liquor amendments necessary to foster the tourist industry. I admit that one member of the Opposition—the hon. member for Belmont—also referred to this. He came to light with the very good suggestion that, when he took tourists on a drive to see the sights of Brisbane, it would be a good thing if he could take them into a hotel and give them a drink. That was exactly what everybody else had said.

Mr. Houston: That was the first time you had heard it.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I do not know whether hon. members opposite could follow what the hon. member for Logan had to say, but, as far as I could gather, he was recommending that the Beenleigh distillery be closed and that something ought to be done with the hotel at Redland Bay. I could not quite follow that.

Mr. BALDWIN: I rise to a point of order. I did not mention the Beenleigh distillery at all and I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Logan has denied making the particular statement mentioned by the Minister and I ask for a withdrawal.

Mr. Sherrington: You are mad on Bundaberg rum.

Mr. Jensen: I do not want Bundaberg rum brought into it facetiously.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I withdraw quite willingly. It is no wonder the Opposition chide me about Bundaberg rum, because I have here the decisions of the 1968 A.L.P. Queensland Convention. This explains why hon. members opposite are always criticising Bundaberg rum. I will read one decision. It is—

“State manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquor.”

That is exactly as I read from the other document. Let hon. members opposite deny it if they can.

In conclusion, I again express my disappointment at the fact that in nine hours members of the Opposition were not able to put forward one concrete suggestion for the improvement of the Liquor Act.

Motion (Dr. Delamothe) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, read a first time.

MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVING INSTRUCTION SCHOOL BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Ramsden, Merthyr, in the chair)

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Transport) (9.4 p.m.): I move —

“That a Bill be introduced to provide for the registration of schools for instructing persons in the driving of motor vehicles, to provide for the licensing of persons engaged in instructing for reward persons in the driving of motor vehicles, and for other purposes.”

At the present time there is no legislation in this State to control the activities and standards of driving schools and driving instructors. All that is required for a person to set up in business as a driving instructor is for that person to hold a Queensland driver's licence, and obtain a vehicle that passes a regular machinery inspection. The instructor is not required by law to be of good character, to have any instructional ability or to have achieved a high standard as a driver.

There are at present approximately 57 driving schools throughout the State, these schools engaging a total of approximately 250 driving instructors. Thirty-seven of these schools are in Brisbane and the remainder are situated at various centres throughout the State from the Gold Coast to Cairns along the coast, and inland at Ipswich, Toowoomba and Mt. Isa.

Strong support for some form of legislative control of driving instructors has been received from various organisations, including the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland, the Master Driving Instructors Guild of Queensland, and Australian Driver Education (an association formed by a number of individual driving schools).

I wish to pay tribute to the hon. member for Merthyr, who for some seven or eight years has been fostering the idea of licensing driving instructors.

Mr. Bromley: He got the idea from me, you know.

Mr. KNOX: The hon. member for Merthyr was advocating the licensing of driving instructors before the member for Norman was a member of this Assembly.

In recent years there has been a steady growth in the number of professional driving schools in this State, and there is an obvious need to ensure that student drivers obtain a high standard of instruction.

The Bill provides that established driving schools and persons presently engaged as driving instructors will have three months' grace, after the Bill becomes law, to register as schools and to apply for licensing as instructors.

The administrative duties and control provided in the Bill will be the responsibility of the Commissioner for Transport. It will be an offence to conduct a driving school unless it is registered. The principals may not engage a driving instructor who is not the holder of a current instructor's licence.

An applicant for an instructor's licence may make application to the Commissioner. He must be twenty-one years of age, medically fit, and the holder of a current driver's licence under the Traffic Act in respect to the class of vehicle on which he proposes to instruct. It is important to note that he must have held such a current driver's licence for a continuous period of three years preceding the date of his application. To hold the licence, he must have competence as a driver of motor vehicles and a sound knowledge of the Traffic Act; he must be competent to teach; to be a fit and proper person as respects his character.

However, it is not an offence for a person engaged in a business or calling to act as a driving instructor to a proposed employee in that calling, provided that no fee or reward is paid by the proposed employee. To explain this in some detail the Brisbane City Council utilises its experienced bus drivers to teach employees, or proposed employees, in the art of driving buses. These instructors will not be in breach of the provisions of the Bill. Members of families, such as parents teaching sons or daughters, or brothers teaching sisters, will not be committing any breach. Likewise, employers in the trucking section of the transport industry using experienced drivers to train and teach employees to drive company vehicles will not be in breach of the provisions in the Bill.

Except in cases where the Commissioner refuses an application for an instructor's licence on the ground that the applicant has not satisfied him as to his competence as a driver, as to his having a sound knowledge of the Traffic Act, or as to his competency to teach, an aggrieved applicant has the right of appeal against the refusal to a tribunal to be appointed by the Governor in Council. The tribunal will consist of a stipendiary magistrate, an officer of the Department of Transport nominated by the Commissioner, and the holder of an

instructor's licence nominated by the Minister for Transport. The decision of the tribunal will be final.

I commend the motion to the Committee.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (9.9 p.m.): At the outset, on behalf of the Opposition, I state that we most certainly welcome this legislation. In fact, we welcome anything that will in any way help to reduce the toll of the road. If this measure aims at achieving this, the Opposition is most certainly behind it. It can be truthfully said that, up to the present time, we have had a rather peculiar approach to driver-training in Queensland. We never seem to determine just how much driving knowledge is required, what skills are necessary to operate today's vehicles, or how drivers should act in the traffic conditions that exist and that have increased in density in recent years, making it more and more difficult to move about. We do not seem to have kept pace with all this in our driver-training.

Over a period of time, we have preached at drivers, and we have persecuted and prosecuted them, yet the road toll continues to rise. Quite obviously, our approach has had a negative result. If the Bill enables us to look at the matter in a different way and put forward fresh ideas for the training of our drivers, it will be a move forward.

In an endeavour to bring the road toll to the knowledge and notice of the people of Queensland, we continually publish road-accident figures. But it does not seem to have any effect on the ordinary drivers in the State, perhaps because we have continued to push and belt these figures to the point where they have become meaningless to the average driver. I suppose this is understandable because we all imagine that accidents happen only to someone else and that we will never be involved in them. I can remember when I was in the Army that I imagined I was the only one who would never be shot or hurt, and I suppose all around me thought this of themselves. The same applies with road accidents; the opinion seems to be shared by most drivers on the roads today.

Every time a person is injured on the road, we all become involved, whether we like it or not. Sometimes large medical costs are entailed when there is an accident. Victims could be slightly hurt or badly hurt. Then in some accidents legal costs are entailed, and these could be quite large. There is also the question of economic costs. Firstly, those killed or badly injured are a loss to the community. Others who are injured receive a pension and are a cost on the community. Many of them lose limbs or eyes, become paraplegics, or are injured mentally. They all represent an economic cost to the community and, when added together, it is enormous. Therefore, it is not only the loss of the lives on the road—I deplore this—but also the tremendous cost to the community that must make every thinking person

begin to wonder whether there is a need for a fresh approach to driver training. In my view, the cause of many accidents comes back to that one basic need.

The Minister said that the Bill will provide for "the licensing of persons engaged in instructing for reward". He mentioned that any person could set up a driving school without proving that he was very competent or that he possessed great knowledge. Such persons can call themselves driving instructors and proceed to teach others. Universities and schools, both primary and secondary, would not engage people not competent to teach, and lecturers and teachers have to prove their competence by passing through courses of training in colleges or universities. I believe that requiring driving instructors to have licences for a certain time, and to prove that they have other specialised knowledge, is a step forward.

A question asked in the House elicited the information that there is a high failure rate among those tested for driving licences who have been trained, or supposedly trained, by many driving schools. Probably members of the transport committee of the Opposition who will follow me in this debate will enlarge on that matter. It seemed to me rather strange that there should be such a high failure rate. If there were in driving schools people competent to train others as drivers, the failure rate should be rather low.

Mr. Houghton: Don't you think some would react in the same way as some youngsters do when sitting for examinations?

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, I agree with that to a certain extent. Indeed, I was about to add it as a rider to my remarks. No doubt there would be some who, when first becoming associated with a policeman or a testing officer in Brisbane, would react in the way that some young people react to examinations. But examinations do not have failure rates as high as 51 per cent. in normal circumstances. Speaking subject to correction, I believe the failure rate in driver-testing is over 50 per cent., and the mind of every thinking person must be engaged in attempting to discover why it should be so. Obviously it comes back to those who are doing the instructing.

Mr. Bromley: Not necessarily.

Mr. TUCKER: To a great degree.

Mr. Bromley: They have very efficient testers, too.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes, and I believe that many of the testers understand that people can become flustered and probably make allowance for that. However, I do not believe that the failure rate would be high for that reason alone.

It is fairly obvious that there are many incompetent instructors. There are, of course, others who are highly skilled and competent and who do not take learners for their driving

tests unless they are quite sure that they are competent to pass and obtain driving licences. I pay a tribute to those driving schools and instructors who adopt that attitude. Of course, there are those who do not act in that way, but who, for quick gain, put young people through meagre training and then take them for their tests. That attitude helps to produce a high failure rate.

I believe it is necessary that schools for the instruction of persons in the driving of motor vehicles be registered, which means that immediately such schools come under review the capacity of their instructors can be investigated. People will then be unable to become driving instructors if they cannot prove that they are competent to teach, that they have a knowledge of the Traffic Act, and that they satisfy the other requirements enumerated by the Minister this evening.

On behalf of the Opposition, I may say that we welcome the Bill.

A number of my colleagues will be expounding on certain other aspects of it but the Opposition certainly will not oppose its passage at any stage if it contains only the provisions outlined by the Minister.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH (Tablelands) (9.21 p.m.): I support the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and reiterate that the Opposition believes that the proposed legislation is very necessary.

I was struck by the speedy way in which the Minister introduced it. As it is a Bill to provide for a completely new Act, it will contain quite a number of clauses, and I thought that the Committee might have been given a little more explanation of some of its contents.

Although hon. members will see the Bill and will be able to make further comments at the second reading stage, the Minister's introduction did bring to my mind the answer that the Minister gave to a question asked 12 months ago by the hon. member for Sandgate. On 12 November, 1968, the hon. member for Sandgate, Mr. Dean, asked—

"(1) Was his attention drawn to the report in *The Sunday Mail* of May 5, headed 'Driving Schools' review to Government', and the statement that instructors were unfit to teach learners how to handle a motor vehicle?

(2) If so, has he considered the submissions in the report? If not, why not?"

I draw the attention of the committee to the answers that the Minister gave—

"(1) Yes.

(2) Yes."

He disposed of that question very speedily 12 months ago.

Since then quite a number of accidents have been caused by inefficient drivers whose inefficiency can be traced to the fact that they were poorly instructed in the first place.

It is virtually a matter of life and death, and I know that the Minister is concerned about it because one frequently reads statements to that effect in the newspapers. This is a practical method of doing something about it very quickly, and the Minister has now moved that a Bill be introduced to deal with the situation.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned the high percentage of learners who fail their driving test in the city area. I read recently that the failure rate is as high as 51 per cent. Anyone reading that and thinking of the cost of instruction would be deterred from even trying to learn from a driving instructor. As in any other undertaking, once a person fails, his confidence is sapped to the extent that he begins to get an inferiority complex and say, "I don't think I can pass the test. I don't think I can do it." That adds to his difficulties on future occasions when he goes before a policeman or a departmental officer to endeavour to get a licence.

The Minister mentioned the Instructors Guild of Queensland. It was formed in 1967 and, together with the Royal Automobile Club of Queensland, is striving very hard and in a practical way to overcome deficiencies in the instruction of drivers. I was not very happy about the Minister's saying that in many instances fathers, relatives or friends who teach a person do not come within the ambit of the Act. I do not suggest that it should be mandatory for everyone who wishes to teach to obtain a permit. However, I think one should look at it in this light: there are training colleges for teachers who teach our children and technical colleges for apprentices being trained as tradesmen, and in neither of these instances is the person who successfully completes the course given a vehicle that can kill, but with driving instruction a person is taught to drive something that can be a lethal weapon unless he knows how to use it properly.

If the Minister could provide for registration of paid instructors and also, after a period, provide that fathers, relatives and friends who want to teach anyone must go through the driving school—it might take two generations—then we would be well on the way to establishing uniformity in teaching. This uniformity should also include uniformity in interpretation of our traffic laws. Some persons are born teachers; others are made. A man may have knowledge and not be able to impart it, and this fact should be kept prominently in mind by those who are testing instructors who come up for their licences.

I should like to draw attention to what happens in other places. I have studied the Western Australia Act, which is the latest one available. I have also made a perusal of training methods in other spheres. For instance, the New South Wales Police Department has gone to no end of trouble to set up a police-training establishment

covering 37½ acres at St. Ives, near Sydney. While this would be outside the Minister's jurisdiction, I think we in Queensland are entitled to one, two, or even three of these training centres, to be utilised not only for the training of police but also for the training of instructors, and, if it so desired, of drivers.

The New South Wales Government provides four training officers at the Newcastle driving-training centre where civilian drivers can take a course. I understand that this is an excellent driving-training centre although it is not quite as extensive and costly as the one at St. Ives. I intend later on to inspect the centre at St. Ives to inform myself on the lengths to which New South Wales police go to make sure their drivers, who are members of the Police Force, understand and interpret very quickly and efficiently every hazard that may come to their notice in observing the driving of motor vehicles.

Another matter with which I hope the Bill deals is the need for the occasional revision of instructors' licences, in view of the increasing speed of cars, the increasing number of cars on the roads, the increasing hazards encountered, and changing rules of the road. Every instructor must be kept up to the mark, so a revision course or test will be necessary. I hope this is provided for in the Bill so that instructors going before the testers to renew their licences will be at all times 100 per cent. efficient.

The Minister said it was important that these instructors be of high repute. He also mentioned that a short period of three months will be allowed in which driving schools can register. I look forward to getting the Bill and seeing what it contains. In the meantime, members of the Opposition support its introduction. I will reserve further comment until the Bill is printed.

Mr. R. E. MOORE (Windsor) (9.30 p.m.): I congratulate the Minister on his introduction of the Bill and agree with him that it is necessary to register driving instructors. It has been found in many driving schools that a certain number of pupils fail to obtain a driver's licence and that certain driving instructors have a higher failure rate than others. It is logical to assume that those instructors do not possess driving knowledge. They may be competent drivers, but they are not able to impart knowledge to their pupils. Often a motor-driving school dismisses an instructor for incompetency, and the next thing is that that instructor puts his name in the phone book, for example, as the XYZ Driving School, and is in business. That type of instructor has failed in his profession, yet he is allowed to attempt to train people who desire to obtain a driver's licence and the cost to those pupils is added to because, not being able to receive the knowledge that they would receive from a qualified instructor, they cannot complete the course in a short time.

The Government has sent a number of worthy instructors to the Victorian Driving Instruction School, and they have passed through that school with flying colours and become examiners. That result has not been achieved simply because the course was an easy one but because the Government chose skilled candidates to attend the school. When the Bill is passed the examiners will be snowed under by the rush for registration. As time goes on the rate of applications for registration will level out at approximately half a dozen a year. In Victoria it has been found that the quality of instructors has improved and that they have a sense of responsibility and achievement and are looking for higher qualifications. Queensland can learn from the experience gained in Victoria.

I cannot get out of my mind the thought that the main cause of accidents is not the inability to steer a car, to change gear, to reverse, or to perform the many necessary functions that are inherent in safe driving, but the inability to instil in the minds of people who get behind the steering wheel, whether it be in a car, a truck or a semi-trailer, the importance of driving at a safe speed. Nothing will convince me that speed does not create the main hazard on the road today and cause accidents. Many other factors can cause accidents, but accidents are due mainly to inattention while driving at speed, carelessness while driving at speed and mechanical failure at speed. In the great majority of accidents speed is the common denominator. Speed must be reduced when driving a motor-car in the rain. A car must be driven more slowly in certain circumstances (although most hon. members have seen drivers who do not seem to know that there should be a difference in speed), to compensate for different road adhesion, braking, cornering and general control of a vehicle.

The right type of instructor can really bring home to pupils during their lessons, when they are most receptive to teaching, what is necessary in driving a vehicle. In that way, we would achieve our goal.

I am pleased that this legislation will not prevent a parent from teaching a child or a person from teaching a friend, but it prevents non-authorised people teaching for profit. The number of people who might be taught by a private person would be very limited. No doubt most hon. members learnt to drive under the tuition of a friend because it is only in recent years that driving schools have been in vogue.

I believe that the general attitude of drivers is the main cause of road accidents. Basically, the legislation is being introduced in an attempt to reduce the toll of the road. Many attempts have been made to achieve this end, but the toll continues to rise. This legislation may have some effect on the road toll, but I do not know how the road toll can be reduced until driving speeds are reduced.

From time to time I receive complaints from people who have applied for a driving licence. One was from a man who worked for the Postmaster-General's Department and drove a vehicle for about 15 years. He left that employment and took another job, but did not buy a motor-car. About four or five years later he decided to get a driver's licence. When he went for his test the instructor said, "Righto, pull out." He pulled out, but then saw vehicles coming in the opposite direction. He thought, "I will wait a little while because it is not safe to move." Because cars had to go around him, the instructor said, "Sorry, fellow; you have failed." He was a competent driver who was forced into error by taking the instructor's word to proceed. Similar circumstances arise occasionally. I wonder if the laying of such a trap should be permitted. I do not think examiners should do that because many people accept them as persons in authority, people to be obeyed. They do not expect tricks to be played on them.

Under this new system we will have a chance of psychologically examining the various types who are to be driving instructors. A person may be a good driver but not be psychologically suited for driving instruction.

Mr. Davis: And there is the matter of their character.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: The Minister mentioned that in character they had to be fit and proper persons to act as driving instructors.

If anyone is rejected as a driving instructor, he has a right of appeal to a tribunal consisting of a stipendiary magistrate as chairman, an officer of the Department of Transport nominated by the Commissioner and the holder of an instructor's licence nominated by the Minister for Transport.

The Minister is to be commended on introducing this measure which is fair in every respect.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (9.40 p.m.): I think that most of us in the Chamber looked forward expectantly to the introduction of this measure and, like my two colleagues who have spoken in the debate, I welcome any measure that will lead to better and safer driving habits. I express the hope that any measure taken to improve driver-training will result in a decrease or decline in the number of accidents that happen all too frequently on our roads. As I said, members of the Opposition and most Government members looked forward to the introduction of the Bill and the foreshadowed Traffic Act Amendment Bill, which will provide for provisional licences, as firm steps forward in combating the toll of the road.

However, I was completely disappointed at the Minister's outline of this measure. His explanation was all too brief for such an important matter as the registration of driving instructors.

It can be said that over the years all members of Parliament have attempted to make some contribution in the House or through the other channels available to them to bring about better driving standards. My own small contribution was, immediately on my election to this Parliament, to propound the idea that driver-training should commence in our high schools. I tried to do something positive about it. I obtained a second-hand motor vehicle for the high school in my electorate and encouraged the principal not only to allow the pupils to obtain some driver-training but also to enable them to gain an insight into the rudimentary mechanics of a motor vehicle.

I believe that in any attempt to improve driver-training we must also direct our thoughts to a better understanding by the driver of a vehicle of just what goes under the bonnet. I forecast that the time will come when driver-training will include some basic mechanical training to give a driver a better understanding of the machine he is operating. Too many accidents happen today because of a lack of complete understanding of a motor vehicle. If the average person who is tempted to tramp heavily on the accelerator sat down and studied the mechanical failures that could result in a serious accident—for example, the pitman arm falling off the steering mechanism which could result in a bad accident—he would realise that he could be placed in dire straits on the road. If people had some basic understanding of their vehicles, many of them who are tempted to speed on our roads would have second thoughts about it. At present, this realisation comes from some knowledge of vehicles and only after many years of driving experience.

The Minister, in introducing the Bill, laid down certain qualifications for entitlement to become a driving instructor. He said an applicant must be 21 years of age and must have held a licence for three years. Because of the unfair loading on comprehensive insurance policies of drivers under the age of 25 years, allowing a person to be a driving instructor at the age of 21 does not accord with the fact that, for insurance purposes, a driver is not considered to be really capable till he is at least 25 years old. If that is a good principle, how can it be accepted that a person is competent to teach other drivers at the age of 21? To me, that simply does not add up.

A person must be 17 years of age before he can obtain a driving licence. If provisional licences are introduced in this State—already it appears that the requirements of provisional licensing have been broken down considerably—for periods of two years, in common with what obtains in other States, a person would be 19 before, in

the eyes of the law, he was sufficiently capable to travel at ordinary highway speeds and cope with the various problems encountered on the road. Yet in only another two years it is considered that he would be, at the age of 21, a competent driving instructor.

It must be borne in mind that not only private motor vehicles have to be taken into consideration. Most driving schools advertise, "Get your licence to drive a semi-trailer," or, "Get your licence to drive a truck." It seems now to be implied that if a driver obtains his licence at 17, he would be competent at 21 to teach any person who entered the school to drive any type of vehicle, whether it be a motor-car, heavy truck, or semi-trailer. I think that the Committee is entitled to a better explanation than the mere statement that all that is needed is that a person be 21 years of age and the holder of a licence for three years. I do not think that by that age he would be sufficiently competent in the driving of vehicles of all types to be able to instruct drivers in the various forms of transport for which licences are needed.

I hold a fairly wide range of licences—from that required for an ordinary motor-car right up to that needed for an articulated vehicle. I think that the only vehicle I am not licensed to drive is a bus. It took me many years to qualify for those licences and to become an efficient driver of those vehicles. After all, one may be able to get behind the wheel of a semi-trailer, start the engine, shove it in gear, and move off down the road, but that does not make one a competent semi-trailer driver. A semi-trailer is one of the most difficult vehicles to drive. In England there has been quite a high accident rate with semi-trailers, because in wet conditions they are prone to jack-knife. Although a person of 21 years of age may be competent to teach a person to drive an ordinary motor-car, I doubt very much whether he would be proficient enough to instruct on any type of vehicle that might be under the roof of a driving school.

In my opinion, the Bill is only a half-hearted and feeble attempt to come to grips with the problem. As I said earlier, many people get into difficulties because they do not understand the machine that they are driving and because they have never been instructed in overcoming the various problems that one encounters as a driver in everyday life. Although many people never leave the environs of the city in their normal driving life and never get off the bitumen, a great number of people are called upon throughout their driving life to drive under all sorts of conditions. I do not think it is good enough to take a person out onto a suburban bitumen highway, teach him to change gears, take him into the traffic, then take him down to the driving test centre, where he is given some sort of examination, is asked a series of questions on the Traffic Act or the rules

of the road, is then taken for a drive and asked to make a "three-point landing" by reversing into the kerb, and then, because he is able to pass that test, give him a licence that takes him out onto the highways in ever-increasing traffic and expect him to drive under all sorts of conditions.

I believe that one of the reasons for the upsurge in accidents in country areas may be that many people, through inexperience in driving, are unable to cope with situations that arise on narrow, slippery country roads, particularly on wet dirt roads in which deep tyre impressions have been made, giving a tram line effect. A number of people find that, because of speed and other circumstances, they are completely unable to cope with the driving problems they meet in country of that type.

I am quite conscious of the fact that the mere ability to handle a motor vehicle at a certain speed, to brake at the right time, to use the gears to pull up, and so on, does not necessarily make a driver a good road user. If the Minister wanted to do something positive about improving the standard of driving, he would seriously consider setting up a school similar to that at Mt. Lawley in South Australia. At such a school not only would driving instructors be put through a rigorous testing course to prove that they could drive under all conditions before being given the green light to act as driving instructors; eventually people who applied for a driver's licence, whether they had been taught at a driving school or by someone else, would have to undergo an equally rigorous test before they obtained their licence.

Two things are very desirable in driving schools. First of all, the person who wishes to be taught driving is entitled to the best instruction it is possible for us, as legislators, to ensure. Secondly, he is entitled to receive this instruction at a reasonable cost. He should not be compelled, because of the incompetence of driving instructors, to come back again and again and be met with a bill out of all proportion to that necessary to turn out a competent driver on our roads. Because of this, I have some doubts about the Bill. I do not think that the matter has been looked at in the light that it is becoming increasingly difficult, no matter how good a driver a person may think he is, to drive on our highways and cope with the increasing traffic and confusion.

Mr. O'Donnell: It is hard work.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I agree with my colleague the hon. member for Barcoo. I do not consider that I have as yet become decrepit; I am far from it. Having had a driving licence for something like 37 years, I consider that I am a reasonably good driver. I may not be an expert, but I think I am reasonably competent. However, from my own experience I find it is becoming increasingly difficult to drive, particularly in the metropolitan area. This is because of

increased traffic, inadequate roads and inadequate laws that do not make some rules clear enough to motorists, particularly such rules as giving way to the driver on the right.

If it is difficult for a person who has held a licence for many years to cope with traffic in the city, how much more difficult must it be for a person who, having had a short period of instruction on city streets, is, speaking metaphorically, thrown to the wolves, and has to cope with traffic on our highways.

Last year I went interstate and I do not mind saying that when I entered the traffic in Melbourne I felt that I was getting a little inadequate. I repeat, if it is difficult for an experienced driver to cope with these conditions, how much more difficult must it be for the new driver?

I do not think the Minister can lay down a provision that a driver need only be 21 years of age and need only hold a licence for three years to be considered extremely competent to instruct other persons in the best methods of driving on our roads and highways.

Possibly the Bill goes far enough but I do not think that the Minister's ideas on driver-training go far enough, particularly when we consider what is going on at Mt. Lawley. Had the Government a couple of years ago introduced a scheme such as this in Queensland when it would have been relatively inexpensive, then this problem would not have to be faced today.

After much urging by me, the Government introduced a linesman's training school, which was equipped with all the various devices. I cannot see that it would be relatively much more expensive to set up a similar type of testing ground not only for the purpose of teaching instructors but also to be used as part of a test for a driving licence.

In tackling this problem and exploring all avenues of solving it, the Opposition, as a responsible body, will support anything that it feels will contribute to a reduction in the road toll. The Opposition has been advocating this measure over a number of years, so I did not like the Minister's attitude when, in introducing the Bill, he said that the hon. member for Merthyr raised the matter of licensing driver-training schools. Let us get beyond petty conduct of that type on this matter of great importance. If the Minister is petty, he will completely destroy the image that he is trying to create of a Minister who is very concerned about the toll of the road. It would appear to anybody outside the Chamber that the hon. member for Merthyr had been the only member to speak about the registration of driving schools.

Night after night I have heard from the Government statements like, "The only members capable of making good speeches are on the Government side, and those on the

Opposition side are all no-hopers." If the Government adopts that attitude it will completely destroy the image that it has tried to create for the Minister as being a responsible Minister concerned with this problem. Even when the hon. member for Norman said that he had spoken about the matter, the Minister replied that the hon. member for Merthyr had raised it before the hon. member for Norman entered Parliament. I do not think the Minister will deny that he said that.

Mr. Knox: No, I don't.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Well, if the hon. member for Merthyr raised it before 1960, it has taken the Government a hell of a lot of years to wake up to the fact that this measure is desirable. The Minister has destroyed his image of a responsible Minister and he will destroy Parliament's image as a responsible Parliament concerned with the welfare of both motorists and pedestrians. The Minister does not do Parliament a service by indulging in such a petty political attack.

Mr. Knox: There is nothing political about it.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: As chairman of the committee that was discussing measures coming before the Assembly, the hon. member for Tablelands said that the Opposition must look at this Bill objectively and support anything that, in its humble opinion, would reduce the toll of the road. I do not think anybody could show a more responsible attitude than that on driving-instructor-training and "P" plates.

In conclusion, I claim that the Opposition is acting responsibly, as it always attempts to, and I regret the fact that the Minister, in his very brief introductory remarks, could not resist the temptation to introduce a silly little political jibe into a matter of such importance.

Mr. Knox: There is nothing political in it at all. I was giving credit to the person who was entitled to it.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: At the same time the Minister implied that no member on the Opposition side had raised it.

Mr. R. E. Moore: If you had raised it, he would have given you credit.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member for Windsor is only a boy. The Opposition said many things about road safety long before he was given a opportunity to enter Parliament only because the Government saw fit to appoint his predecessor to the Law Reform Commission.

The Minister owes the Opposition the tribute that over the years it has been consistent in its suggestions. After all, most of us are parents and probably all of us have relatives who use the roads both as motorists and pedestrians. The Opposition cannot be accused of ever adopting other than a

responsible attitude to road safety. The licensing of driving instructors is very important.

When we discuss "P" plates I will have more to say on the fact that it is rather strange that, under our various State laws, to become the driver of a stationary engine one must serve about 500 hours under instruction on an internal combustion engine that is anchored to the floor, yet we put a lethal weapon into people's hands with a minimum of five or six hours' instruction. That does not add up. We must look at this matter seriously because motor vehicles are becoming more powerful every day.

(Time expired.)

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (10.6 p.m.): I had intended to speak later in this debate, but in view of the remarks of the hon. member for Salisbury I feel obliged to speak now.

Mr. Sherrington: You would not have a speech without me.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am sorry that the hon. member has proved to be so touchy.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition adopted the right attitude when he said that the Opposition was in total agreement with the provisions enunciated by the Minister. For some reason, however, the member for Salisbury appears to believe that the Minister was making a cheap political jibe when he used a simple sentence of acknowledgment. I should like to read exactly what the Minister said because the most stupid remark tonight was that of the hon. member for Salisbury when he tried to condemn the Government for the things that it is trying to do. The Minister said—

"I wish to pay tribute to the hon. member for Merthyr who, for some seven or eight years, has been fostering the idea of licensing driving instructors."

That is all the Minister said. If that is objectionable to the hon. member let him rise to his feet and say so.

It hurts my modesty to say that not only does the Minister think so, but also the Master Driving Instructors Guild of Queensland thinks so. The guild thought that I had shown sufficient interest over the past seven to nine years—

Mr. Sherrington: Anybody would think you were Robinson Crusoe.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member for Salisbury becomes most vociferous; he can dish it out, but he cannot take it.

The Master Driving Instructors Guild of Queensland thought that I had done so much in this matter that its members elected me unanimously as their patron. If the hon. gentleman has done as much why did they not pick on him? The guild members, by their unanimous motion electing me as patron, spoke for themselves. Let there be enough of this pettifogging impertinence and stupidity.

Mr. Sherrington: I hope that the hon. member was not referring to me as stupid, because he would hardly be in a position to pronounce judgment on that.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member raised a point which deserves further consideration relative to the instructors being 21 years of age. He developed his argument to show that a person who got a licence at 17 years of age would be barely experienced by the time he was 21 years. I point out that this legislation was requested by the guild over the years for a number of reasons. Firstly, as pointed out by the hon. member for Windsor, all that was required of a person who wished to start a driving school was that he had held a driver's licence for 12 months. He could then paint "Joe's School" on the side of a car and be in business. That is the present position. The guild had been very conscious of the fact that this did not give its members any professional status or standing in the community. For many years it has been seeking registration in some form or other.

The Minister has been accused of taking a very long time to get around to this, and no doubt he has. I may have been critical of this in the past but, on reflection, I think it is sound to make haste slowly, particularly when introducing brand new legislation.

It is not as if we are starting off a brand new State and putting our first driver-training car and the first instructor on the road. We are faced with a fait accompli. We have a large number of driving schools and driving-school instructors. It would be the easiest thing in the world to legislate, on very firm and strong terms, in such a way that we could close all these schools or a big majority of them. It has been necessary, over the years, to find some method of separating the sheep from the goats, giving justice and equity where it is warranted, and at the same time raising instructing standards in our driving schools. For the first time, this Bill, which has been introduced by the Minister, will do just those things.

Mr. Wright: How will it do them?

Mr. RAMSDEN: It will do them because, as I have already said, the driving schools themselves asked for this legislation.

Not long ago, I was at a meeting of the Master Driving Instructors Guild of Queensland, which was attended by its solicitor. Those at the meeting had before them the R.A.C.Q. suggestion to control driving schools and many motions that had been passed over the years. In the presence of the solicitor, we went through the R.A.C.Q. suggestions and, after some discussion, we found that the guild and the R.A.C.Q. were basically on one and the same track. I have been given to understand that the Bill meets the requests and desires of the guild, and I think that the Minister will be happy to give the Committee that assurance.

I have with me the official proposal that that guild first brought up when, some years ago, it was discussing this vexed question of licensing schools and instructors. The guild suggested that, because there were so many schools and instructors, it might be necessary to phase the proposal in over a number of years. That was suggested before the Government had turned its attention to this Bill.

The guild suggested that the Government appoint the appropriate people from the Government departments concerned to supervise and control driving instruction in Queensland. The guild had its own idea how this should be done. This is what the Bill proposes.

The guild suggested that an application form should be devised, to be completed by all existing driving instructors for record purposes, and thereafter by all persons desiring to become driving instructors. Indeed, this is what will happen, because the Minister has already said that a period of three months will be allowed for existing schools and existing instructors to register.

The guild said that the authority, which it called "the panel" for want of a better name, would then issue an interim or probationary licence or, on the other hand, reject the application.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. Wright: Have those suggestions been accepted by the Government?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I have said that basically the Bill meets those suggestions.

Mr. Wright: Everything that you have said?

Mr. RAMSDEN: The Bill basically is what the guild is asking for.

One of the points made was that all applicants should be over 21 years of age. That is the point called into dispute by the hon. member for Salisbury. I believe that that age was set having in mind the fact that there are driving schools in existence, and therefore when registration came nobody under 21 would be entitled to apply for a licence. It was as simple as that. It is a downward age limit, if I may put it that way, and it does not mean that anyone who is 21 will be given an instructor's licence.

It is further stipulated, as the Minister said in his introduction, that an applicant for an instructor's licence should be of good character and have a sound personal reputation. The guild states that a person who applies for a licence shall have no conviction of any civil or criminal offence of a nature which may be determined by the Commissioner of Police to be detrimental to his becoming a driving instructor. I presume that instructors will be vetted in the same way as taxi drivers and other

people in positions of similar responsibility. No doubt the regulations in due course will cover that requirement.

The guild went on to say that an instructor shall have held a motor vehicle driving licence for at least four years, and shall have driven over 40,000 miles. That in itself limits the opportunity of a person of 21 years of age to obtain an instructor's licence.

Mr. Wright: That latter requirement would be hard to prove or assess.

Mr. RAMSDEN: It is true enough that that would be hard to assess, but no doubt a person who wants to earn his living in this way would be able to produce some proof of his experience.

The final point that the guild asked was that applicants for instructors' licences should possess the aptitude considered necessary to instruct effectively. In other words, an applicant must be more than merely an experienced driver of the types of vehicles on which he is going to instruct. In addition, he has to be qualified to instruct. I consider that I am a capable driver; I have driven for, I suppose, some 40 years, and in that time I have had three very minor scratchings. On the other hand, I would possibly be the world's worst teacher because I have not the necessary patience. I just cannot apply myself to watching people do silly things that it comes to me as second nature not to do, so that as a teacher I would be a hopeless failure. I think it has to be recognised that there are many people who are in themselves good drivers but who are quite incapable of teaching. That is the point made by the guild.

That was phase 1. It was then suggested that as phase 2, this panel, as it was called, should establish a set of standards relevant to the formation of a guild of driving instructors, and eligibility for membership would have as a prime basis the requirement that the individual be actively engaged in the driving instruction industry. Also provision would be made to circumvent any attempt by large driving schools to influence the voting of their members. That is a matter of internal control. The guild rightly, in my view, feels that once their standards and status as a calling are raised, they ought to be given over the years more and more control over their own affairs, just as other responsible bodies in the community control theirs.

They suggested—again I remind hon. members that this was long before the Government decided to introduce the proposed Bill—that a board of five examiners should be appointed from within the guild for the purpose of carrying out tests for professional driving instructors' licences. They suggested that the appointment of the board would be for a period of 12 months, more or less subject to the demands of the majority of the members of the guild.

The proposals submitted suggested that the applications would be submitted to a panel, which would arrange for individual testing to be carried out by appropriate personnel comprising, firstly, a qualified driving testing officer (the Bill, or the regulations made under it, will provide for that); secondly, a supervisory officer in teaching from the Department of Education (I do not know whether the Minister has given that submission any thought, but that was to ensure that the instructor would know how to teach); and, thirdly, a member of the Road Safety Council. These examiners would then test applicants for professional instructors' licences.

As I said earlier, that scheme was submitted many years ago, and it was worked on over quite a long period. If the Minister has taken his time in bringing the proposed Bill to fruition, I should say it is because he has had regard for the desires of not only the guild but also of the R.A.C.Q. and Australian Driver Education. He is now bringing down a Bill that does, I believe, basically meet all the requests made by the guild.

Discussions took place over a long period on the question of whether or not the schools themselves ought to be registered. I think I am correct in saying that in most other Australian States they are not registered.

Mr. Knox: In most States they are not registered.

Mr. RAMSDEN: As a result of the representations made by the guild, as far as I am concerned, and probably by others, the Minister has incorporated in the proposed Bill provision for registration of both instructors and driving schools.

Mention has been made of the high cost of instruction, and there is no doubt that the cost does become high in the case of a pupil who takes a course of instruction, undergoes a test for a licence and fails, repeats the course, fails again in the test, and so on. However, I believe, and the guild believes also, that with the upgrading of driving schools and the higher standard of instructors that will be demanded under the Bill, the rate of failure will not be so high.

It is believed, too, that the cost of driving courses can be controlled in two ways.

Firstly, it can be left to the wisdom of the guild itself, because the guild is conscious of the fact that it wishes to raise its own standards and standing in the community. Consequently, the guild will be responsible for acts of self-discipline amongst its members to make certain the public is not fleeced. Indeed, that is one of the very reasons why it has been seeking registration for so long. Secondly, even if the guild were to break down in imposing discipline on its members, I believe that in the ultimate the protection of the customer would be in the hands of the Consumer Protection

Council, when it is set up. Therefore, I do not think that hon. members need have any great fears on that point.

I shall leave further comment till the second-reading stage, and I take this opportunity, on behalf of the Master Driving Instructors' Guild of Queensland, of thanking the Minister for introducing the proposed Bill.

Mr. BOUSEN (Toowoomba West) (10.25 p.m.): As I believe this Bill is a step in the right direction, I should like to support the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other speakers on this side of the Chamber. The position with driver-training in Queensland is somewhat chaotic, and I believe that strong legislation should be brought down with a view to setting a better standard. More stringent laws may be necessary to ensure safer driving in Queensland.

When learning to drive one must acquire the practical knowledge of how to handle a vehicle and, at the same time, have a wide theoretical and practical knowledge of road safety. An instructor must possess all these qualifications and have himself passed through some driving school before being registered and licensed as a person qualified to train others in safe driving.

Like the hon. member for Salisbury, I disagree with the Minister that 21 years of age should be the minimum age for a driving instructor and that he should need only three years' experience as a licensed driver. When the Minister made this statement, I immediately thought of the age group between 21 and 30 and I felt that possibly 25 years should be the minimum age. I feel that a man of 25 years is much more mature than one of 21. I also think that the time he must hold a licence before being registered should be at least five years. I would be prepared to accept a recommendation by the Minister, if he agreed to the five years, that the licence need not necessarily have been held in Queensland, provided the applicant can show that he has been a licensed driver for the required time. I also believe that he should be qualified to drive all forms of transport from the humble mini-car to the large semi-trailers so many of which we see on roads.

Any person who is granted a licence to become a driving instructor should be of good moral character. I believe that young females learning to drive must be protected. If a licence is issued to some person without references as to good moral character, the lives of some of our young women could be placed in jeopardy.

The licensing of these drivers must be under the Department of the Minister for Transport, but the issuing and policing of licences could be allocated to the Police Department. Before any applicant is granted a licence he must undergo a test of proficiency. The test should be a written, oral and practical one. He must also qualify in

the traffic laws of the State. It is no use licensing somebody to teach people how to drive vehicles if he himself is not fully conversant with our traffic laws and does not possess some practical knowledge of driving and of the vehicle being driven. A person who does not have those qualifications cannot give his pupils correct driving instruction and the knowledge of the traffic laws that is required of any motorist.

The hon. member for Tablelands claimed that in Brisbane 51 per cent. or more of people who applied for driving licences failed to pass the required tests. I suggest that the percentage is closer to 60, and that, if the large provincial cities and country towns in which driving licences are issued are taken into account, the percentage of failure will be even higher. To have qualified instructors at all times, we must ensure that they meet the requirements laid down. Any person can set himself up in business and advertise himself as a licensed driving instructor without possessing any of the qualifications that I have outlined. As well, he could charge exorbitant fees. I think that the usual fee varies from \$2.50 to \$3.50 an hour, but the unscrupulous person who is ready to take somebody for a ride will charge higher fees and ensure that his pupils fail their driving tests so that he can make his occupation a paying proposition, instead of ensuring that his pupils obtain drivers' licences.

After being granted a driving instructor's licence, a person should be required to renew his licence every 12 months to ensure that he possesses the practical experience and moral character required.

The hon. member for Tablelands referred to students attending teachers' colleges and apprentices attending technical colleges being required to pass practical examinations to obtain their degrees or credentials. The point that he made could be related to my contention that a person should be at least 25 years of age and should have held a driver's licence for five years before he could become a driving instructor. In the academic field students are required to complete two years in Junior and two years in Senior before they matriculate, and in the trades an apprentice has to complete four or five years' training before he can qualify as a tradesman.

Driving instructors must be conversant with the traffic regulations of this State because a lack of knowledge of those regulations can jeopardise road safety. Many Press articles have stressed the importance of road safety and claimed that the Government is only paying lip-service to it.

Now I refer to "The Road Ahead", in which under the headline "Negative approach by Queensland Education Department to school driver tuition", this report appears—

"In the past it has been quite evident that the Department of Education has been

unwilling to include driver-training in the social subjects taught at Queensland State High Schools."

It then states—

"The Director of Secondary Education, Mr. C. R. Roberts, in a recent public statement said, 'The Department permits its principals to co-operate fully with organisations such as Rotary, Lions, RACQ and similar bodies in these courses, so long as they are properly supervised, are conducted outside of normal school hours, and away from the actual school grounds'.

"If that is the extent of the department's 'co-operation' it is no wonder that Queensland is getting nowhere in its attempts to lessen the road toll among our young drivers."

This appears later in the article—

"The first stage could be made available prior to legal school-leaving age and could include the broader aspects of the motor vehicle problem rather than the mechanics of driving.

"Subsequent stages could be provided in the following years at high schools and technical colleges and all stages could be provided at evening schools.

"Referring to the Brisbane State High, Mr. Roberts wrote: 'The effect on the school grounds of five cars continuously being driven on them for five hours every day is not difficult to imagine'."

That is, if we are to conscientiously and deliberately take up driver-training in the secondary school education curriculum.

The article continues—

"The RACQ has already proved that driver training can be successfully incorporated into the high school curriculum. The club has already done so at St. Paul's School, Bald Hills, and at Brisbane Grammar School.

"The Dean of Medicine at the University of Queensland, Prof. E. G. Saint, has expressed interest in the RACQ's work in this field.

"University assistance is helping the club in the selection and matching of students to determine the actual results of proper driving training.

"The RACQ is prepared to continue its efforts in proper driving training for young people within the limits of its resources."

It is then said that the Government gave very little help in this matter, and an appeal was made to the Government to do something better in the field of driver-training.

I support the Bill, but I ask the Minister to investigate the suggestions I have made with a view to providing more stringent laws along those lines.

Mr. KAUS (Hawthorne) (10.38 p.m.): I join with my colleagues in congratulating the Minister on introducing this Bill to register driving schools and license instructors. I

know that the hon. member for Salisbury has referred to this matter, as have quite a few hon. members, for quite some time. In my maiden speech I referred to it; I am but one of the few, and I am not looking for any kudos.

I am glad that the Minister presented the measure this evening, because I said in my maiden speech that all driving instructors should be registered and that, before being granted a licence, they should be tested and their traffic history investigated. No doubt that will be done. I commend the work done by the hon. member for Merthyr. He has devoted a lot of time to the subject, as he explained in his speech earlier tonight. I congratulate him on the work he has performed and, no doubt, you, too, Mr. Hooper, have done much in the matter.

What qualifications will be required of driving instructors? Will they be required to pass a driving test of high standard, and will they be required to sit for a written examination? In New South Wales they are required to pass an oral examination, but I think it is better that they sit for a written examination. Must they have a thorough knowledge of the driving rules set out in the Traffic Act? Must they have the ability to teach satisfactorily the safe driving of motor vehicles? Must they have a good record as drivers? Must they be medically fit? No doubt all of these matters are covered by the Bill. Will the cars they are driving be properly maintained, safe and in a roadworthy condition?

Mr. Sherrington: It is very important that they be fitted with dual controls.

Mr. KAUS: I agree, but I doubt whether each one could be fitted with dual controls. I imagine that some driving schools would have quite a few cars fitted with dual controls. I do not know the cost, but I imagine it would be high.

The car bought by the average instructor would have to have good brakes and be in good mechanical condition.

The benefits that will accrue will include keeping out driving tutors of bad character and those who possess insufficient qualifications.

Another point that weighs heavily with me is that if the standard of driving tuition is improved, the standard of driving generally will rise, and this should reduce the road toll.

I should like to see the Government set up one of these driving schools. It has been advocated by the R.A.C.Q. and many other organisations. A previous speaker mentioned Mt. Lawley in Western Australia. There is a driver-training centre at Newcastle, and, I think, there is one in Sydney named the St. Ives Police Training Centre. It is a bitumen circuit in the form of a figure 8 with curves of small radius, steep upgrades, and corners with the wrong camber, so that the driver's ability to control the

vehicle can be assessed. I hope that in time the Government will set up such a centre in Queensland because it would be of great benefit.

I should like instructors from the schools to attend those training centres. The earlier people learn to drive properly, the better off they are. When the novelty wears off, they become good drivers; but they must gain this experience first.

It is good that the Minister has introduced this Bill because the licensing of driving schools and professional driving instructors was part of the election policy of the Government. I know that fairly high standards, which must be met by all professional driving instructors and testing officers, will be laid down.

Driving instructors should themselves be subject to testing, and only after they have proved their competence should they be licensed to teach others. Testing officers, too, should hold qualifications at least equal to those of licensed driving instructors.

I should now like to quote an extract from a paper by Miss A. Raymond titled "High Risk Groups, and Hazardous Practices". She states—

"One characteristic which applies to every driver for some part of his driving career is inexperience. In learning to drive, as in learning any other skill, mistakes will be made because of lack of experience. Unfortunately these mistakes are made to the hazard of others on the road. There is no way of learning to drive in which the learner can be safely isolated until a certain amount of skill is acquired.

"The major part of learning to drive is not in mastering the mechanics of making the car go, but in developing the ability to assess traffic situations and take appropriate action. Other traffic is an essential part of the learning situation and any mistake made by the driver is likely to have damaging results to persons and property."

Mr. Wright: What is it that you are reading from?

Mr. KAUS: It is a paper by a Miss A. Raymond.

Mr. Wright: How do you spell that?

Mr. KAUS: The hon. member can find that out later. Miss Raymond continues—

"A little quiet practice on his own with no-one to observe his mistakes is impossible for the learner-driver because without traffic to contend with his road sense is not being developed.

"This situation must, therefore, make inexperienced drivers a high risk group as they are the group that will be making the inevitable errors of the learning period. Not all mistakes will result in accidents. Some will produce near-misses which may be just as effective in revealing an error

of judgment to the learner-driver, and will be considerably less expensive to all concerned.

"It is impossible to make a clear-cut distinction between experienced and inexperienced drivers, because experience is a relative value and cannot be measured."

Further on in her paper Miss Raymond states—

"Unlike other skills, driving is one in which it seems socially unacceptable to admit to any further learning after the attainment of a driver's licence. It could be called a skill which produces 'instant experts'. A few weeks or months are spent mastering the mechanics, then the driver goes for a driving test, which sets a minimum standard of performance, passing which entitles him to a driver's licence. The actual process of obtaining a licence is rather like a 30-minute brain-wash where the candidate enters as a nervous novice and emerges as a highly competent and polished expert. Unfortunately the change is 'all in the mind'."

I hope that the driving instructors envisaged by the Bill can do a bit better than that. As hon. members know, we have tried to do our best to reduce the road toll, and in the city we have, to some extent, done quite a good job. Unfortunately in the last year whilst road casualties have decreased in the city, they have increased on the open road. With the registration of driving schools, instructors will be able to get to young lads and put them through the hoops, as it were, and I am sure that good results will be seen in the years to come.

Mr. R. Jones: You always talk about the young. What about the accident prone?

Mr. KAUS: There are quite a few who are accident prone. I do not know how the hon. member for Cairns rates as a driver. He may not be able to handle a car. I know that some people cannot handle cars.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Committee a few figures that I have taken out. Between June 1967 and June 1968, 476 people were killed on the roads; about 10,100 were seriously injured; and about 7,500 were slightly injured. In the five years since 1963, no fewer than 2,334 people have been killed on the roads and 50,300 seriously injured. Between 1965-66 and 1967-68 the figures levelled out, ending the long gradual rise that stretches back to 1957-58.

The figures that I took out show that, although the number of accidents has increased slightly—from 25,625 in 1963-64 to 31,397 in 1967-68—the number of casualties has been fairly static over the last five years, and it rose very gradually during the preceding five years. However, the total number of persons killed increased by an average of 2.95 per cent. over the years 1963-1967, and in the following year, 1967-68, the total dropped by 1.04 per cent. compared with the previous year.

Mr. Wallis-Smith: Why don't you give the figures, not the percentages?

Mr. KAUS: These are figures that I took out. I do not know how accurate they are, and they are not the latest figures.

Mr. Houston: Didn't you check their accuracy?

Mr. KAUS: They are sufficiently accurate. The hon. gentleman may check them if he wishes.

Anyone who thinks that travel on the roads is becoming safer is quite mistaken. Casualties on the roads have risen more slowly than the use of motor vehicles, the main reason being that people have been using two-wheelers less and less in recent years. On the average, the rider of a bicycle, scooter or motor-cycle is much more likely to have an accident or involve someone else in an accident than are pedestrians or those who drive or ride in four-wheel vehicles. It is all to the good that people increasingly prefer the safer types of vehicles to the less safe.

If the present trends continue, we can expect to see 72,000 casualties in the next 10 years to 1978. As many people as the entire population of Charleville, Mareeba, Beaudesert and Longreach will die on the roads in the next 10 years, and as many as the total population of Townsville, Toowoomba, the Gold Coast and Rockhampton will be seriously injured in road accidents. How many more people will be killed on the roads before Christmas? I hope that no more will be killed, but hon. members know what some drivers are like—not only the young ones; the old ones, too.

Mr. Wright: Do you really know what they are like? That is what I have been pushing since I came into this Chamber.

Mr. KAUS: This is a personal approach to the question.

Mr. Wright: It is a big question.

Mr. KAUS: Yes, it is, and it is hoped that an answer will be found to it.

If the trends of the last 10 years are allowed to continue, I fear to forecast how many people will be injured on the roads by the end of the century. The figures are appalling, and we cannot tolerate the unnecessary pain, bereavements and human waste that result from road accidents, nor can we shoulder with equanimity the heavy economic burden that they impose. Death and injury deprive the nation of productive output, add to the costs of medical treatment, and occupy the time of the police and the courts. Costs attributable to road deaths and road injuries now amount to \$200,000,000 a year, and that does not take into account the suffering and grief that they cause. What will the bill be by the end of the next decade or the end of the century? Probably it will be astronomical. What is the outlook if we do nothing about it?

We know that the accident rate can be lowered and that the consequences of accidents can be made less severe. We must keep the totals down and work ceaselessly to reduce them. This will not be easy in the face of the rapid and continual growth in the use of vehicles. These are increasing in number every year.

I know that the Minister is looking at the problem. He knows that it is urgent and he will tackle it methodically and consistently. I hope he makes sure that, in planning to deal with the problem, he is as clear-minded and as scientific in his approach as he can be. He has to strengthen the organisational plan and co-ordinate effective action by educating people in the safe use of roads, by improving vehicles, and by making the environment of road users safer. We must apply what we already know directly, simply and objectively. At the same time, through research and experiment on those aspects where the greatest dividend can be gained, we must prepare the basis for a planned, continuing and co-ordinated attack.

I have here figures comparing deaths and injuries in Vietnam with those on Australian roads between July 1962 and 1968. Australian forces have been in Vietnam since 1962 and, up until 1968, 201 Australians have been killed and 874 injured in that area. Most of them were young men. During the same period, 6,780 young Australians under 25 years of age were killed in accidents on Australian roads, and 218,700 in the same age group were injured.

From this comparison it would seem that the university youths who devote so much time and energy to Vietnam protests would be better occupied if they channelled their efforts into a constructive attack on the major killer of Australian youth, namely, road accidents. In contrast with the vast sums expended on the Vietnam war, the Commonwealth Government makes a niggardly annual grant of about \$350,000 to the Department of Shipping and Transport, which is advised by the Australian Road Safety Council, one of the various State road-safety bodies receiving their hand-out from this small sum. The Federal body charged with the responsibility on a national scale is left with a little over \$200,000. This, of course, is insufficient to run an effective Press campaign, let alone a television campaign, even in one State.

Although education is by no means the final answer to reducing our road toll, the road-safety bodies must be given a much larger grant if they are to be at all effective. Our approach must be to find the facts and then seek out and apply effective remedies. With money and planning, road-safety measures must start with the facts. The finding of the facts, to some degree, involves police reports and local authorities. They can show what kinds of accidents are happening and where unsuspected trouble spots

show up. Once the pattern has been identified, the underlying reason can be sought—enough for research. We then must look for counter-measures and this involves a wide range of possibilities, such as legislation, regulation and the enforcement of traffic rules, training and education, better road layout and maintenance, improvement in the design, equipment and upkeep of vehicles and, of course, people must go with the vehicles and the roads. To help people use the roads more safely, we have first of all to persuade them that their own behaviour on the roads can be a factor in reducing the number of accidents. This applies to pedestrians crossing roads as well as to the motor cyclist or the driver or a high-performance car.

The internal combustion engine has added a new flexibility to our system of communication, but it has also transformed our social life. It probably brings more forms of pleasure within the reach of more people than any other development of the 20th century. At the same time it demands new standards of responsibility if the gains are not to be thrown away in pain and loss. If only because opportunity is so great, we must induce sane social attitudes to the problem created by the motor-car, and we have to bring home to all road users the fact that anybody who has not learned to use the road safely is not equipped for modern life.

In conclusion, I remind all members that in driving a car the driver is, in effect, a computer who is measuring constantly changing situations as he drives along the road. I hope that this Bill will improve the driving of the junior members of the community. I am sure that, with time, that can be achieved. I commend the Minister on his introduction of the Bill.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (11.1 p.m.): Being docile in nature, I do not want to buy into any argument between the Minister for Transport and the hon. member for Salisbury on the reasonably fair mention by the Minister in his opening remarks of the hon. member for Merthyr. As I say, the Minister was fair; but he would have been a good deal fairer if he had given credit to all members who have taken a great interest in legislation of this type as shown in the speeches that they have made. I do not want to list the hon. members concerned because we all know who they are. As always, when particular persons are mentioned a certain number are omitted. However, I do not want to get involved in that argument because normally I am a placid person.

Mr. Sherrington: You will agree that I won on a technical knock-out.

Mr. BROMLEY: I agree with the hon. member for Salisbury that he won on a technical knock-out. I have won on a complete knock-out.

In introducing the Bill the Minister said that approximately 250 instructors were connected with driving schools and that something like 57 driving schools were in operation throughout Queensland.

The hon. member for Merthyr referred to Frank Douglas, the President of the Driving School Guild. I know him very well and I know that he conducts his driving school very efficiently. In passing, I might mention that my daughter entered a charity contest as Miss Ace Driving School, and she raised a tremendous sum for charity, the greater amount of which went to the Blind School, Narbethong.

Obviously this legislation is introduced as a result of meetings of the committee on driving improvement, and I congratulate the members of the committee, who met regularly over the years and made findings of tremendous importance. I know that the Minister has been very keen about its activities. I want to refer to the committee's second report, which is compiled in an excellent manner, as was its first report.

At this stage I have very few suggestions to offer. I did intend to deal with this matter during the transport Estimates debate, but did not have the opportunity to do so. As the Minister was throwing bouquets around earlier, I feel it incumbent upon me to read a letter that I received from him.

The letter states—

"Dear Mr. Bromley,

"In January, 1967, I forwarded to you a copy of the original Report on Policy and Procedures for the Promotion of Driver Improvement and Road Safety through Licensing and Enforcement prepared by the Committee on Driving Improvement.

"I was pleased to subsequently receive your interesting comments on the proposals outlined therein.

"The Committee's Revised Report on Driver Improvement has now been received from the Commonwealth Department of Shipping and Transport.

"Enclosed herewith is a copy of that Report on which I would appreciate your further comments in due course."

Mr. Campbell: That is a very courteous letter.

Mr. BROMLEY: That is so. I appreciate the Minister's action in sending it.

I have not much time to devote to the report but I should like to deal with one or two items in it. I wish to refer firstly to the age of learners. This matter is referred to in section 60 of the report, which says that there should be a uniform minimum age throughout Australia for the issuing of driver's licences in the various classes. While that may apply to "P" plates, I will not deal with them, but nothing appears in that paragraph dealing with ages about requiring

a person wishing to obtain a licence to produce proof of age when applying for that permit or licence. Something should be done about that.

During the debate on the liquor laws today, it was stated that a person under the age of 21 can go to a hotel—no-one knows he is under 21—and be given a drink. Virtually the same circumstances apply to the issuing of licences. I do not know whether prosecutions have been launched, but I understand that instances have been discovered of people under the age of entitlement to a learner's permit who have received such a permit and have eventually received a driver's licence.

Section 73 of the report refers to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads in the United States acting in co-operation with the States, and operating a National Driver Register Service. That is an excellent point, as is the one in section 76, which I will not deal with tonight.

I now wish to deal with a few remarks made by the Minister when introducing the Bill. Some members have commented on statements made by organisations and hon. members about high-school driver training. If the Minister is "fair dinkum" about reducing the road toll, he should confer with the Minister for Education and align his thinking and that of the Minister for Education and the Government generally to the great and most imperative need for driving tuition in high schools. We have put this suggestion forward in the House on many occasions. It seems to have been completely ignored or to have fallen on deaf ears. Many organisations support it.

I refer to the November issue of "The Road Ahead", which contains an article headed "Negative Approach by Queensland Education Department to School Driver Tuition." It deals with the policy adopted by the Australian Automobile Association at its meetings in Victoria and Queensland, and, as it has been referred to tonight, I shall not canvass it.

If we proceeded with this idea, we would need the services of teachers who are fully qualified in instructing people how to drive or of licensed commercial driving instructors, and although the latter would cost some money, they could be a means of saving many lives. We could also produce drivers who would be thoroughly versed in road-safety techniques. Any sincere attempt to save lives should be considered by all hon. members, including the Minister, who I believe is properly concerned about our tragic road toll.

I wish to refer briefly to a question I asked in the House on 14 October relative to the number of applicants for driving licences and the number of driving schools that were operating. The Minister for Works gave me a detailed and helpful answer.

Mr. Sherrington: He did not simply say "Yes" and "No".

Mr. BROMLEY: No. Unlike some Ministers, he gave me a detailed answer. He said—

"The estimated number of driving schools operating in Brisbane is slightly in excess of fifty. There is no requirement for the registration of the driving schools by reason of the fact that they are driving schools, but persons carrying on business under name other than their own name or names are required to register such business name with the Registrar of Business Names under the Business Names Acts."

Will the schools be required to register not only with the Department of Transport but also with the Registrar of Business Names?

In an earlier part of his answer, the Minister said—

"The average failure rate for the last twelve months at Rosalie was 36.86 per cent. and at Coorparoo 47.85 per cent."

That might give hon. members some food for thought. I do not know the reason for that. Possibly the civilian testers at Coorparoo are more thorough than the ones on the other side of the city. Certainly, from my own knowledge and from talking to members of driving schools, I know that the testers at Coorparoo do a very thorough job. The high failure rate makes one wonder whether those who obtain their licences are in fact only slightly more competent than those who fail, or whether they are less nervous when they go for their test. I think it was the hon. member for Townsville North who mentioned nervousness in applicants as a possible reason for the high failure rate.

In my opinion, if the Government is "fair dinkum" about decreasing the tragic toll of the road, everything has to be tried, and I appeal to the Minister to use his good graces in Cabinet to have more police officers put on the roads. Without doubt, the sight of a police uniform is a deterrent to any would-be breaker of the traffic regulations. I read in a newspaper, which I cannot find at the moment, that in New South Wales, in which a really massive road-safety programme has been undertaken, considerable success has been achieved by appointing an additional 150 traffic policemen to watch for traffic breaches. The road toll in that State has been considerably reduced.

I believe that a special area should be set aside specially for the training of drivers, whether they be high-school students or pupils of registered driving schools. That has been done in one State in Australia, and overseas. It is no use saying that no vacant land is available for the purpose. There is any amount of it available in Brisbane, and right throughout the rest of Queensland.

One thing that annoys me very much about driving instructors is the way they use parked vehicles in teaching their pupils how to back into parking spaces. Only the other day when I was walking up the street I saw a car scratched by a pupil of a driving school who

was endeavouring to park a vehicle. Many friends of mine have told me that on returning to their parked cars, both during the day and at night, they have found on them dents and scratches that were not there when they left them. A great deal of damage is done to parked cars by learner-drivers being instructed by driving schools. This instruction is going on, of course, day and night, Saturdays and Sundays included.

Another thing being done by some driving-instruction schools, which incidentally appear to spring up like mushrooms overnight, is using, in spite of instructions to the contrary by the Commissioner of Police and his department, areas around schools in all electorates. I refer particularly to the vicinity of Villanova College because of the nature of the area. Any hon. member who knows the avenues over there knows that some of them are very steep. When all is said and done, I suppose they would be ideal for teaching learner-drivers to take off uphill from a parked position. Nevertheless, because of the danger associated with teaching people to drive in the vicinity of schools, I made representations to have the practice stopped. The Commissioner of Police sent letters to the various testing centres, and driving schools were told that they were not to drive round that area because of the danger to children. They were told that repeatedly by Sergeant Roy Tomkinson, who was in charge of the Coorparoo Police Station (incidentally he did a wonderfully good job while he was there), but I do not know whether the new sergeant in charge has issued similar instructions. In fact, the instructors are using the area again and I am receiving complaints from many worried mothers in the area.

As I said, the driving schools seem to use this area a good deal because of the steepness of the avenues. Anyone watching regularly, as I do when I receive complaints, can see the dangers that exist not only to the children but also to the drivers who are receiving instruction. I am sure that the Minister realises that possibility. I have seen motor-cars endeavour to take off from the steep hillsides and run back 20 yards down the hill. Unfortunately for me, one day I was parked down the hill and, perhaps fortunately for the woman who was learning to drive, the car came down and hit the bumper bar of my car. Probably my car prevented the other car from going even further down the hill.

The car concerned did not have dual controls, nor was the woman pupil using a seat belt. I have watched many of the driving instructors from the various schools—there are too many for me to name them all—time after time, and I have spoken to many of them. I have watched them for one purpose in particular. The Minister knows that I and others are as concerned as he is about the wearing of safety belts in cars, and I can state that the instructors do not, as far as I can see, encourage their pupils

to wear them or wear them themselves. I think it is a point that could be made to driving instructors as soon as possible.

An article appeared in the official journal of the R.A.C.Q. reporting on a survey conducted by a doctor. He said that only one driver in 10 uses a seat belt. I should say that fewer than one driver in 10 uses a seat belt in the metropolitan area. On Sundays, I have made a point of going out to the Pacific Highway and watching the cars going to the South Coast. I should say that one in 10 would be a fair figure for people going on long journeys. If they get in a car to make a trip to the South Coast or the Sunshine Coast, they are more inclined to wear safety belts than they are if they are travelling only for a short distance in the suburbs. As I said, I have made a careful study and I can honestly say that that is what happens. Despite a great deal of newspaper publicity and many exhortations from the Minister asking people to wear safety belts, unfortunately they do not wear them.

I express my gratitude to the Press for the tremendous job they have done in endeavouring to break down today's tragic road toll. In many ways they do a very good job. They publish photographs that, to my way of thinking, shock people into realising what can happen through not wearing seat belts and for other causes.

I now want to refer briefly to the report of the Department of Main Roads which, at page 7, mentions traffic accidents. It is headed "Traffic Accidents" and reads—

"The Technical Advisory Committee which was established under authority of the Traffic Acts, makes recommendations to the Minister for Transport on matters relating to the operation of the Traffic Act and Regulations. An important aspect of the Committee's work concerns measures for the safety of road traffic. The underlying causes of traffic accidents are being sought and the Traffic Branch is involved in a program of investigation aimed at evaluating causes as they are related to the driver, vehicle and road environment."

Finally, I want to say that I personally, anyhow, and I am sure other members also, would be most appreciative if the Minister, at a later stage, supplied further information on the technical advisory committee and gave the committee the details in which we would all be so interested.

(Time expired.)

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton South) (11.27 p.m.): I rise to support this legislation, which I believe is long overdue. However, I am somewhat disappointed with the short preamble given by the Minister. Having regard to the importance of such legislation, I should have thought he would give the committee more detail. I am also disappointed with the criticism by members of the Government. They seem to think we

cannot criticise legislation if we are in agreement with its principles. Anyone who is objective in his thinking may still be able to see the need for some improvement.

The hon. member for Merthyr, thanks to compliments paid to him by the Minister, rose to his feet and started to blow his own trumpet. I ask him what he has to skate about if, as he said, as a Government member it took him 10 years to obtain this legislation. The same member advised us to hasten slowly. He should beware lest we start to call him "Sam the Tortoise". He says that possibly the best thing to do with this type of legislation is to phase it in, but phasing, unless properly programmed, will always lead to procrastination.

The hon. member for Windsor gave us some information about Victoria and the traffic scene down there. The hon. member for Hawthorne was somewhat casual in his attitude to the road toll. He gave figures of 50,300, or something like this, as though he were reading a thermometer. He finished up by saying that the road toll had slightly increased and that the Government had done a good job in the city. Yet to date this year, 137 people have died in Brisbane. He then devoted the rest of his speech to Vietnam.

I support the legislation for a number of reasons, firstly, from the aspect of the road toll. The "Telegraph" of 2 December, 1969, discloses that, up to this date, this year 514 people have died on our roads. This is in 335 days. Last year 419 deaths occurred. As the hon. member for Salisbury said, members of the Opposition will support anything that will assist in cutting the road toll. It is the responsibility of every member here to do something about reducing it. We must introduce legislation that will not only protect people on the road but will also cut the road toll. As well, we must look at the failure rate of driving schools, which is what the Bill is all about.

In 1968-69, 29,300 people applied for drivers' licences, and of that number 43.98 per cent. failed to obtain licences. That percentage represents approximately 12,900 people. The important point is that of that number, 7,628 had received lessons from commercial driving schools. That figure represents almost 60 per cent. In other words, six people out of 10 who attended driving schools for training failed to obtain drivers' licences.

In reply to a question on 11 November, 1969, the Minister for Works said that the reason for the failure was mainly inexperience in the control of the motor vehicle and also the failure to comply with the various provisions of the traffic regulations. Surely those are two of the main aspects that must be taught. If nearly 8,000 people fail after having been trained at commercial driving schools and are still inexperienced in controlling a motor vehicle or still fail to comply with the traffic regulations, it is quite obvious that something must be done to correct that situation.

In addition, we must protect the public from unscrupulous driving schools. Tonight an hon. member pointed out that a large amount of money is made by unscrupulous driving schools and that their business is a profitable one; therefore, I think that the legislation is timely. It is time that we started to protect the thousands of people who attend driving schools and give away many dollars in trying to learn how to drive a car.

Obviously the Bill is important to the whole State. As the Minister said, 57 driving schools operate in Queensland, and of that number, 20 operate outside Brisbane.

Another important aspect is that of the 514 people who have died on Queensland roads this year, 377 were killed outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. Kaus: Have you any figures on how many were trained in driving schools?

Mr. WRIGHT: No, only the failure rate.

It is apparent that there is a need for the legislation to provide for a severe test of the instructor's ability to instruct. I asked the hon. member for Merthyr a number of questions about this, but in reply he gave only generalisations. It seems that everybody realises the importance of ensuring that instructors know how to teach other people to drive, but I would like to know how this ability will be assessed. Therefore, I ask the Minister to tell us exactly how the committee, commission, or whatever it is called, will assess the teaching ability of the instructors. It is important that we have a high standard of instructor in order to produce better drivers on the road.

Mr. Kaus: Don't you agree that not all instructors are good instructors?

Mr. WRIGHT: That is quite obvious. If something like 60 per cent. of pupils fail their driving tests, many of the instructors cannot be good ones. I know that one member pointed out that this comes back to the personality of the pupil and to the fact that because of nerves, he finds difficulty in passing the examination. It must come back on the drivers themselves. However, this failure rate must be lowered. No-one likes to go to any school and pay \$20 or \$50 to learn something and then fail an examination at the end of the course.

As well, we must put an end to the driving-instructor racket. The hon. member for Norman emphasised this when he referred to the number of driving schools that have sprung up. Over the last couple of years they have sprung up everywhere, and it seems that anyone can run a driving school. The trouble is that bad driving is contagious, and bad road habits are so easily passed on.

I think we should commend the excellent schools that exist. We are always ready to criticise but we should realise that 40 per cent. (even though it is a small percentage)

of those who enrolled at these schools passed the course. It is quite obvious that there are some instructors who know their job.

Following the test of the instructor's ability, I believe a need exists for a school for driving instructors. The hon. member for Windsor does not agree with that idea. He believes that it is quite all right for a progressive State like Queensland to rely on Victoria. It is a pity that we cannot stand on our own feet. Surely we can establish, as urged by other hon. members tonight, something like the school at Mt. Lawley, or the one in New South Wales.

Mr. R. E. Moore: You are misquoting me.

Mr. WRIGHT: What did the hon. member say?

An Opposition Member: He does not know.

Mr. WRIGHT: The hon. member does not know. We will let it go at that.

Such a school should be established by the Government. If the Government is opposed to running such a school, it should be run by an organisation similar to the R.A.C.Q., or by the guild to which the hon. member referred. Again, I believe the Government must render some financial assistance to such a centre. Whoever establishes it and runs it, we need such a course and a training centre where people, whether they are instructors or ordinary drivers, can be trained properly.

When a course is established the Government should continually check the standard of the driving schools. We have heard that they are to be registered and we have been told that instructors are to be given a special licence. But what is the use of these licences if they are not checked continually? I should like the Minister to tell me what policing will be undertaken when the schools are registered and the instructors are licensed, and who will carry out the inspecting.

The Government must accept further responsibility in other aspects of this legislation. There is a need for a Government-sponsored school, for Government-sponsored checking, and for a Government-sponsored course which, in the main, could be adhered to by the schools.

The member for Salisbury referred to a number of matters that should be taught. I should like to stress the importance of tuition in driving, both theoretical and practical, road law, and the mechanics of vehicles themselves. We must look into other aspects even though most people go to a school to learn how to drive a motor-car. Many others, who perhaps are in the minority, attend the schools to learn how to drive a bus, a semi-trailer, a motor-bike, an end-loader, or a forklift. The instructors should be capable of teaching them how to drive these vehicles.

I know that other hon. members wish to speak tonight and that we are racing time. I commend the Minister for putting the spotlight on the individual. I believe that is

what this legislation does. We have heard much about the need for better roads and better road rules. I do not wish to dampen enthusiasm on those matters, but, at long last, this legislation is placing the emphasis on the individual, and at long last we are realising that the individual plays the major part in our road carnage.

I have mentioned in earlier speeches the need to look at the personality traits of people. Even if it takes me 10 years, as it has taken the hon. member for Merthyr, I hope that, at the end of that time, we will have some test by which we can assess the personality traits of drivers. Not only should we establish a school where teachers can be taught how to instruct, but we should also have a course to cull out applicants. Driving will then be regarded not as a right but as a privilege.

I hope that the emphasis on instruction may eventually spread to all high schools, which at present is not encouraged by the Education Department. I referred to this earlier in the session, but it is time we realised its importance. The emphasis on driver-training should continue and it should flow into our high schools and be sponsored and supported by the Department of Education.

Mr. R. Jones: Were you not awarded a Rotary scholarship or some such award in 1967 relative to road safety?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, I was. I do not believe, however, that this makes me an expert on the matter, but I have had some personal experience.

Finally, I hope that this legislation and what the Minister has in mind relative to driving schools will do something to stop the butchery on the bitumen.

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (11.40 p.m.): I wish to speak to this Bill only briefly because most aspects have been covered by previous speakers. I am pleased to see that Queensland has joined the other States in legislating for the registration of commercial driving schools and the licensing of commercial driving instructors. It is important that instructors impart to their pupils not only a knowledge of driving techniques and road laws but also a proper attitude to road safety and road courtesy.

This legislation will attract instructors of a higher standard because they will now feel that they are protected to a certain degree. It will also protect the public against being fleeced by people who are not competent to teach driving. Many driving schools have not been competent to teach. The hon. member for Rockhampton South quoted figures to show that over 60 per cent. of drivers who learnt at commercial schools failed in their tests. This shows the necessity for the legislation that the Minister is introducing.

The main responsibility rests with the examining officers. Regardless of how well the driving instructor teaches his pupil, the

examining officer will have the last say on who is and who is not competent to drive on the road. Therefore, these testers should be of the highest possible standard in Queensland.

I understand that the Minister sent three Department of Transport officers to Victoria to be instructed in testing so that they could return to Queensland to test driving instructors.

Mr. R. Jones: They should go overseas.

Mr. MILLER: I do not believe that they should go overseas. I think that we are capable of doing this. I am informed that one of these officers topped the course with 98 per cent.

Mr. Wright: We should set one up in Queensland?

Mr. MILLER: No. I do not think that the demand is great enough at present to require such a school.

Mr. Wright: Do you think it will be done in the near future?

Mr. MILLER: As our population grows we will certainly need a school in Queensland. However, at present, the instructors at Rosalie and Coorparoo should go to Victoria. As the hon. member for Norman said, different standards apply at Rosalie and Coorparoo.

The hon. member for Salisbury doubted whether some of these instructors would be competent at 21 years of age. I remind him that they will have to pass a strict test before they are allowed to train learner-drivers. Driving instructors are tested in New South Wales and South Australia on driving competence, knowledge of the road, knowledge of the laws, and instructing ability. In Tasmania, the Tasmanian Transport Commission carries out a written examination on traffic laws, and a test to establish ability to operate a vehicle. In Western Australia applicants are required to have a certificate of competency issued by the National Safety Council of Western Australia. As has already been mentioned, Queensland testers will be tested in Victoria, and I believe that the Victorian standard is the highest in Australia. I should like the Minister in his reply to comment on the standing of the Victorian school in Australia, and perhaps the world.

We are talking tonight about the testing of driving instructors. I believe that whilst that may play a small part in reducing the road toll, it will not be reduced significantly till there is also testing of cars. That has been mentioned many times in this Chamber. I do not intend to claim that I introduced it, because I did not; to my knowledge, it was the hon. member for Norman who first did that. Far too many cars are sold to innocent young drivers who are now being listed as responsible for a high percentage of road accidents.

Mr. Tomkins: They drive too fast.

Mr. MILLER: Some might. Many do not understand the mechanics of a vehicle, nor do I suggest, as some have, that drivers should learn them. I believe that people should be able to buy a vehicle and know that it is safe to drive on the road. Surely that is not asking too much.

Mr. Tucker: Did you notice that at one time one of the motoring journals listed the faults found in new cars that had just been purchased?

Mr. MILLER: The sales manager of Arnold Degen Pty. Ltd. told me of the faults found in new motor vehicles before they are delivered to buyers. The number is surprising. I give Arnold Degen full credit for employing a man specially to pick up the cars and inspect them before they are taken to Arnold Degen's premises. In spite of that inspection, many faults are found that have to be rectified before the cars can be sold.

Mr. O'Donnell: The R.A.C.Q. does the same thing.

Mr. MILLER: It might, too. The R.A.C.Q. tested a vehicle for a Miss Campbell, a very young girl from Bulimba. Miss Campbell is 17, and I do not suppose that she could be expected to know very much about the mechanics of a motor vehicle. When the vehicle was inspected, the rear brake hose was found to be leaking and, among other things, the foot brake pedal depressed fully to the floor upon application. No road test could be carried out because of the condition of the foot brake, steering, tyres and exhaust system. The report concludes, "This vehicle is considered unroadworthy and dangerous in its present condition. Faults listed do not conform to the Queensland traffic regulations."

We are introducing tonight legislation governing the testing of driving instructors. I am sorry that road safety and the inspection of motor vehicles do not come under the administration of one Minister. The Minister for Transport is responsible for road safety, whilst the Minister for Labour and Tourism handles the inspection of motor vehicles. Surely the inspection of motor vehicles should come under the Minister in charge of road safety. If all these matters were under the control of one Minister, perhaps I would not get into trouble, as I sometimes do now.

The hon. member for Salisbury and other hon. members mentioned the need for a traffic course in which drivers could learn to overcome problems with which they will be faced daily on the roads. At present, people learn to drive on the roads at about 30 miles an hour. They do not learn to overcome for example, a skid that may occur in wet weather. A young driver may face many difficulties in uncertain weather, and I certainly support the request made by other hon. members for a driving course.

Mr. Wright: Do you think that course could also be used in secondary schools?

Mr. MILLER: Yes. I cannot see any harm in young people learning to drive as early as possible. In my opinion, the driving schools could be asked to pay a fee for the use of such a course, and I think they would be prepared to pay it. They must be concerned about the number of accidents that occur with inexperienced drivers on the road—I have seen a number of them when coming to attend sittings in this Chamber—and I am sure that they would much rather have a track or a course to which they could take learner-drivers and get them used to a vehicle before taking them out onto the road.

A Bill dealing with the issue of provisional licences is to be introduced later. I have asked on other occasions for the use of reflectorised number plates on vehicles because I believe that they are very necessary on dark roads at night. When provisional number plates are introduced, I hope that they will be reflectorised so that they can be recognised easily both at night and during the day. Police and oncoming vehicles would be able to recognise them quickly. In the interest of road safety, I should like to see reflectorised material used more than it is in Queensland at the moment.

An hon. member opposite referred to the disqualification from driving of persons who fail to conform to the laws. That is another area in which a considerable reduction in the road toll could be achieved. I mentioned in a debate earlier this session the number of people who have appeared in Court three times in 12 months charged with drink-driving offences. As I said then, I do not believe that a person such as that should have his licence restored automatically at the end of the three-month, six-month, or 12-month period of disqualification. He should be subjected to a test before his licence is restored. In fact, I believe that any consistent traffic offender should lose his licence and that before he again receives a licence, he should have to prove in a test that he is suitable to drive on the roads.

Opposition Members: Oh, no!

Mr. CASEY (Mackay) (11.54 p.m.): Although hon. members opposite say "Oh, no!" because of the time and that I have risen to take part in the debate, I intend to give the committee the benefit of my personal experience in the field of driving. I shall not have to resort to reading from correspondence, or from miss so-and-so's report, or from a report of what happened at a meeting of the Sunday afternoon drivers' guild. I prefer to discuss some of the points that have been mentioned during the debate and some points that I think the Minister did not cover fully in his introductory speech. Perhaps the proposed Bill makes provision for them; perhaps it does not. It is logical to believe that they would be included.

As I said, I intend to give some points from my own experience as a driver.

Despite my youthfulness, I can assure hon. members that I will test my ability and skill as a driver of anything from a motor-bike to a road-train against that of any other member. I have been quite adept at this and have earned my living driving heavy trucks and semi-trailers for a considerable number of years on roads throughout this State and others in the countryside and in the cities.

The hon. member for Windsor claimed that speed was the cause of all accidents on our roads and then he and other Government members gave detailed statistics of road accidents and deaths that are available to any member in the Parliamentary Library and are published in the Press from time to time. They do not need repetition in the Chamber. I should say that the first and most important need for any driving instructor licensed under this scheme—and, for that matter any driver—is the adoption of the proper common-sense attitude to his work and his driving on the road while in charge of a vehicle. The second most important aspect is his experience and his capacity to control the vehicle under his command. These go hand in hand.

If we apply this to the proposal in the Bill, I believe the provisions outlined by the Minister do not go far enough. I feel that a provision for the grading of instructors should be included in the Bill; this is essential.

The hon. member for Salisbury and others referred to the youthful age at which an instructor could obtain a licence. I certainly would support the suggestion that a 21-year-old who perhaps qualified after being tested as a driving-instructor on semi-articulated vehicles would not have the experience to carry out that aspect of his driving instructor's licence. Therefore, I think it would be necessary to apply gradings to cover teaching for various types of licences. Such a provision may be in the Bill; I do not know. The Minister did not give much explanation on that aspect in his introduction.

I do not need to be specific for the benefit of the Minister or anyone else about what I mean by grading based on experience in a particular field of work, but driver-instruction in different types of country must also be taken into consideration. I know that the hon. member for Gregory and others from far-flung areas of the State would know and appreciate, as I do, that in those areas a person who has driving instruction, whether it be in a school, through his business, or through his family, is not required, during any period of his training to go through some of the hazards encountered by persons learning to get instructors' licences or even learning to drive in Brisbane. I know of the case of one person who worked for me. He was an excellent driver. He could drive any type of truck in the country areas. He came with me to Brisbane at one time, and for the first time in his life saw a set of traffic lights and did not know what they were all about. Yet that man,

for a number of years, held a licence to drive an articulated vehicle in this State. I think there should be incorporated in the Bill a code or standard that takes into account the driver's ability. It is difficult to establish a set standard for both the country and the city, but, I believe the Minister should study it very closely.

There is a good deal of difference between the ability of an instructor or a driver to drive an automatic-transmission vehicle and their ability to drive a manual-transmission vehicle. I recall reading with mirth a newspaper report of an attempted robbery in the United States, when the gang of thieves that held up a bank had arranged for one fellow to steal a car and have it parked in a certain position so that the gang could make their get-away. That fellow "pinched" the car and placed it in position, and after the gang had robbed the bank they raced out and hopped into the get-away car, only to find that the fellow who had been given the job of driving it away could not do so because it was a manual-transmission vehicle and he had not learned to drive one. Needless to say, the robbery was thwarted. The story illustrates my contention that there is a tremendous difference between driving a car with automatic transmission and one with manual transmission. Under the present system in Queensland—and I presume that the same provisions will apply under the Bill, because nothing to the contrary has been indicated—licensed instructors and drivers will find that they are allowed to drive both automatic-transmission and manual-transmission vehicles. Some sort of qualification should be imposed either through the licence of the driver's school or through the driver's licence.

Perhaps the greatest anomaly of all is that no standard traffic code is observed throughout Australia, yet driving instructors are to be registered on their ability and knowledge to operate under the traffic Acts. I know that representatives of all States have held several committee meetings in order to implement a standard traffic code and that quite a number of matters still need to be sorted out, so I appeal to the Minister to do all he can to speed up the adoption of a standard traffic code throughout Australia.

As many hon. members have pointed out, to qualify for an instructor's licence as envisaged by the Bill a person will have to undergo a standard traffic test based on a standard traffic code for the whole of the Commonwealth. Therefore, a standard is set for both driving instructors and drivers.

It has been pointed out that under the Bill the instructors and not the driving schools are being licensed. Perhaps the Minister could look at that aspect a little further. The Bill should provide strict control on the retesting of instructors for the renewal of licences. I do not know what the period of the licence is. Would it be 12 months?

Mr. Knox: Twelve months.

Mr. CASEY: It is not like a driver's licence, which is for 10 years?

Mr. Knox: No.

Mr. CASEY: Every 12 months a driving instructor will be required to renew his licence. I do not know whether the instructor will be compelled eventually to undergo a medical examination. Driving instruction is particularly suited to retired people receiving superannuation benefits who can get some money together to purchase cars and be registered as driving instructors. While many elderly people are quite capable of driving, those who are qualified in their later years as driving instructors should be required to undergo a medical test before having their licence renewed.

Anybody in the community who is a qualified driver can set himself up as a driving instructor or a driving school, so I believe that legislation should be enacted to insist that the cars that are used as instruction vehicles be fitted with dual controls.

I have a few other comments to make. Many other problems have been raised tonight but, speaking as a driver who has travelled long distances over roads in our State, I believe that one of the worst problems in the community today arises because anyone who qualifies under a driving instructor and gets his licence is licensed immediately not only to drive a vehicle but to tow a unit. Anyone who travels from here to Cairns, particularly on the narrow sections of the road, knows that more hazards and more accidents are caused in country areas, and even in the western areas, by trailers and caravans. I have seen this frequently over a number of years. I made the point earlier about country drivers in the city; however city drivers find it much harder to drive in certain country areas than around the city. People who are used to city driving are qualified to tow a trailer or caravan on the State highways. I maintain that, in the main, many of them are a definite danger on the road and cause a considerable number of accidents. Some provisions could be included in the driver instruction courses, and the licensing of drivers, so that only those who qualify under a qualified instructor in the towing of caravans and trailers are allowed to tow units.

Mr. Kaus: You are referring to Sunday drivers?

Mr. CASEY: We heard a lot about them earlier in the debate.

In the Minister's introduction he referred to training in families. This matter was referred to by several hon. members, and it is a facet of driver training that is most important and should not be frowned upon. It is only natural that a skilled and qualified driver should be more concerned than licensed instructors about teaching a member of his family, or any person with whom he is closely connected or to whom he is

related, the proper, safe way to drive, because, finally, the profit motive is the driving force for driving schools. Family training is an important facet that should be encouraged by all means.

Much has been said in this debate about driver instruction generally and about whether instruction should or should not be incorporated in the school curriculum. I should like to mention a project that I have been personally associated with at the Mackay High School. The Mackay West Rotary Club undertook driver-training instruction for senior students at that school. It ran two courses a year with a vehicle kindly lent by one of the local motor-car dealers. It was taken to the high-school grounds every Saturday morning; the students came in droves to learn under the guidance of the more experienced members of the service club. I should like an assurance that no provision in this Bill will prevent such training being carried out. The project undertaken by the club is a commendable one. I know that other clubs throughout the State followed the example and are incorporating the same type of driver instruction in their yearly community-service projects to assist local high schools to teach the younger people not only the proper method of operating and driving motor vehicles but also the rudiments of a mechanical knowledge of the vehicles that they are required to operate.

[Wednesday, 3 December, 1969]

Mr. BALDWIN (Logan) (12.11 a.m.): I do not think that anyone could be blamed for wanting to say something on such an important matter as this introduced by the Minister for Transport. However, I have heard mentioned several times tonight, the possibility that the legislation outlined by the Minister might have some marked miraculous effect on road safety. I doubt this. I certainly hope it will, but I do not see any material ground for thinking that much will come of it in that direction. I can see that much will come of it for certain instructors, in the fees paid for registration and in the creation of a desirable monopoly for some by the mere fact that instructors have to be registered. However, we do not register school-teachers, university lecturers or the like because they have no monopoly of education.

The Bill implies that some of the present driving instructors, or some of those who will come into the field in this mushrooming season of driving instruction that seems to be with us in the larger centres, are not fit or are of bad character. It is not hard to believe this, judging from what I have heard here tonight and outside, especially from people who have been in the hands of some of them. One wonders at the origin of some of those coming into the milch field of driver instruction. I know that some have been either drop-outs or throw-outs from the Police Force. Others have been

unsuccessful salesmen or commercial travellers or taxi drivers. Many week-end instructors are drawn from various occupations. They are people who are trying to supplement their low wages or salaries or people on high wages or salaries simply trying to earn more.

Incidentally, school-teachers are in great demand as week-end and holiday instructors. This is significant in the light of what we have heard about the training of instructors and the desirability of their being more than "Do this, do that, and do what I do" men, to get below the surface of what it takes to reach a reasonable level and to have some chance of being a safe driver. We have heard figures of a failure rate as high as 60 per cent. This could be attributed in part to malpractice by some—few, I hope—unscrupulous instructors who, according to complaints I have had, deliberately arrange the failure of some, but not all, of their students. In that way they get them back for more lessons.

We must ask ourselves how many of those in the very high percentages of failures finish up as complete failures. I know of some who presented themselves three times and obtained their licences on the third occasion. The final percentage of failures might therefore be quite different from the initial failure rate.

The three months period of grace that the Minister mentioned as the change-over time might be all right for some instructors, but, if we assume from the implications of the Bill that there are some who are not good instructors, apart from temperament, but who might, with further training become good instructors, I am of the opinion that three months is too short a period. I do not mean that all should have a longer period if they do not need it. There might be some instructors who desire further training before registration, and I believe that they should be given the opportunity to get it, especially if teaching driving is their livelihood. I have no doubt that where this type of activity is a person's livelihood, the Minister's officers will be very careful to make full investigations before arriving at an adverse decision. Of course, some adverse decisions will have to be made in the light of what I have said.

We have heard much tonight of instructor-training. That, too, is more or less implied as being necessary by the very concept of the Bill. Reports show that most instructors merely instruct by the "Do as I do" method. I have stood and watched and listened to them, and I have thought how bad such instruction was. It turns young people into nothing better than automatons, with little understanding of the vehicle, conditions, reactions, limits and capabilities. Instructors of that type do not know how to do much better, simply because they are not trained teachers. Many think that, because they know how to drive, they have some miraculous ability to pass the knowledge on to all kinds of pupils under all

conditions. From my many years of experience as a teacher, I know that effective teaching by such persons is highly chancy.

I have had complaints that when instructors have found out that their pupils are in the higher grades at secondary school or at the university, or when they are older people or perhaps professional people (such as one whom I have in mind who was a ship's engineer but who had never driven a car), they were persuaded to go to other instructors. That rather puzzled me till I found out in the course of conversation that some instructors do not want intelligent pupils. They want what might be called the "imitation" learner, because he is quick to learn. The instructor is concerned only with teaching him some superficial skills, such as putting out his hand or putting on the blinkers at the right time, changing gears at the right time (which is not very difficult with a modern synchromesh gearbox), and avoiding close scrapes in traffic. Finally he runs the gauntlet with the testing officer, and he is then off the hands of the instructor, who takes on his next pupil.

On the other hand, anybody who applied intelligence to such an important matter as learning to drive might turn out to be an embarrassment to many instructors I know. Of course, as instructors are paid by the hour, one would think that they might welcome questions because the more questions asked the more money an instructor could expect to receive.

I know from both instructors and pupils that not all instructors take their students out in all kinds of natural conditions. In these days when long-distance driving is becoming more common, the average run of drivers will encounter a wide variety of road and weather conditions. But some instructors do not even take their pupils out at night; some, perhaps wisely, refuse to allow them to go onto a crowded street and experience conditions that we, as parliamentarians, drive under most of the time.

At present instructors cannot be forced to take students out in all kinds of weather. As hon. members have heard, some of the driving schools are receiving quite a large rake-off, and I suggest that they could well plough it back into the industry and purchase driving areas in which all conditions of lighting, weather, terrain, traffic, narrow streets, winding streets, and so on, could be simulated. It may be said that I am jumping too far into the future, but I think my suggestion should be given due consideration, especially in the light of what the hon. member for Norman said about instructors making use of public facilities and private property to train their students, with the resultant danger to children and others.

Mr. Sullivan: Where do you think the first responsibility lies in teaching young people to drive?

Mr. BALDWIN: I am coming to that.

Mr. Sullivan: You have taken a fair while to do so. Where do you think it actually lies? Don't you think that the responsibility lies with the parents?

Mr. BALDWIN: Through you, Mr. Hooper, may I ask the Minister who has interjected this question: does he think that all parents are equally well equipped to instruct their children in many fields? As a matter of fact, as a teacher, I have had parents say to me, "I don't know how you taught my kid that. I never could.", and it has been something relatively simple. It is well known that once children reach teen age the first people they tend to question are those closest to them—their parents—and it is a wise child who can learn from his own parent, and it is a very clever parent who can teach his own child. On the other hand, trying to palm off onto parents some of the responsibility that the Government should be taking shows a lazy attitude.

Mr. Sullivan: A lazy attitude—I like that! I was told to expect comments such as that from the hon. member.

Mr. BALDWIN: I will retract that. I know that the Minister is not lazy.

Mr. Sullivan: Are you suggesting that the responsibility should be taken away from the parents?

Mr. BALDWIN: Perhaps I did not fully answer the Minister's question. I am not denying that most parents would feel they are responsible; but do not forget that it is all very well to say this when, in this fast-changing modern world, responsibility is limited by the conditions under which we can fulfil it. We should never lose sight of that. Schools in general everywhere are fast taking over the responsibility of parents even to teaching elementary hygiene such as not to pick the nose.

Mr. Sullivan: Oh!

Mr. BALDWIN: I have seen it. I have been a teacher for 20 years. It is not only my experience. I was president of the union and had analyses of information from all over the State, along those very lines, endeavouring to inquire just how far the area of responsibility of the average, reasonable parent could be expected to extend today. If the Minister doubts that, he should look to some of the inquest-court findings in cases of accident, child deaths, and so on. Very clearly, the question is raised in these matters. I agree with the Minister, who is very obviously interested in the matter. We all must be. We must question it to see just how far we can justly extend the responsibility of parents in this matter and many others.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. BALDWIN: I agree it is very important but I am simply questioning how far we can extend it.

On the matter of high-school training, which has been raised also, we have heard much criticism of the departmental attitude in apparently rejecting driver-training and instruction at high schools. Do not forget that nowadays most of our students leave high schools at the age of 17 years or earlier. Very few stay after 17 for any appreciable time and the traffic regulations make it quite clear that, except in certain special circumstances, the person who puts a child of under 17 at the wheel of a vehicle is personally responsible for that and for anything else that happens as a result of it.

When this was brought up, I as a teacher had no hesitation in saying, "You change the law to cover us all with sufficient compensation, and provide us with the necessary areas, equipment and training, and teachers in the department might well be asked to consider such a proposal."

Mr. Chinchin: Do you think this should be done in ordinary school hours?

Mr. BALDWIN: I have given a blanket answer to that if the hon. member would get out from under the blankets and listen.

Mr. Chinchin: That is typical.

Mr. BALDWIN: If the hon. member objects, I apologise. I will send him a special clean pull of my speech.

The hon. member for Salisbury mentioned hobby clubs, an area of necessary training in schools in which students can be given mechanical knowledge that would be of considerable assistance to them when they pass into the hands of instructors who are not willing or able to enter into this area of instruction. This too, of course, calls for a reorganisation, re-equipping and retraining of many of our teachers, to carry it out to any degree that would have a sufficiently large carry-over value. As a matter of fact, some schools go to the trouble of buying model plastic cars. They are see-through models that do not run, but every part is movable by manual control. These are of considerable interest and advantage to students. Some schools are even extending to actual cut-away models and are running rudimentary mechanical repair courses, which, of course, are very handy indeed.

As a teacher of physics in a high school, I always tried, wherever possible, to turn many of the theories of physics to practical use in areas where students would encounter them. Not the least of those theories were driving conditions and the way a vehicle would handle with certain friction and centripetal forces, acceleration, powers, and so on, measured with respect to gravity. The students appreciated this, for it put meaning into their course. Despite many of the criticisms that are made of our "useless" youth, I have not heard from them remarks like those I have heard here tonight.

Last but not least—and it is important because so few stop to think about it, and it has subtle implications and effects upon the whole area of road safety, car training and car handling—is social maturity in our environment. This matter is very important. To illustrate, I ask: how many accidents are caused by the hedge-hopper, the driver who moves ahead of one car at a time? He cannot beat anything else, and he has no other claim to fame than that he passed someone or shot out at an intersection ahead of another car and cut it off. I have heard the young lads skiting about this at school.

A Government Member: What are you going to do about it?

Mr. BALDWIN: It is a matter of social-maturity training. Contributing largely to social immaturity is the television commercial that advertises a certain petrol, a certain oil, or a certain car. The imitative factor that is transferred to many young drivers is far too strong. I do not think that even Government members, with their lack of knowledge of the theory of educating or teaching, will deny that one of the major learning processes is by sight. On television this major learning process is in action all the time, and on television we see those thrilling episodes of broadsides and jumps because someone had a certain car and used a certain oil or a certain petrol. That type of commercial has a carry-over effect on young viewers, and it should be counteracted. The Bill contains nothing to counteract that very real, widespread and subtly dangerous force and does nothing to create good drivers and maintain road security.

Mr. Sullivan: You were talking about social maturity and broadsides and jumps. How do you relate that to motor-cars?

Mr. BALDWIN: Many young people tend to imitate that subconsciously when they get behind the wheel of a vehicle, no matter how big or small it is or how new or old it is. I am saying this in all seriousness simply because, as a teacher, I have heard young people in groups discussing these things.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (12.35 a.m.): It seems that in drafting this legislation the Minister followed very closely the legislation in force in other States of Australia with the exception of Victoria where the licence period is three years, and the Minister intends to restrict it to 12 months. I do not know the reason for the longer qualifying period in Victoria, but obviously the Minister examined that aspect of the Victorian legislation and chose to restrict the period to 12 months, as is the case in other States.

Mr. BIRD: I rise to a point of order. Are we discussing the registration of driving instructors, or the issuing of "P" plates?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsden): We are discussing the registration of driving schools and the licensing of instructors.

Mr. MELLOY: I think the hon. member spoke before he woke.

I have been referring, as the Minister and every other hon. member realises, to the registration of driving instructors. The Minister specified 21 years of age as the minimum age for instructors. I think that age is a little young for an instructor, although I know that he could hold a licence for three years. I do not think a person has enough maturity at that age. An instructor has to gain the confidence of the pupil. Any person who is learning to drive must feel that the instructor has extensive driving experience. The instructor must have the maturity and knowledge so necessary to inspire confidence. Something more than driving experience or driving ability is needed by a person who is teaching others to drive. This task should be carried out by a person who is at least 25 years of age, as has been submitted by other speakers. That is an age at which most persons have achieved a degree of maturity and can cope with emergencies which so often arise when people are learning to drive. Instructors must have an expert knowledge of driving, and must also have the ability to impart that knowledge to their pupils. A person might be very competent and able to handle a car in such a way as to satisfy any examiner when applying for an instructor's licence and still not have the ability to impart knowledge to pupils.

Hon. members in this Chamber who have driven with me would readily assert that I am a most competent driver, but I attempted to teach members of my family to drive and gave up in disgust, or they did so. It is not easy for everyone to impart driving knowledge. An instructor must have tolerance and understanding, which apparently, I did not display when I was trying to teach members of my family. In the end, they went to driving schools. That is why I say the instructors must be mature.

Mr. Sullivan: It shocks me to hear that you have not enough tolerance to teach your own child to drive. It is a father's responsibility.

Mr. MELLOY: I have an excellent record as a driver. I think we should ignore the Minister's remarks because it is past his bedtime. In fact, the time has long past when the galahs on the other side of the Chamber should have been put back into their cages.

People being taught to drive by instructors are taken out onto the road where the instruction is given. They are trying to understand the gears and, at the same time, keep an eye on the kerb and the various road signs. I suggest the provision of training areas where they could be taught to

handle a car and to drive it properly before they go onto the road. They would then handle the car automatically and have to pay attention only to the road signs and the regulations they have to comply with. To do all of those things at once creates confusion. They should be taught to handle a car in an open paddock where there would be no risk of hitting any obstacles or persons. Then they should be taken onto the road to learn the road laws. In this way they would obtain licences much earlier.

I have heard of excessive sums being paid for driving instruction. I know of one person who paid \$120 to a school. In some cases, a driver has undertaken three tests before he has obtained a licence. I cannot say whether that is the result of poor instruction, but it leads to the view that the strict supervision and licensing of driving instructors is a step in the right direction.

I claim that many instructors are not qualified to teach people to drive and that this is the main reason for the high failure rate. Some schools are concerned at the number of times a learner undertakes a driving test; it is all grist to the mill for others. I imagine that a proportion of them are conscientious and scrupulous in this regard, but apparently many are not, and the public should be protected against these exploiters.

I think the Government should take a particular interest in fees, and fix the maximum total charge for driving lessons. That would curb some of the schools that do not hesitate to repeat lesson after lesson, and in many cases refuse to allow learners to go for their tests. I think it should be the responsibility of the Government to fix a maximum total fee.

That is all I wish to say at the moment. As I do not wish to delay the Committee unduly, I shall reserve further comment till I see the Bill.

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Transport) (12.46 a.m.), in reply: I should like to say first how much I appreciate the remarks of members generally in welcoming this legislation. There have been about 13 or 14 speakers, and they covered a fair range of subjects related to the Bill, as well as other matters of public interest. I do not intend to deal with every speaker in my reply, but rather, because quite a number of speakers spoke on the same subjects, with some important matters that have been raised.

One matter mentioned in the early stages was the failure rate among applicants for a driver's licence. It is in fact high. Figures were quoted from answers to questions asked in the House, and I believe that in recent times there has not been much change in the failure rate. I understand that those who go for their tests through the R.A.C.Q. have in recent times shown a failure rate lower than the average, which is about 40 per cent. in Brisbane.

One of the reasons for introducing this legislation is to try to raise the standard of the profession of instructing in driving, which is, I understand from my opposite numbers in other States, very much a profession. That should contribute to a reduction of the failure rate, assuming the first premise is correct. On the matter of the cost of courses, which was raised by a number of members, the failure rate is related to the cost because failure means that people have to repeat lessons. It has been suggested by several speakers that pupils who fail were not adequately prepared in the first place. It is hoped that raising the standard of driving instructors will reduce the failure rate, which will in turn reduce the total cost of learning to drive. That is part of the background to the legislation. It is true that many people fail in their driving tests because of nervousness and other psychological problems. Because of nervous problems that they are unable to overcome, some people never seem to be able to pass any sort of tests.

The standard of the examiners who will be examining driving instructors has been raised by several members. Four officers of the Department of Transport have already attended the course in Victoria, which is highly regarded throughout Australia. It is of five weeks' duration, and those officers came through with flying colours. That is the school in Victoria where examiners are trained for testing driving instructors, and I am pleased to be able to say that one of the men from the Department of Transport topped the school with very high marks. It has been possible to have examiners trained adequately at the school in Victoria, which has attained world recognition, and I believe that the standard of our examiners will be excellent.

The type of test has been referred to. In my opening remarks I referred to the fact that medical standards would be required, as well as an ability to teach. Of course, there will be oral, written and practical tests for the instructors.

Mr. Wright: How do you intend to assess a man's ability to teach? That was the main point I made.

Mr. KNOX: Certain criteria are used for that purpose. After all, these people are not being tested to assess their suitability to teach at a secondary school or a tertiary institution. Ability to communicate simple instructions to an ordinary person is all that is required. Most people with a number of other qualifications can do that, but the fact is that one has to discover whether or not they have the necessary ability. Some have not, and they should not pass the test. I do not intend to attempt to outline at this stage the professional requirements, other than to say that the persons concerned will be tested for their ability to communicate instructions to a pupil.

Driver-training courses have been introduced in quite a number of State high schools and denominational schools in this State.

Mr. Bromley: They are working on a voluntary basis, with the co-operation of motor-car firms.

Mr. KNOX: That is quite true. The hon. member for Mackay said that he did not want the work now being done in that field to be prejudiced by the introduction of the proposed Bill. If instructors are being rewarded for their services, they will, of course, have to be licensed. However, I should think it would be in the interests of the students at these schools if a licensed instructor could be engaged, because his ability to teach would be quite high.

Mr. Bromley: I think I made the point that they should have a licensed instructor.

Mr. KNOX: It is desirable. Voluntary workers who are not taking any monetary reward for their services will not come under the control of the proposed legislation and will not be in breach of it. As I said, I think it would be in the interest of the pupils if a licensed instructor was used.

Criticism of the minimum age of 21 for instructors puzzled me a little bit. Instructors must have a number of other qualifications. They must have held a driver's licence continuously for three years, be medically fit, and pass many other tests. The Bill provides that they shall not be less than 21 years of age. There is a similar provision in every other Australian State, and I cannot understand why hon. members opposite say that people of 21 are too young to give driving instruction.

Mr. Sherrington: How do you correlate that with what the insurance companies say?

Mr. KNOX: The criteria are different. Insurance companies are looking at a group of people, irrespective of the ability of the individuals in the group.

Mr. Wright: Wouldn't you think that a man of 21 would be too inexperienced to give instruction in driving a semi-trailer?

Mr. KNOX: Firms have instructors who are 21 years of age, or about that age, training people to drive semi-trailers. In the army, some of the instructors are under 21 years of age. The point is that men under 21 are flying the most modern aircraft in the world and performing very complicated tasks.

Mr. Sherrington: And they are specialising in one field, and one field only.

Mr. KNOX: That is correct, so age cannot be singled out as—

Mr. Wright: They have been trained specifically to do that.

Mr. KNOX: Yes. However, the point is that the hon. member is using only age as a criterion.

Mr. Sherrington: No, not at all.

Mr. KNOX: He is, and I think he is making a mistake. A person may be allowed to instruct down to the age of 21 years. The hon. member thinks that it should be 25 years, not 21. I do not agree with him. A person who passes the medical examination and all the other necessary tests should not be precluded from practising this vocation simply because he is under 25 but over 21 years of age.

Mr. Sherrington: At the same time, persons such as that would be attracting high loadings on their insurance.

Mr. KNOX: That is so.

Mr. Sherrington: It just does not add up.

Mr. KNOX: Insurance companies are looking at the whole range of people from 17 to 25 as a group. Many people of 17 years would not be any drag at all on the payments for that group yet they pay the same premium penalty as others in the group.

Mr. Sherrington: Conversely, the insurance companies would not take this premium penalty off a driving instructor who has proved himself.

Mr. KNOX: On the hon. member's argument, we should not have anyone under 21 in the Armed Services because of the tremendous responsibility they have there.

Mr. Sherrington: Don't start that argument; they are there against their will.

Mr. KNOX: Maybe. A question has been asked regarding registration of these driving schools. I think I should answer it. Of course, they will not be absolved from registration required by any other Act—whether as a firm, under the Shops and Factories Act, or any other law. They will have to meet their obligations in other directions.

Mr. Wright: You said that an instructor must have held a driver's licence for three years. Does this mean that to instruct in the driving of a bus he must hold a bus licence for three years?

Mr. KNOX: In my opening remarks I said he had to hold for that period a licence for the vehicle on which he wishes to give instruction. A person is licensed to drive different categories of vehicles. He will not be licensed to instruct on a vehicle for which he has not held a licence for that period.

I do not think there are any other salient features of the Bill that require answering at this stage. Of course, at the second-reading stage there will be opportunities to go into the legislation in greater detail.

Mr. Wright: What is your opinion about setting up in Queensland a driving instructors' school such as the one in Victoria?

Mr. KNOX: It is not a bad idea but we have not the number of people in this State who would be required to qualify for this type of operation. That is why we sent our men to Victoria. Only four were involved. We only have about 200 or 300 people in the whole State who want to be licensed. No doubt, in the course of time, driving instructors themselves, once they are licensed and have an association of licensed instructors, will sponsor some of the things that are being done in other States. They are sponsoring courses at the technical college and have other courses of a private nature.

Mr. Wright: Are those four men members of the Police Force?

Mr. KNOX: No, members of the Transport Department.

Motion (Mr. Knox) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Knox, read a first time.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah)—Minister for Transport (1 a.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Traffic Act 1949-68 in certain particulars." The purpose of the Bill is to provide for the issue and control of provisional driver's licences in this State, and this is in accordance with the Government's policy speech this year.

Provisional driver's licences are issued in all States except South Australia, and are not issued in the Commonwealth territories.

The amendments set out in the Bill are brief, and to implement the purpose only the inclusion of a definition of the words "provisional licence" is necessary to the principal Act, with the insertion of these words or words to a like effect where necessary in other sections of the Act.

The issue and administrative control of provisional licences will be incorporated in the traffic regulations. However, a statutory addition to the Traffic Act is necessary relative to the cancellation of a provisional licence in cases where the holder is found to have blood alcohol in his body in circumstances as provided by the drink-driving provisions of the Traffic Act (section 16A).

It must be clearly kept in mind that the issue and holding of a driver's licence is a privilege granted in law by the community and is not a right. A person obtaining his first licence at 17 years of age can hold the same licence by renewals of 10 years up to his 41st birthday and then obtain further

renewals until his 51st birthday, irrespective of any suspensions or disqualifications that occur in the meantime, unless he is disqualified for a period beyond his 41st birthday. It is proposed to issue further provisional licences for the first 12 months of the licence period, as is the case in New South Wales. A provisional licensee will be required at all times when driving to display a reflectorised plate with a red "P" on a white background on the front and rear of the vehicle that he is driving. I hold up a sample of that plate.

It is not proposed to restrict the speed at which a provisional licensee can drive below the maximum speed according to conditions applicable to any road or highway. In other words, like everybody else, he is required to obey the rules of the road as far as speed is concerned.

However, it is proposed to apply the existing demerit points system to the licensee and to stipulate that, when the provisional licensee accumulates four demerit points, his licence is cancelled.

If a provisional licensee is found in circumstances coming within the provisions of section 16 or 16A of the Traffic Act—the drink-driving provisions—and by breathalyser or blood test it is established that he has at the time a blood-alcohol content of .08 per cent. or more, or refuses in terms of the Act to provide a specimen of his breath or blood when required, his licence will be cancelled.

Mr. Houston: For how long?

Mr. KNOX: Three months. This cancellation does not in any respect cut across the powers of a court to disqualify him for a period if he is convicted by the court of drink-driving. Normally, that averages out at approximately six months. As hon. members know, with a blood-alcohol content of between .08 and .1 a driver is suspended for only 24 hours. If a provisional licence is cancelled the holder will not be able to apply for and obtain another provisional licence until after the expiration of three months from the date of cancellation. If and when he does re-apply he must start all over again and undergo the necessary tests provided by the regulations. I must make it quite clear that the provisional-licence system will apply irrespective of the age of the applicant. I think I have summarised the provisions of the Bill; it is very short indeed.

An Opposition Member: You have watered it down a bit.

Mr. KNOX: No. Nothing in it is substantially different from what is contained in the legislation in other States. Victoria has a three-year provisional licence and New South Wales has a one-year provisional licence. We are following the Victorian practice.

In relation to the use of the demerit system we believe that our system is much tougher than that in other States because

four points can be accumulated for one offence, such as exceeding the speed limit. There will be a four-point demerit for not carrying "P" plates and there will be a provision for the carrying of the provisional licence. People have 48 hours in which to produce an ordinary licence, but provisional-licence holders must carry their licence with them. Failure to do so attracts a demerit of one point. A number of other offences carry a demerit of two or three points, which can quickly accumulate to four.

Mr. Bromley? If a person loses his licence can he go straight away for another licence?

Mr. KNOX: No, he has to wait for three months.

Mr. Wright: What is the cancellation period when they accumulate four points?

Mr. KNOX: It is three months.

I commend the motion to the Committee.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (1.7 a.m.): This legislation is another example of the Government's confusion about its promises at the last State election. The idea in offering the "P" plates to electors at that time was formulated by the Treasurer in a desperate attempt to counter the public's acceptance of the Labour Party's proposals on road safety. Quite a considerable time elapsed after the announcement of Labour's policy in the New Year before the Government came to light with this proposal. That the Government presented the idea as a half-baked suggestion to lull the people into believing that it was trying to do something is proved by the fact that the Minister has now completely changed his grounds relative to the issuing of these licences. According to the Minister's statements in "The Sunday Mail" of 25 May 1969—I have not seen that the Minister denied that they were accurate—certain restrictions were to be imposed on speed. The Minister also stated that licences would be lost or taken from drivers if they broke certain rules and regulations. He now says that there will be no variation of the speed limit and that the four-point system will operate. Surely that is a complete reversal of what he said previously.

Mr. Knox: I did not say previously what was in the Bill.

Mr. HOUSTON: I did not say that the Minister did, but he told the people what he believed the "P" plate legislation should contain.

Mr. Knox: I said what was current in New South Wales.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister did not say that at all. He said—

Mr. Knox: I gave to the Press a statement about what was current in New South Wales.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister said that he supported that.

This is the report as it appeared in the Press—

"Mr. Knox agreed that the lower limit might tend to increase the frustration of young drivers and tempt them to put their foot down on an open road where they felt no police were about."

But he said—

"I have no doubt there'll be some who do just that but, if they get caught, they'll lose their licence."

The article continues—

"He did not feel that other motorists would also be frustrated, perhaps to the point of taking risks and overtaking, at having new drivers slowing down open-road traffic to 40 miles an hour."

The Minister made statements clearly indicating he believed that there should be a limit on the speed at which these drivers should be allowed to drive. The point I am making is that when the Treasurer announced the idea of "P" plates during the election campaign, he had no idea at all how they would operate. The Minister made statements that indicated that there would be a restriction on speed.

The article continues—

"Mr. Knox said that under the N.S.W. system, drivers could lose their provisional licences for any one of a number of offences which include—

"Exceeding the speed limit in a built up area by five miles an hour."

It is not that he would lose four points.

The Minister said a few moments ago that he wanted to achieve uniformity. He said that, in New South Wales, provisional licences were issued for 12 months and that we should do the same. If the Minister wants to adopt the New South Wales system, he should be consistent. There should not be one rule for the New South Wales provisional driver and another rule for the Queensland provisional driver, because many New South Wales provisional drivers will be driving cars on our roads, particularly in south-east Queensland, and many Queensland provisional drivers will be driving in New South Wales.

In that State, provisional drivers can lose their licences for: not stopping after an accident; incorrect movement on a right-hand turn; disobeying a traffic light; not giving way to the right; passing a stopped vehicle at a pedestrian crossing; crossing separation lines; not keeping wholly within a traffic lane; not making a left-hand turn correctly, and not pulling out from the kerb safely. That applies in New South Wales. Why the difference? It is obviously because there has been another eruption in the Government parties.

A Government Member: Nonsense!

Mr. HOUSTON: It is not. Why the difference? Why did not Government members support the Treasurer, and the Minister for Transport when he said, as reported in "The Sunday Mail" of 25 November, that those were the things he believed?

Mr. Miller: Do you consider that back-benchers should be rubber stamps?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, I do not think that at all.

Mr. Miller: More than one Minister has a say.

Mr. HOUSTON: When the Treasurer, the Leader of the Liberal Party, tells the people that certain legislation will be introduced and the Minister for Transport, also a member of the Liberal Party, makes public statements, the public is entitled to believe that that is the Government's policy.

Mr. Miller: Can't he say that he supports the New South Wales principle?

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister went further. He said, according to this Press report, that his recommendations to the Premier were two years and 40 miles an hour. Surely the hon. member for Ithaca, as a back-bencher, will not claim, now that the election is over, that what the Minister said or believed was the intention of the Government is not binding. Not long ago, the hon. member and his colleagues said that the Liquor Act Amendment Bill was introduced in that form to honour an election promise. The Government did not go any further than that. The Government wants the people of Queensland to believe it is an honourable Government and that it introduces legislation in line with what it tells them it will do. In this case the Government promised, through the Minister, that these provisional licences would be for two years.

Mr. Miller: Did the Premier say this?

Mr. HOUSTON: No, but the Minister for Transport did. The Premier did not say anything in his policy speech about provisional licences. They were announced by the Treasurer, as Leader of the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party stood a candidate against the Country Party candidate in many electorates. Why did it do that? Because it believed that its policy should be accepted by the people of Queensland. There was argument at the Gold Coast, and the Liberal Party fought the Country Party. There was more abuse between those parties at the Gold Coast than there is between any other two sections of the community. This all goes on because the Liberals want to dominate the coalition. However, that is a separate issue.

Surely, when the Liberal Party, through the Minister for Transport, makes public statements at election time, the people of Queensland are entitled to expect them to

be carried out. I say quite distinctly that in this legislation the Government has gone back on its election promise.

Mr. Ramsden: That is rubbish, and you know it.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is not.

Mr. Ramsden: You have not talked sense all day.

Mr. HOUSTON: The facts are there; the Government is going against an election promise.

Let us look at the facts. When a person applies for a driving licence, he is asked questions about the rules of the road, and, when he gets his licence, it is quite conceivable that he has a fair knowledge of those rules as laid down by the traffic regulations. Applicants are, of course, also put through a test to see whether they can handle a motor vehicle, but that does not prove whether they are or are not capable of putting into practical effect the rules that they know by heart. Only a complete fool would attempt, during a test for a driving licence, to break the rules laid down in the regulations.

Once drivers have their licences, however, some unfortunately break the laws, and some of the most common causes of accidents are: speeding; drink-driving; not giving way at intersections (commonly called the right-of-way rule); not keeping to the left; inattentive driving; driver asleep or drowsy; overtaking improperly; inexperience; insufficient care at railway crossings; driver dazzled by approaching headlights; following other vehicles too closely; improper starting from a parked position; disregarding, misunderstanding or failing to observe traffic signs or signals of other drivers. Over 74.2 per cent. of all accidents reported in the three months ended 30 June, 1969, came in the categories that I have just mentioned, together with a small number of other faults.

Not one of those faults would be apparent to an officer testing a young driver—or, for that matter, an old driver. It is therefore obvious that there is a period of time necessary for the assessment of the competence of a driver and his ability to interpret regulations and apply them in practice. For that reason the introduction of the “P” plate should have some significant value in helping to reduce the toll of the road. The Opposition will therefore support the introduction of the legislation because we believe that any practical action taken to cut down the road toll should be given an opportunity to show its worth.

But that does not mean that we believe this to be the end of the matter, nor do we believe that it will in itself drastically reduce the road toll. It is our hope that the extra experience that drivers will obtain, under supervision and control, should stand them in good stead in their later years of driving.

The Minister referred to four points. Unfortunately one of the great killers on the roads today is excessive speed. If a speed limit of 60 miles an hour is set on a road, surely that indicates to an experienced driver that that is a safe speed under good traffic conditions. A prudent and competent motorist will not exceed that speed unless some dire necessity causes him to do so—for example, the need to avoid an accident. He will at all times observe the speed limit, but he is also likely to drive below it when he understands the conditions under which he is driving. Only experience teaches a driver when to reduce speed, so it is questionable whether it is wise to allow a new driver to drive at the speed limit. Unfortunately, new drivers are apt to think that the speed limit is the speed at which they should travel.

No-one can take away the advantages of experience on the road, and the present system of training and testing drivers is such that they are not trained and tested under the extraordinary conditions that they are likely to encounter on the roads. In my opinion, the introduction of the “P” plate was a golden opportunity for the Government, at least in the first instance, to allow the new driver to find his feet in an area in which he would not be a menace to other users of the road.

I know that the Minister advocated originally that the limit should be 40 miles an hour. I do not agree that 40 miles an hour is necessarily the ideal speed—it could be 50 miles an hour; it could be more—and I certainly do not agree that every driver must travel at 60 miles an hour on the open road. As I said earlier, on many occasions it is very foolish to attempt to do so. One finds that the older, more experienced driver assesses road conditions much more quickly than the less-experienced driver. He does that not because of his age but because he has been unfortunate enough, or fortunate enough (it depends how one looks at it), to have been in a similar situation previously and he realises that a higher speed could be dangerous under the prevailing conditions. The speed at which one travels certainly is related to the experience one has had under various road conditions.

According to statistics, the second-highest killer is alcohol. Is alcohol itself the killer, or do those who are under the influence tend in some instances to disregard speed limits? I think it would be true to say that one could couple many of the accidents associated with an excessive intake of alcohol with speed. In other words, I believe that speed is the dominating factor in causing accidents.

Failure to give right of way at an intersection causes the greatest number of accidents but, fortunately, not the greatest number of deaths, although the figure is relatively high. In my view, the right-of-way rule needs clarification and I urge the Government to examine it carefully. In three months, 1,574 accidents occurred

because motorists failed to give right of way. It could be that the rule is wrong; it could be that the necessary warning signs are not placed at intersections. I think that the answer is to be found in the lack of signs; but I believe that experts should consider the position. It is a matter in which the experts should come up with an answer.

The point I am making is that when a new driver is being tested for a licence he obviously will not break any rule at an intersection. That is one of the fundamental things an applicant knows. He knows that if he is to obtain a licence, he must make sure that he does not break the laws at intersections. But when he has been on the road for two or three months, he becomes familiar with driving conditions near his home or his work. It is an area over which he has travelled many times before and his familiarity with it often leads him to ignore the laws. It is true that familiarity breeds contempt.

We do not oppose the trial of "P" plates but I feel that the provision that, once a provisional driver loses four points, he will lose his licence is simply handling the situation with kid gloves.

The Minister said that some offences can bring four points but, under the points system, one of the great problems is that of time. At present under the nine-points system a driver can break the regulations and get nine points up but a period of six months or more might elapse before the paper work involved finally allows the police to catch up with him. The four-points system will be very little different because the process of the law is inherently slow. It bogs itself down.

Surely a driver must adhere to certain basic principles. The New South Wales code sets out those principles quite successfully and, as New South Wales was in this field before us, we should view the matter in general terms and, as far as is humanly possible, have the two provisions run hand in hand.

I condemn also bringing in these controls by means of regulation. This is another example of taking away from Parliament the right to determine matters of great import. The introduction of "P" plates and the regulations dealing with their operation are important measures. Surely a matter of such importance should not be left to the whim of Cabinet or the Government, to be brought in by regulation in the event of any motion for disallowance. This Parliament having only two hours to debate whether or not the regulation is right. If the regulation is introduced in an election year and the previous pattern is followed, the law stands as the regulation states and not as Parliament may or may not determine. These matters should be part of our law and not measures introduced by regulation alone.

We will not be opposing the introduction of the regulation but we will certainly be looking at it with a view to making sure that this is not just a tame-cat attitude by the Government to make people think that they are attempting to do something when, in reality, they are doing little or nothing to alter the present situation.

In drink-driving there is a difference between .08 and .1 per cent. Any driver who is found to have more than .1 per cent. of alcohol in his blood loses his licence for three months on his first conviction and for a longer period on his second conviction. In effect, the Government says, "If you have between .08 and .1 per cent. you will lose your licence for three months, but if you have below .08 you will not lose it at all." If the Government is sincere in its statements on road safety and the supply of liquor to young people—and the great majority of the new young drivers are under 21 years of age—surely it should say to holders of provisional licences, "You should not drink at all while you drive." The Government should not introduce this legislation simply to satisfy its conscience because it promised during the election campaign to introduce it, and if it really believes that the Bill will achieve something it should put forward some constructive measures.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH (Tablelands) (1.32 a.m.): I suppose all hon. members realise that the most important document that any one of them carries is his driver's licence. When travelling anywhere his gold pass does not mean a thing, but if he shows his driver's licence his cheques are accepted and his signature can be checked. The driver's licence is a very important document, and its importance should not be watered down.

As the Leader of the Opposition has said, the Government has changed its ideas, so I ask the Government to consider uniformity. That is a key word in many aspects of life, and it makes for easier living and an easier understanding of conditions.

With a modern motor-car a motorist can drive from South Queensland, and even North Queensland, to Melbourne in two or three days, and in travelling through two or three States a motorist encounters different rules and regulations. They cause confusion, embarrassment and, in many instances, accidents, and even, possibly, loss of life. No-one can be blamed for that lack of uniformity except members of Parliaments.

When introducing the Bill, the Minister said that it was based mainly on the New South Wales Traffic Act, but he did not say on what State the previous Bill was based. Apparently the Government is going from one State to another, or perhaps certain provisions are not based on those of any other State. The result is that it is getting further into the wilderness of non-uniformity.

Every aspect of our life is made easier by uniformity. In many instances an exchange of ideas between States is needed, and on this

matter Ministers should move quickly towards establishing uniformity among the traffic regulations that apply to provisional licences.

The introduction of the Bill will create a rush for licences, because people will say, "We do not know what is coming in, so let us get a licence." In many instances people will obtain licences before they are really competent to obtain one. They will have this very important document for the rest of their lives, yet they will rush in to get it simply because they are not sure what will happen under the provisional-licence system. If a uniform policy existed throughout Australia, relatives and friends in other States could let them know what happened there. Everyone would know the position without much trouble, and embarrassment could be avoided.

The Minister referred to licence renewals becoming due on a birthday. I know that it is impracticable to alter the position in any way, but it is time that an easily understood and well-publicised advertisement such as, "Don't forget that your licence may be due on your next birthday," was inserted in the Press, or announced on the radio. Since entering this Chamber about six instances have come to my notice of very good citizens and good drivers who have produced their licences, only to be told that they are six months overdue. They were in that position simply because they had not thought about the expiry of their licences on account of their age. I know this matter cannot be linked with the registration of vehicles because many of these drivers do not own a car, but I ask the Minister to get his officers to devise some means whereby people can be alerted to this possibility of their licences being out of date.

The Leader of the Opposition ably covered the section relative to the regulations. I agree with him wholeheartedly and I do not intend to delay the Chamber further, other than to say that this is another example of the Government's trying to provide added insurance against accidents by virtually earmarking persons who have just received their licences. Drivers who see a "P" or "L" plate will immediately give the vehicle added attention, and this could prevent accidents and complications.

The Bill is accepted by members of the Opposition, but we will examine it closely and have more to say about it at the second-reading stage.

Mr. CHINCHEN (Mt. Gravatt) (1.37 a.m.): It is generally agreed that this is an important measure. It was certainly decided at the time of the Government's policy speech that something should be done about provisional licences. The decision was made purely on the basis of the success claimed in other States. It was only natural to consider this matter in the terms of the legislation in other States. Having examined the matter in detail, the Government surely has every right to determine the best provisions for this State, and that is what was done. Quite

frankly, I would not consider that drivers with provisional licences should travel at speeds different from the normal speed.

Mr. Houston: Why didn't you say that during the election campaign when your Minister said that they would.

Mr. Knox: I did not say anything about that during the election.

Mr. CHINCHEN: There is complete misunderstanding about this. Naturally these matters are first considered generally, on the position in other States, but after detailed consideration surely we do not have to adopt what is done in another State. It is ridiculous to say that we should follow implicitly what is done in another State. Surely we can determine what is best after seeing what is done in other States. That has been done, and I believe that when the other States see what we have done, they will realise that what we are doing is superior to what they do. Time and again this sort of thing happens. Sometimes we are first and somebody else builds on our legislation and ends up with something superior to what we have. There is no question about it; this is superior.

Many people consider that our young people—and they are mainly the people who will have provisional licences—should be continually hounded as a class. I do not agree with this. I can see the attitude relative to insurance premiums because there is no other way to overcome that problem. But we can only go so far and for the average person, considering the mileage that would be covered, 12 months would be adequate to attain a reasonable degree of competence. I think that three years is ridiculous and that 12 months would represent sensible and sane thinking. I think that our speed restrictions of 35, 45 and 60 miles an hour are reasonable. Accidents can and will be caused by a slow-moving vehicle. We have all experienced this. The rate of the general flow of traffic is what people should maintain for safety. The demerit points system is a sensible system because it conforms to what is happening in this State. I think that we were the first to introduce the points system and that it is now being accepted in other States.

An Opposition Member: No, we were not.

Mr. CHINCHEN: We were not the first State? I would like to know which was.

Mr. Knox: Queensland.

Mr. CHINCHEN: Of course it was Queensland. The other States did not have the ability to introduce this system for provisional licences. We are fortunate in having introduced a points system. It is a more realistic and a fairer way of doing things without imposing severe penalties, and losing a licence for three months is a severe penalty for an offence such as failure to signal intention to turn or diverge.

Mr. Houston: Don't you think it is important?

Mr. CHINCHEN: I agree that it is important.

Mr. Houston: You could be killed because of that.

Mr. CHINCHEN: I agree. Does the Leader of the Opposition feel that if he does this once he should lose his licence? Why should a young person be treated differently from him?

Mr. Houston: Has he had the same experience as I have?

Mr. CHINCHEN: Another is failure to keep as far left as practicable. Here is a problem. In Brisbane today, car after car travels near the middle of the road. It is an offence, but for some reason or other there are not many convictions for it. There is a Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. It is an excellent publication and I compliment the department on it. It is kept up to date and gives all the information necessary for traffic control. However, a local authority handles its own traffic.

Mr. Houston: Who set that up?

Mr. CHINCHEN: Just a moment. For some reason or other a local authority is not obliged to follow this manual.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. CHINCHEN: The Leader of the Opposition had ample time to make his speech and he has continually interjected while I have been speaking. I hope that he will keep quiet for a while and learn a little for a change.

Mr. Houston: Your Government brought in that law.

Mr. CHINCHEN: If a local authority having control of its traffic introduces a sign, it would naturally introduce the sign recommended in this manual because what is stated here is excellent information.

Mr. Houston: Now you are squealing about it.

Mr. CHINCHEN: However, the manual states, "The authority should." It does not say that the authority shall or that it must. It mentions lanes in urban areas. It says that separate lines should be marked on all two-way urban roads, deals with lines on urban streets, and explains how they have to be marked, and what spacing there should be. But this is not implemented in the City of Brisbane. We have very wide roads, such as Cavendish Road, Ipswich Road, and the Pacific Highway, which are all major roads, on which there could be four lanes of traffic, and perhaps more, but they are not marked. This creates a big problem for new drivers.

Situations arise in which large vehicles are forced to the right-hand lane. Because of the habit of some Brisbane drivers of passing on the left, the drivers are scared to move

to the left, and so hold-ups occur. Only this morning I saw a taxi pass a tanker on the left-hand side on Logan Road. That practice is growing and growing, and it is a great danger. The only way to overcome it is for the Brisbane City Council to mark all the wide roads into lanes for the free movement of traffic. That is essential for safety, particularly for young drivers.

That same situation is dealt with in this manual which is, I repeat, a magnificent publication. It mentions what must happen in regard to traffic islands. Most detailed information is given concerning the type and size of islands, where and when they should and should not be used, how they should be marked, and so on. Around the city at the moment more and more islands are being created, and they will be necessary for traffic control. But they are not illuminated at night, whereas the manual states that adequate provision for night-time operation is essential for the successful functioning of traffic islands. It goes on to mention illumination.

The problem that I am about to mention exists in many areas other than my electorate, and one example that comes to mind, with which the hon. member for Belmont would be familiar, is at the corner of Broadwater Road and Newnham Road. There is a sign reading "Keep left", and when one approaches it going up Newnham Road and wanting to turn right, the sign is edge-on. A stranger to the locality swinging in to take the turn could easily hit the sign standard, and that in fact happens time and time again. Whilst travelling to and from Parliament House I have seen many of these signs hit because the traffic islands are not illuminated. In Melbourne and Sydney, and most Victorian and New South Wales provincial cities, there is a flood of white light over traffic islands. Although the manual states that traffic islands should be illuminated, that is not done in this city. Traffic islands therefore constitute a great danger at night, particularly to young inexperienced drivers.

I suggest that the contents of this manual should be implemented, and some authority should see that that is done in the interests of safety. I think it would be found that literally hundreds of accidents are caused by the absence of lane markings on wide roads and because of inadequate illumination at traffic islands. I was reading that in America illumination of islands is insisted upon, and what are called fracturable standards are used. The article did not explain what they are made of, but when they are hit they fracture. That means that no damage, or very little, is done to vehicles. What is being paid in insurance premiums because of the cost of the damage to hundreds of vehicles that hit sign standards in Brisbane must be enormous.

I think that the authority handling traffic matters should be obliged to carry out what is laid down in the manual, and

inspections should be carried out to see that that is done in the interest of safety. At the moment that is not happening. It is very obvious that the Brisbane City Council is not traffic conscious. It is not spending on traffic control the amount of money that should be spent. No doubt there are reasons for that, and obviously they are financial ones. However, it seems to find plenty of finance for things that interest it, and traffic seems to be one that does not. If the roads of Brisbane were lined as those of other capital cities are marked. I would be very happy. If they were marked as they are in Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, or Sydney, that would do me. Every major road in those cities is lined.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! For the information of the hon. member, I remind him that the question is that consideration be given to introducing a Bill to amend the Traffic Act in certain particulars. The hon. member has drifted right away from that motion.

Mr. CHINCHEN: Thank you, Mr. Hooper. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about danger areas for traffic. That comes under the Traffic Act, and I was merely considering how the driver holding a provisional licence could be assisted. When hon. members know more about the proposed Bill, I am sure they will find that it contains provisions relative to provisional licences that have proved worth while elsewhere.

There is one other point that I wish to mention. I assume that a driver who accumulates four points will lose his licence automatically, and I hope that he will not have to wait for three months before applying for another test. In my opinion, it would be entirely wrong if he had to do so. There is a delay of up to four or five months in tests, and I think that a person who loses his licence should immediately be able to book up for another test and have it as soon as possible after the three months has expired. If he is not permitted to do that, he will be penalised for perhaps five or six months.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (1.52 a.m.): I expressed some disappointment at the Minister's introduction of the Bill providing for the licensing of driving instructors. I was astounded by the Minister's attitude when introducing the proposed Bill to amend the Traffic Act to implement a system of provisional licences and plates.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the proposal now before the Committee represents a somersault on the part of the Government, and I believe that the Minister has bowed to the dictates of caucus rather than to the dictates of his own conscience in introducing the Bill. He has stated repeatedly over the years that he believed in investigating every means of increasing road safety, following the recommendations of various safety bodies, and examining each suggestion thoroughly. In this instance,

apparently to appease disgruntled back-benchers, or perhaps even Cabinet Ministers, the Minister for Transport has made an about-face on provisional licences. He went to some lengths to refute the arguments by the Leader of the Opposition and stated that at no stage had he claimed that provisional licences would be issued for two years.

Mr. Knox: That is not what I said. The Leader of the Opposition said that I gave the New South Wales provision as the one now being introduced. Two years was mentioned in the policy speech.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Leader of the Opposition claimed that the Minister said he supported the provisions of the New South Wales Act, and the Minister denied that the proposed Bill was an about-face in Government policy. I say that it is a complete about-face.

Unlike the Minister for Justice, who came into the Chamber yesterday afternoon and deliberately misled the Committee by quoting from a document purporting to be the official A.L.P. policy and containing convention items that had been discussed——

Mr. Chinchén interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I shall deal with the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt in a moment. If ever I heard anyone have a couple of "bob" each way, it was the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. Having made his speech—it was a very poor one—he now wishes to interrupt me.

I shall deal first with the Minister for Transport and the leader of his party. The Minister displayed a "P" plate. I suggest that he should be using it as a Minister after his performance in this debate. As I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt——

Mr. Chinchén: You like saying that.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Half the members in this Chamber would never make a speech if it were not for the hon. member for Salisbury. They jump on my band wagon and quote what the hon. member for Salisbury has to say. The hon. member should ask the hon. member for Tablelands to show him the quote from the book written recently about election campaigns of what the people who wrote it had to say about the hon. member for Salisbury and the way he conducted his campaign and so on. I have nothing to fear from any back-bencher, Cabinet Minister, the Premier, or anybody else about my capabilities inside or outside this Chamber.

Unlike the Minister for Justice, who came in this afternoon waving a secret brief that purported to be A.L.P. policy—whether he paid too much for the document and was led up the garden path by somebody, I do not know——

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I know you are a man of tolerant nature, Mr. Hooper, and I am sure you will not mind my finishing this. I came in with a factual document. The Minister came in with some convention items that, in that form, had not even hit the deck. I have here the policy speech of the Hon. G. W. W. Chalk, delivered in the City Hall, Brisbane on 23 April, 1969. At page 26 it reads—

“The Government will continue its drive to endeavour to reduce the toll of the road, although it must be realised that, to a large extent, achievement depends more on the preparedness of the individual to discipline himself rather than to be disciplined. However, with a view to endeavouring to create a greater awareness and ensure more skilful tuition of new drivers, the Government will amend the law—”

There was a rather dramatic pause here. I can imagine the leader of the Liberal Party with his hand-picked audience in the City Hall—probably one could gain entry only by invitation—pausing dramatically in the speech and then saying—

“We will amend the law so as to provide for provisional licensing with a currency of the first two years of holding a driver's licence.”

The Government and the Minister now say that the Government has not made a complete about-face on what it led the electors of the State to believe in the State election. If they want to say this document is phoney, there is the imprimatur of the Government policy speech which I obtained from the Parliamentary Library a few minutes ago. It is no good the Minister now putting on the same performance as the Premier put on with the Margarine Bill. It is no good his coming into the Chamber and saying, “We did not say that.” It is there in the policy speech. The Minister is putting on the same performance as the Premier did with the Margarine Bill when he knew full well that it would not stand up to a High Court judgment.

I appreciate your tolerance, Mr. Hooper, and I am not going to impose on your generosity any longer. I merely want to say that the Minister has bowed to the dictates of caucus, bowed to the dictates of the Liberal rebels as the Premier did on the margarine issue, and has brought into the Chamber legislation that, in my opinion, is a farce, to say the least.

Let me make my attitude to provisional licences quite clear. I must confess that I had some reservations about the effectiveness of provisional licences in combating the toll of the road; however, I have examined the measure and attempted to see what I believe is best. If the Government introduces provisional licences, it should make them an effective measure because the mere branding of a driver with the letter “P” on his car indicates to the general public that in the eyes of the law he has not reached the acceptable standard of driving on the

road. If the Government brands him with the letter “P” like some poddy calf and then turns him loose on the road, what will it achieve if it will not assist him by placing some sort of protective restrictions around the “P” plate.

The Minister said that the Bill is based on the New South Wales Act; however, he did not say that that Act restricts holders of provisional licences to a speed of 40 miles an hour. In the debate on the previous Bill this evening driving instructors were referred to, and I pointed out that many driving schools advertised that they could teach a person to drive a heavy vehicle or a semi-trailer. It is reasonable to assume that, if a person obtained a licence through a driving school to drive a semi-trailer or an articulated vehicle, he would immediately be competent to commence employment as a semi-trailer driver travelling interstate. If the holder of a provisional licence can become a semi-trailer driver—and I do not see any restriction in the Bill on his doing so—will the introduction of provisional licences achieve anything in the interests of road safety? A provisional-licence holder would be able to drive a semi-trailer at 60 miles an hour without having gained sufficient experience in the handling of heavy vehicles at that speed.

Once provisional licences are accepted they should be effective, so instead of rushing legislation through in the dying stages of Parliament the Minister should look at the whole matter of road safety in an endeavour to solve the many problems that arise. Recently I asked him how many vehicles had been involved in accidents and had subsequently burst into flames, and of the number how many had their petrol tanks located at the front. The Minister told me that he did not know and would get the information. Still I wait. Perhaps the information will come with Santa Claus on Christmas morning.

Mr. Knox: I wrote you a letter.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister did not write me a letter. I have received no information.

Mr. Knox: I told you it was not available.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister did not write me a letter. If he did he forgot to sign it. People are being incinerated in cars that have their petrol tanks in unsafe positions.

After taking a thrashing from his own caucus on this matter—and I am quite satisfied that he did and that is why he backed down on it—

Mr. R. E. Moore: Don't you believe it.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Members of the Government say, “Don't believe that.” They want to assure me that everything goes well in caucus in the Liberal Party.

Mr. Ramsden: At least we are allowed to express our opinions.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: If a disagreement arises in the Liberal caucus it is described as a little family tiff, but, when it is in the A.L.P., it is described as a riot. Government members cannot think that I am so naive as to believe that sort of tripe.

Road safety involves much more than provisional licences and driver-training. Many features are involved that the Minister would tackle if he were really doing his job. He would not be introducing this measure in the dying stages of Parliament but would be closely investigating what is happening and what causes accidents. Time after time we get statistical indexes from the Commonwealth statistician about accidents. Failure to give right of way occurs because of confusion about the right-hand rule. Many people believe mistakenly that, because they are on the right, they have the right of way, but section 13 of the Act states very clearly that every road user must exercise due consideration for other road users. One part of the law cancels out the other.

In recent times 60 per cent. of accidents have been caused by failure to give right of way because of the confusion about the right-hand rule. It is evident that many inexperienced and experienced drivers take the right of way simply because they are on the right; they become involved in accidents, or near accidents, every day of their lives. It is time that the legislation was reassessed, especially as this Bill is initiating the process of branding new drivers with provisional licences. Many of them cannot fully comprehend the right-hand rule because very few ordinary drivers are familiar with its ramifications. I do not know how often I have seen people forcing their way into the main stream of traffic because they believe that they have right of way. They risk their lives, and those of other people, with consequential accidents or near-misses. I have said that it was wrong to depart from the principle relative to major roads, and that, in the interests of road safety, we should revert to the principle of giving way to the main stream of traffic.

I said that I would not conclude my speech without "tipping the tin" on the member for Mr. Gravatt, who grasped the opportunity to advance his usual petty attitude by having a whack at Clem Jones and the Labour Council for not being traffic conscious. He then criticised certain aspects of road signs, and so on. I should have been disappointed if he had not adopted that attitude, but he was not in the Chamber when a former Minister for Labour and Industry, the Hon K. J. Morris introduced the Traffic Commission legislation with a great fanfare of trumpets. I remember that the C.M.O. Lord Mayor, Mr. Groom, was bitterly critical of the hideous yellow gibbets that were springing up all over Brisbane for the traffic lights.

The then Minister, in his usual style, entered the Chamber resplendent in his little white suit and surrounded by his admirers, the new Liberal Party members, and made

great play on this question of traffic control and traffic-control devices. They propounded the matter fairly well to the public at election time, but, when it started to cost £200,000 to £300,000 a year to administer it, they dodged their obligations and dumped it onto the local authorities. It is as plain as that, so it is no good the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt coming into the Chamber and getting stuck into a Labour council for something that was dumped into its lap by this Government some years ago because no more political votes were to be wrung out of it and it was costing too much.

Then the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt spoke about provisional licences and the insurance premiums paid by young people who are "sentenced" to pay high loadings until they are 25 years of age. He said, "I don't know what other system could be adopted." He does not mind when there is a dollar in it for his mates the insurance companies, but when it is road safety, he has serious doubts about it. I say as forcefully as I can that the Opposition will at times welcome constructive legislation providing for the advancement of safety, whether it is on the roads, in industry, or anywhere else.

Mr. Chinchin: This is it.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Oh, shut up, for God's sake. I have often studied the question of noise levels. I have heard about the high-pitched whine and how it destroys the soul. The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt has that effect on me. The Minister for Health should have a serious look at the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt.

It is passing strange, as I said in the previous debate, that a person who sits for a second-class internal combustion engine ticket has to spend something like 500 hours—

Mr. Chinchin: It was 400 in your last speech.

Mr. Knox: I thought you said 500.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: That is right. These poor creatures are in a state of stupor at this time of night. They never get things right. One new Government member stood up and said that we were on the wrong Bill. They perform very poorly after midnight when it gets down to serious thinking. We welcome these things.

Mr. Row interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister for Primary Industries should not come into it because I respect him somewhat.

A person desiring to obtain a stationary-internal-combustion-engine ticket must serve something like 500 hours, yet a driving licence for a moving vehicle, which has been described as a lethal weapon, can be obtained after five or six hours of instruction and a minimum of experience.

Motor vehicles are becoming more powerful and complex to drive, and we will have to look closely at whether the laws governing their use are adequate.

The legislation introduced by the Minister will serve no useful purpose. I should admire him more if he stuck to Government policy and introduced legislation that would not in any way restrict these people but would be for their welfare. It would have been to assist them during the difficult period when, having obtained driving licences, they are thrown upon the mercy of modern traffic, which is not easy to cope with. If that had been done, I believe that the Minister would have earned commendation. As it is, the Government's action is nothing but a complete about-face. I can see no real purpose in the legislation. All that the Government is doing is branding new drivers as inferior drivers, and possibly people to be avoided on the road.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (2.16 a.m.): In the first place, I am driven into this debate mainly by the contribution of the hon. member for Salisbury.

Mr. Sherrington: That is what you said on the last Bill.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Then the more the hon. member shuts up and listens, the less I will be drawn into the debate. I want to join issue with the hon. member for Salisbury because he complains, on the one hand, that the Minister has gone back on the Government's policy speech, that the Minister has reneged on what was contained in the policy speech, and, on the other, that the Minister should have had a good look at the matter of road safety instead of rushing it through, to use his phrase, in the dying stages of Parliament.

I ask him to be reasonable. The very fact that we have altered the wording in the policy speech shows that the Minister has had a good look at road safety. We, as a party, have been able to confer, look at the report of the Committee on Driver Improvement and see the recommendations that have been made from State to State. Then, because we are a democratic party in which we as back-benchers have some say, we have been able to say to the Minister, "This we believe we should do in Queensland, and this we believe we should not do." Yet the hon. member for Salisbury complains bitterly about that.

I want to say that the report of the Committee on Driver Improvement, on Policy and Procedures for the Promotion of Driver Improvement and Road Safety through Licensing and Enforcement, has made certain recommendations on what we call "P" licences. First of all, it made a recommendation that we as a Government have not seen fit to adopt but which I personally wish we had adopted. It recommended that they be called probationary licences rather than provisional licences. Had that recommendation been

followed, the hon. member who has just spoken would have been devoid of an argument. I want to develop that point a little later.

The second recommendation made was that "P" licences should be issued to all new drivers irrespective of their ages. In Tasmania all previous licence holders who have been disqualified for three months or more are issued with "P" licences. In New South Wales, according to the committee's report, a second type of "P" licence was issued which may limit the holder to driving in his business hours. It may be that time will show that we may have to do something along those lines. I do not know.

There were some differences in the States in the procedures to be adopted where licences are applied for after the cancellation of "P" licences. In most States, a further test and a further "P" licence is granted *de novo*. In Western Australia, for instance, a driver has only to complete his three years of probation, and time lost during his period of disqualification does not count in the three years. I believe that our adoption of the points system has presented a tougher proposition in Queensland. The offences leading to the cancellation of "P" licences vary from State to State.

The Committee on Driver Improvement—and I wish to emphasise this—in the absence of information on the effectiveness of imposing special conditions, such as speed limits and the display of "P" signs on vehicles, does not favour the introduction of such conditions until more information is available about them. It is quite definite on that point, and it recognises about 19 prescribed offences, the failure to observe any one of which results in the cancellation of a "P" licence.

The Government has been accused by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat of going back on an election promise or statement. I wish to make it clear that, in considering the committee's recommendations, we noted the committee's advice that, apart from some study in Victoria of the relative likelihood of drivers of various ages and experience being involved in accidents, no research or special investigations were undertaken before introducing the legislation in all three jurisdictions. As I said earlier, in the absence of such statistical detail and study, the committee was not prepared to recommend the imposition of conditions until such information was made available.

For my part, Mr. Hooper, I take the view that "P" stands for "probationary", not for "provisional". In my opinion, all licences are provisional for all time. They exist only subject to the proviso that the driver is physically and mentally fit to drive and is prepared to observe the rules that have been introduced—not to limit the use of the road, but to ensure that, if they are observed, the roads will be safe for all who drive. A licence can be cancelled, in my

view, only when a licence holder ceases to have the necessary qualifications or to observe the road laws. In that sense, therefore, all licences are provisional.

In my opinion, the new licences to be issued under the provisions of the proposed Bill will be probationary licences, and all who are issued with them will be on probation. In other words, they will be given a licence to drive a car in exactly the same legal sense in which the holder of a 10-year licence may drive. If the latter can legally do 60 miles an hour on a declared length of road, so too can the probationary driver. If the experienced driver is restricted in any way, so too is the probationary driver. I cannot see any reason for restricting the new licence holder in the "P" licence category as has been done in other States. In my opinion, if the holder of a new licence is not qualified to drive with safety on the road system, he should never have been given a licence in the first place.

A person who holds a pre-provisional licence can, of course, be called upon to show cause why his licence should not be suspended or cancelled when he attains a score of nine points. Hon. members have been told that the sting of the "P" licence system being introduced in this State lies in the fact that although a probationary driver can legally do anything that an old driver can legally do, if and when he has earned for himself not nine points but four points, he will not be called upon to show cause why his licence should not be suspended but will have it cancelled automatically. In view of the sudden-death nature of the application of that points system, I think that the decision to make the probationary period only one year, instead of three years as in some of the other States, is a just one. The points system to be applied in Queensland is much more severe than points systems applying elsewhere in Australia.

I am reminded of the Committee's note of warning on clauses 46 and 47 of its revised Report on Policy and Procedures for the Promotion of Driver Improvement and Road Safety Through Licensing and Enforcement, which was revised in 1967-68 and which I have already quoted. However, it says—

"Apart from some study in Victoria of the relative likelihood of drivers of various ages and experience being involved in accidents, no research or special investigations were undertaken before introducing the legislation in all three jurisdictions.

"In the absence of information on the effectiveness of imposing special conditions, such as speed limits and the display of 'P' signs on vehicles, on the holders of probationary licences, the Committee does not favour the imposition of such conditions until further information is available."

Whilst in this introductory stage the Government's thinking appears to be quite sound, the next year or two could well produce the

sort of detailed evidence the Committee on Driver Improvement is looking for. If that turns out to be the case, no doubt the Government will bring down whatever amendments are then shown to be necessary in the light of experience.

Surely our policy is to educate all drivers and make them good drivers, not to make driving so restrictive that the majority of drivers will finish up as offenders. For my part I do not look upon motorists as people to be battered into insensibility, either by police or regulation. That would make a driver less observant because he would forever be looking in the rear mirror for "Big Brother" on his tail. A motorist, whether he be a driver of 10 months' or 10 years' standing, must be brought to realise that in the last analysis no actions of Governments or Act of Parliament will stop the toll of the road in Australia, a toll which, incidentally, has cost Australia more in deaths than any wars in which she has taken part since 1939. The only possible restraint on the road toll must come from the heart and mind of every motorist.

Mr. Wright: You realise that the crux of the problem is the individual.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is what I said. I have been driving continually since 20 years of age and I have come to the conclusion that 99 per cent. of the accidents I have seen or heard of have not been caused by mechanical error or bad roads but by bad drivers who are too impatient to stop at an amber light, too impatient to stop in a line of traffic giving way to the right, or too impatient to wait until the hill crest is passed before overtaking.

In my opinion and experience a good driver is one who can adjust his driving to suit the changing circumstances of weather, traffic density, narrow and badly constructed roads or, indeed, any hazard, without ever being involved or involving others in accidents. I trust that this "P" licence will help Queensland to produce good drivers.

Mr. R. E. MOORE (Windsor) (2.29 a.m.): I will not be very long. I have one or two views to put after which I will resume my seat. The thought that comes into my mind on the introduction of these "P" plates is that the 17-year-old driver is allowed to obtain a provisional licence and then, in one short year is allowed to obtain a full licence. I do not believe that a 17-year-old is really mature enough to drive a car at all. However, that is the law, and I sometimes feel that the age should be raised to 21 as it is for voting.

Mr. Newton: You are reflecting on the youth of this State.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: Well, the hon. member may take it as that. I was instructing lads in the apprenticeship school at Banyo, and most of them owned motor-cars. One of the lads purchased a car and came to the school on Monday and was very proud of

his newly acquired motor vehicle. Soon after he was driving to the coast one night at about 70 miles an hour with his arm around his girl-friend, and he decided to overtake three cars. In doing so he was confronted by the lights of an oncoming vehicle. He put his foot to the floor-boards, and, luckily, had the Lord with him. He took a strip of green paint off one vehicle and a strip of blue paint off the other. He was lucky to get away with it.

Anyone would think that a 17-year-old would learn by that experience; however the next thing I heard was that in Kalinga he was racing another vehicle to a bridge, when a Jaquar came in the other direction. He said to me, "Just as well the Jaguar didn't make it, because I needed all the bridge." Again he was lucky; he got away with that one.

At Easter-time he decided to go for a drive up round the North, and while overtaking a service-car on the highway he was confronted by a car driven by a female school teacher with another as passenger. He slowed down to 50 miles an hour, pulled round past the service-car, spun his car on two wheels, and wrecked the teachers' car. I asked him how old the teachers were, and he told me that they were two "old maids" of 35 and should not be allowed on the road.

Mr. Wright: What sort of social background did he have?

Mr. R. E. MOORE: He was quite a good lad.

Mr. Wright: What importance would you place on the individual basis?

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I do not know; that is a conundrum.

Mr. Wright: No it's not. You have made a generalised statement about 17-year-old lads.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: My view is that 17-year-olds are a little irresponsible, but all of them grow up to be decent fellows.

I know of another man who, at 35 years of age, has only one arm. I will call him "Tom". I said to him, "Tom, how did you lose your arm?" He replied, "I was playing 'chicken', and I wiped my car off and lost my arm." He is now a responsible fellow, and it is hard to imagine that even at 17 years of age he would have played "chicken". He told me that he rammed the other vehicle at 70 miles an hour. I found that the only way to gain the confidence of these lads was to adopt a fatherly attitude when inquiring about what they did, or about breaches they had committed. (Laughter.)

That is what I did. That is the only way. If they are not treated kindly, their confidence cannot be gained. It certainly cannot be gained by using a big stick, and probably anyone who uses a big stick will not last to hear about it. They volunteered

information, and, I gleaned from practical experience, that 17 was too young. By the same token, there were a few who were absolutely responsible. Many laws are introduced that affect the many to control the actions of a few. That is why we are introducing this "P" plate provision.

I am a little sorry that the Government has not decided to introduce the 40-mile speed limit for provisional drivers.

Mr. Newton: You are saying that they are not mature.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I am talking about the 17-year-olds.

Mr. Newton: The 17-year-olds are called up for national service under the Federal laws.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: They are not in the Vietnam ballot.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsden): Order!

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I can debate Labour's attitude to defence on another occasion. This is not the time to do so.

Mr. Newton: A 17-year-old is old enough to carry a gun.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Belmont to remember that we are discussing a Bill relative to provisional licences and not one dealing with Vietnam and the national call-up.

Mr. Newton: I make it quite clear that I will not let him abuse my son: I have sons who are teen-agers, and I will not let the hon. member for Windsor abuse them.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the hon. member for Belmont that his conduct is disorderly. If he continues, I shall deal with him under 123A.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I should have liked the 40-mile-an-hour speed limit to apply to these young people because speed is a killer and, at that speed, they would have more control of their vehicles.

Many members have licences that are current for 10 years. Unless a person breaks the law regularly, and is apprehended by the police for breaches, his driving licence is likely to be in a cellophane covered wallet and is probably not looked at for 10 years. In the 11th year he would be driving without a licence. I was not present to hear the Minister's full introductory speech, but I imagine that when a licence expires a person has to get another licence with a "P" plate, just like a driver who has not previously driven a car. If in some way he has four baldy tyres, he loses his licence for three months.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I have not skidded on my head. My hair is flowing into my eyes so much I can hardly read.

There is one thing I believe in. If I had an ambition when I entered Parliament, it was to return a few freedoms to the people because I believe too many freedoms have been taken from them. In this regard I suppose I will be inconsistent. However, I think we are erring on the right side by giving a driver with a provisional licence the right to drive at 60 miles an hour on the open road and 35 miles an hour around town. If we find we have been too lenient, it will not be difficult to amend the Act again.

It has been said by some hon. members that, with a 40-mile-an-hour limit, two provisional drivers could drive side by side on the road to the Gold Coast and hold up other traffic that could not pass them. That limit applies in Sydney and in Melbourne, where traffic is denser than it is in Brisbane, and they do not have that problem. However, that is the other argument.

This is Government policy. I will state my views, but I will not vote against this motion because the majority are in favour of it.

Mr. Hinze: Come on, it is a quarter to 3.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I will not be very long. I said I would take only a couple of moments.

The hon. member for Belmont and other Opposition members said that they wanted their children to grow up to be grandmothers and grandfathers. If they do nothing to overcome the present road carnage, the odds are against that. So we must look at this situation.

Mr. Newton: They will call you grandfather after the speech you have made tonight.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I thank the hon. member. He is giving me a pat on the back.

Anybody can obtain a driver's licence if he can pass the test. Some people simply have no mechanical ability. If they were given any type of machine to operate, they could not handle it. Yet we will allow them to drive motor-cars. I wonder whether some of these people will ever have the necessary ability. Some people could not drive a nail. I imagine most Opposition members are in that category.

Mr. Bromley interjected.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I am not talking about driving automatically because there is more to it than that.

When a motor vehicle is being driven at upwards of 60 miles an hour, a spot of elementary physics comes into the matter. Anybody who has studied physics knows that force is in a straight line so that a vehicle becomes a missile, and it is weight by pace, and when the direction has to be changed it is done by adhesion on the road, which is not very great. This must be

drummed into the average motorist. If the vehicle were on ice and the steering wheel were turned, the vehicle would still go in the same direction, wheels or no wheels. It is only a missile at the best of times. Thank you!

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (2.45 a.m.): I was most impressed with the last two words of the previous speaker—"Thank you." I believe that we certainly deserve thanks for listening to such absolute drivel. I do not believe for a moment that the member who has just resumed his seat is not serious, and, if only he could put his thoughts into words and phrases that members on both sides could understand, it would be much better for everybody. Even the hon. member for South Coast said, "For God's sake, hurry up and sit down." I hope he does not say that to any other speaker.

I want to say first of all that any means introduced by any Minister of decreasing the tragic toll of the road will receive my approbation. Nevertheless, I am a little disappointed with one or two aspects of the Bill. Although it is not a large Bill, it contains a number of principles on which many members could speak. Although I may be wrong in this, I feel that the "P" plates are too small and should be made larger. Although they are to be placed at the front and rear of vehicles, I believe they should be larger. I do not know what the price will be.

Mr. Knox: Do you think it would be better if they were the size of this sheet of paper?

Mr. BROMLEY: Yes, I would be happy with that. I believe the present size is a bit small.

The Minister said that the "P" plates would have to be displayed by drivers who had just received their licences, irrespective of their ages. I took out some figures privately; I did not get them from any Government department or the library. I obtained them from other sources. Although I do not enjoy saying this, it seems to be true, from the observations that I have made, that older people going for their licences find it more difficult to become accustomed to traffic. Officers of the Police Force have told me that they have found that people who get driving licences later in life do not make as good drivers as young people do, yet members, including the one who has just resumed his seat, have castigated the young drivers of today. I shall deal later with the accident rate of young drivers. From my own observations, it seems that what I have been told is more or less correct.

It was with some horror that I heard the Minister state recently that by the end of this year there would be over 600 deaths on the roads in this State. The very thought of that is frightening to sober, thinking people such as members of the A.L.P.

Mr. Miller: Do you remember the A.L.P.'s Christmas message on the main arterial roads last Christmas?

Mr. BROMLEY: No, I do not, now.

Mr. Miller: I was most amazed at the message.

Mr. BROMLEY: The message that I have for the people is to take more care on the road. If we are going to speak of roadside signs I want to refer to something that I have mentioned in this Chamber before. There are advertisements at the sides of roads, and I believe that, at every place at which an accident occurs, an enlarged photograph of the wreckage should be displayed on a hoarding. That is the message that I should like to get across to the people. I believe it would bring to their mind—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BROMLEY: I am sorry, Mr. Hooper; I got off the track. People do not seem to realise that this could happen to them, whether they have just received their licence and are carrying a "P" plate or whether they have had a licence for some years. If one could instil into the minds of drivers and pedestrians that they could be involved in the next fatality, the toll of the road might be reduced.

Australia's performance in reducing the level of road fatalities is very poor compared with the performance of other countries. As far as I am concerned, it is not good enough, and I do not think others who are worried about the toll of the road regard it as being good enough, either. More research should be undertaken into the causes of road accidents. Money to cover the cost of such research would come from various sources, but I think it should come mainly from the Commonwealth Government, which should increase its grants to the States from fuel tax. It collects over \$400,000,000 more than it distributes to the States in roads aid, and I think its attitude is selfish. Another indication of its selfish attitude is to be found in its treatment of the railways of Australia. I do not wish to get on to that subject, Mr. Hooper, but the news sheet published by the Commonwealth Railways makes interesting reading as to the money granted by the Commonwealth to the States from various fields of finance. All money paid by motorists in fuel tax should be returned to the States.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not know whether the hon. member for Norman is deliberately not directing his remarks to the motion before the Committee, but they have no connection with it. I am sure he will be happy to return to the subject now under discussion.

Mr. BROMLEY: It is rather strange that at this time of the morning, after several hon. members from the Government side of

the Chamber have spoken about matters not directly connected with the Bill, you should decide, Mr. Hooper, that I must stick to the actual terms of the motion. I point out, with due respect to you, that the reduction of the tragic toll of the road is a serious matter, and I wish to place before the Committee some suggestions that may assist to bring about a reduction.

The legislation that the Minister proposes to introduce is designed to reduce the toll of the road. If it is not, why would the Committee even consider introducing it? Both Government and Opposition members have been asking for some time that a measure such as this should be introduced. Of course, finance is a consideration in any measure, no matter what it may be, that is introduced into the Chamber. In the last few weeks, hon. members have heard Ministers say, "We would like to do this and that. We would like to reduce the toll of the road. Unfortunately all these things cost money."

Before I was warned by the Chairman, I was about to say to the Committee that motorists who pay fuel tax should be entitled to some protection and that revenue from fuel tax should be used to teach people and reduce the toll of the road.

I want now to quote from "The Sunday Mail" of 27 July 1969 an article headed, "Rush to beat 'P' plates here." It reads—

"The introduction of 'P' plates has brought about a 10 per cent. reduction in accidents amongst drivers with less than a year's experience."

This refers to Western Australia. It then goes on to mention that the New South Wales restrictions on provisional drivers are even stricter than those in the other States.

That is why I said that this legislation appears to be watered down. The article continues—

"There are more than 106,000 'P' plate drivers in New South Wales, or about 5½ per cent. of the State's total licensed holders."

This indicates to me that even in New South Wales the rush to get licences is just as bad as in Queensland.

Finally, on the financial side I pose the question: Will the tax-payer, who is so often a motorist, become Australia's first natural resource to be exhausted, whether by accident or financially? With the introduction of this "P" plate legislation and the fact that "P" plates will be introduced in Queensland as soon as possible, I want to mention some of the tragic accident figures in Australia for 1968.

In 1968 there were 3,382 road deaths, or one death every 2½ hours; 82,210 persons were reported injured and probably many others were not reported. This is at the rate of one every 6½ minutes. 58,759 road accidents involving casualties were reported; 50.9 per cent. of persons killed were under

30 years of age; 60.5 per cent. of persons reported injured were under 30 years of age; 29.6 per cent. of persons killed were under 21 years of age; 38.4 per cent. of persons injured were under the age of 21 years; 39.4 per cent. of persons killed were drivers, and 36.5 per cent. of all accidents reported were on straight roads.

I do not want to get onto the subject of roads other than to say that the Minister made some mention, by way of interjection, of accidents that happened on roads in country areas. Incidentally, I must give credit for those figures to Sir Norman Nock who was addressing the 42nd Annual Conference of the Australian Automobile Association held in September. I pay tribute also to the A.A.A. for producing such an enlightening and interesting newsletter.

I had intended to quote from it, Mr. Hooper, but I shall bow to your ruling and say that one thing that worries me a great deal is that it appears from investigations I have made that the accident rate in Queensland costs this State well over \$100,000,000 a year. That is in addition to the heartbreak caused to the families of the many young people who, having obtained their driving licences only a short time previously, are either injured or killed. Perhaps the figures I have quoted are in the Minister's possession. On a population basis, in the age group referred to by the Minister when introducing the Bill, Queensland has the highest rate of road accidents in Australia. I do not want to refer to figures, because the Minister did not mention figures, but in 1968-69 in Queensland 30,507 road accidents were reported, and of that number 7,212 accidents involved casualties. Of the number of persons injured, 10,252 were seriously injured. The greatest number of injuries and deaths occurred in the 17 to 20-year age group, and that fact demonstrates the importance of introducing legislation to combat the road toll. Although the Bill appears to be broken down, it is a short step in the right direction.

The Minister said that excessive speed was the greatest killer, which indicates that the roads in country areas are worse than those in the metropolitan area. The Minister said that intoxication was the second-greatest killer.

In conclusion, I stress the importance of boycotting the motor-car manufacturers and oil companies that continually advertise on television and other media the so-called merits of their products that enable cars to reach high speeds. Those firms are playing up to the young people, and they are sabotaging the work that road-safety organisations in this State are doing. They sabotage the work that is performed by the organisation of which the Minister is chairman. The firms that engage in that type of advertising can be regarded as would-be murderers.

One particular oil company could have been regarded at one time as a sensible company in that it used to advertise by

announcing safety slogans. I do not know whether it found that that type of advertising did not increase sales of its products, but now it has reverted to the stupid type of advertising that claims that its products enable vehicles to reach high speeds. Loss of life can arise in this way.

I will now quote from "The Australian Temperance Advocate" of August 1969 a paragraph which I believe, is worthy of consideration because it is concerned with the road toll and accidents caused by drink-driving. It reads—

"The advertising boys have succeeded! Adult conversation, adult example, adult-designed television programmes culminate in the big lie: Alcohol confers magical powers; try it! A sherry, a cocktail, a glass of ale will disperse your shyness, unpopularity, your petty concerns. Share in the experience of life's avoidable regrets!"

That paragraph must cause concern and its publication is a credit to the magazine. Incidentally, the front page carries a photograph depicting a shocking accident and the caption asks, "Is permissiveness suicide?" It then queries the public attitude. I believe this photograph would invoke sober thoughts in people's minds, particularly in young people.

I now wish to raise once more the matter of miners' phthisis pensioners who receive a part Commonwealth social service benefit but do not receive a reduction in rates or any other concession because a couple gets about \$7.50 between them. They are not eligible for a medical benefits card or the 50 per cent. concessional motor-vehicle-registration fee that other pensioners receive. I ask the Minister to consider my request again because they are worthy people. I again ask him to increase the allocation to the Queensland Road Safety Council on a basis similar to that adopted in other States.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton South) (3.9 a.m.): Since my election to this Chamber I have availed myself of every opportunity to speak on road safety matters, even to the extent of waiting until 3.10 a.m. During these speeches I have been very critical of the road situation and of the Government's policies in this sphere. I point out that not for a moment do I doubt the Minister's personal desire to lessen the worsening road toll or his sincerity. However, like the Leader of the Opposition, I am critical of the ever-changing policies on road safety adopted by the Government to appease the Queensland voters. Politics, very often, are put before principles, to such an extent that road safety today is almost a farce. During the last few months we have heard much about what the Government intended to do about provisional licences. As the Leader of the Opposition stated, the Minister's introductory remarks varied greatly from the Press reports. I shall be interested to hear the Minister's

reasons for selecting the 12-month period and also for not achieving uniformity with the legislation of other States.

It goes without saying that speed plus alcohol plus lack of experience equals tragedy. That is a proven road-safety equation. New South Wales and Victoria have introduced a speed limit of 40 miles an hour and Tasmania has introduced a speed limit of 50 miles an hour. We have done nothing like this. The speed limit in the South is justified by the fact that the ability to drive deteriorates as the speed increases. I am sure that the Minister realises that, considering the road traps and the differing weather conditions that exist in this State, 60 miles an hour could be considered an excessive speed for an inexperienced driver.

The hon. member for Merthyr mentioned the definition of the "P" plate or licence, and whether the "P" stands for probationary or provisional has yet to be defined. It seems, however, that the legislation is based on the definition of "probationary" because a driver who obtains a licence for the very first time, regardless of age, is placed on a probationary period of 12 months. I should like the Minister to explain the psychological effect of this. It seems that this is of importance in other States and, like the hon. member for Salisbury, I wonder whether such a driver could develop an inferiority complex or whether he would regard it as just a stage in the development of his experience in driving.

I should also like the Minister to state if consideration is being given to applying these provisions to the accident-prone driver or the consistent breaker of road laws, that is, the driver who has reached nine points and has lost his licence.

Over all, one must support the legislation because, like the previous Bill, it is a step in the right direction. However, it does almost nothing to produce drivers who are educated to the road environment and, as I have said many times in this Chamber, this is the aspect that the Government continually overlooks. When Government members stop paying lip-service to road safety and join with Opposition members in their attack on the crux of this matter, many of the problems will be overcome.

I question the profitability of the provisional licence if the driver lacks practical and theoretical road knowledge. It is better to prevent road accidents than to police them. I suggest that during the three-month period of suspension there should be a compulsory course of driving theory so that those who have broken the laws can study road rules and road use. As the hon. member for Windsor said, there is also a need for a knowledge of the physics of road use.

I am pleased to see the introduction of this legislation. I shall wait till I see the Bill before I comment further.

Mr. B. WOOD (Cook) (3.14 a.m.): This is another attempt to control the rising road toll. Every measure in this regard is worth while. It is not easy to determine which are the most effective, because, in spite of their number, the toll continues to rise. The Minister has predicted that this will be a record year for accidents. Many people question the effectiveness of our road safety plans, yet the situation is such that, if those measures had not been taken, the toll might be two or three times as high as it is now. Under this measure good drivers will be carrying what is virtually a brand to show the public that they are novices, whilst at the same time drivers of many years' standing who are bad drivers will go unbranded.

I suggest for the Minister's consideration another "P" plate of a similar type, of distinctive colouring and carrying a number to indicate the points that a driver has accrued under the points system. Any person seeing such plates on a car would then know that the driver had accumulated the number of points shown. All drivers who were not fully competent would be clearly indicated. After a period of one year in which no additional points were added, the plates could be removed. They might prove an added deterrent to unsafe driving, and may have some influence in reducing the road toll. As I have already said, anything that might do that is well worth consideration.

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (3.17 a.m.): The hon. member for Cook spoke of the tragic record of road fatalities. I wish to say that the measures that the Government has so far introduced to reduce the road toll have been very effective in the areas in which they have operated. I refer mainly to Brisbane and the coastal strip in which breathalysers, radar traps, and the points system have been used. It is a different story out in the West where there are fewer police for the effective implementation of the legislation.

I agree with the Minister that new drivers should clearly keep in mind that the holding of a driver's licence is a privilege granted by the community, and not a right. I was a little surprised at the accusation of the Leader of the Opposition that the Government is introducing tame-cat legislation. I do not consider it to be tame-cat legislation. We have followed the New South Wales principle of 12 months.

Mr. Houston: In one point only.

Mr. MILLER: Yes. The Leader of the Opposition quoted the list of traffic violations that can cause the loss of a new driver's licence in New South Wales. In Queensland, a new driver who is convicted of drink-driving will receive four points and lose his licence. If a driver exceeds the speed limit by 20 miles an hour or more, he will receive four points and lose his licence.

Mr. Houston: Do you consider that it is all right for a driver who has only been

driving for a couple of weeks to drive at 75 miles an hour, which is under 20 miles in excess of the speed limit?

Mr. MILLER: He accrues points. If he drives without "P" plates to warn other drivers and the police that he is a new driver on the road, he loses his licence. If he fails to remain at the scene of an accident, he gets three points.

Mr. Houston: Don't you think that that is a serious offence?

Mr. MILLER: Yes, I do.

Mr. Houston: Yet a new driver who runs away from an accident will get only three points.

Mr. MILLER: If a driver exceeds the speed limit by more than 10 miles an hour but not exceeding 20 miles an hour, he gets three points. Failing to give way, disobeying a traffic sign with the exception of parking, stopping and standing signs, disobeying traffic control light signals, disobeying police direction, improper overtaking or passing, driving without a licence, crossing double centre lines, and driving an unroadworthy vehicle, all bring three points.

Mr. Houston: You still have not taken the licence from him.

Mr. MILLER: I do not think the hon. gentleman could suggest, in all honesty, that the Government has introduced tame-cat legislation.

A driver gets two points for careless driving, failing to signal his intentions, exceeding the speed limit by 10 miles an hour, or making an improper turn. He gets one point for failing to produce a provisional driver's licence, failing to keep left, following too closely, failing to report traffic accidents, driving a vehicle with minor defects, and any breach of the Traffic Regulations relating to standing or stopping.

I thank the Minister for giving backbenchers a copy of all legislation that comes into his hands.

Mr. Houston: Don't they all do that?

Mr. MILLER: No. I do not believe that all Ministers give backbenchers copies of all legislation and information relative to it. I am pleased that the Minister does that.

I am very pleased also to see that the "P" plate is made of reflectorised material. However, I should like to know whether the law permits a person to attach a red "P" plate on the front of a vehicle. Usually the reflecting material shows red in the daytime and black at night. I should like the Minister to indicate whether in fact the "P" shows black at night.

Mr. Knox: Yes, it does.

Mr. MILLER: I thank the Minister for that information. I do not think that a red sign would be permitted on the front of a vehicle.

Mr. Houston: The Government is amending the Act. Parliament has power to amend regulations.

Mr. MILLER: The Government would have power to amend the regulations if the "P" plate showed red at night, but the proposed Bill does not amend the regulations.

When one realises that 500 drivers a week are being issued with licences in Queensland, one can see the need for the introduction of provisional licences. The number of new drivers coming onto the roads is causing problems of immense magnitude, and I believe that the provisions of the proposed Bill will play an important part in reducing the toll of the road.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (3.23 a.m.): It has been very interesting to listen, in the early hours of the morning, to some of the contributions that have been made to the debate.

The hon. member for Ithaca was concerned about the "P" plate to be attached to vehicles. Anyone with any knowledge of traffic matters would know that a red sign on a vehicle is a warning. If one turns a corner and puts on the blinkers on one's vehicle, they flicker red; trucks carrying flammable liquids, for example, carry a red sign front and back, and this applies also to trucks carrying explosives and heavy equipment.

Mr. Miller: I have never seen a red turning indicator or a red reflector on the front of a vehicle.

Mr. NEWTON: Haven't you?

Mr. Miller: I am surprised that the hon. member for Belmont was not aware of that.

Mr. NEWTON: It is not a question of being aware of it. I am only stating what I observe on the road virtually every night.

Mr. Miller: I think you're colour blind.

Mr. NEWTON: I am not saying that I am not. I may have to take a test for colour blindness.

Having heard the second part of the Government's policy speech delivered by the Leader of the Liberal Party—it dealt at some length with the issuing of provisional licences—I was rather amazed by the Minister's introduction of the proposed Bill. Nowhere at all did I hear an age group mentioned in connection with provisional licences. Once the Bill passes through this Chamber and becomes law, any person, irrespective of age, applying for a licence will have to carry out the regulations laid down by the Government. I want to correct the impression that the hon. member for Windsor endeavoured to create that young people were the only ones affected by the provision. He continually mentioned 17-year-olds.

It amazes me that hon. members opposite, especially those on the land, should adopt the attitude that 17-year-olds are incapable of

driving properly when many have sons and daughters driving tractors, motor-cars and farm equipment at 13 years of age. They will obtain their licences as soon as they turn 17.

Hon. members opposite should not try to create the impression that these young people are not capable of driving. Children today are educated to a much higher standard than were many members in the Chamber. Quite a number of us left school at 14 years of age and probably would not have passed the 7th Grade. Of course, the grades were different in those days. However, there is nothing wrong with the driving ability of these people either today or at the time they obtained their licences. In arguing the matter as the hon. member for Windsor did, he cast a reflection on our youth. Many teen-agers today would be more capable of passing a driving test than many of us would have been in our day.

Mr. Knox: I agree. Do you think 21-year-olds would be responsible also?

Mr. NEWTON: It is not a question involving age groups at all. The Bill affects everybody who endeavours to obtain a driving licence. The Minister must know that people endeavouring to obtain a licence late in life would face many more problems than young people of 21 years of age, or under.

I think we should carefully study several aspects of the Bill. Let us see that what occurred in other States does not occur here. Other motorists take advantage of these people and it is to be hoped that when an accident involving a provisional-licence holder occurs, the blame is not automatically laid at his door.

This Government set up a central traffic area in Brisbane and in that area recently disputation has been taking place about the placement of traffic lanes. If a driver does not drive in a lane that will take him the way he wants to go, he can be forced to drive around in the central traffic area for some time. A number of people have been cautioned by traffic police for not keeping to the left of the roadway.

Traffic islands and traffic standards have been referred to, and I point out that, with the elimination of trams from the metropolitan area, traffic standards have disappeared from the roadways.

I hope that either in his reply or his second-reading speech, the Minister will resolve the doubts that exist on a number of matters. When provisional licences are issued in this State, we should ensure that motorists who have no respect for others are not able to take advantage of provisional-licence holders. If that matter is considered with the other points that have been raised, the general public may have the Government's attitude on "P" plates clarified.

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Transport) (3.32 a.m.), in reply: Again I thank hon. members for their contributions to the debate. Quite a number of subjects have been discussed, and I intend to reply only to those that are pertinent to the Bill, assuming that the others are observations.

I think that I should trace the history of "P" plates in Australia. It was pointed out during the debate that Queensland was going in a different direction from the other States on the introduction of "P" plates. I point out that many of the systems in other States operate on a hit-or-miss basis, and some doubt still exists as to value of "P" plates.

Indeed, the hon. member for Merthyr pointed out that the experts who looked at the introduction of "P" plates as recently as last year still were not convinced that their introduction was advantageous.

Five or six months ago it was decided that we should use the points system for "P" plates in this State, and I looked at the matter and discussed it with people in other States in this field. They were very impressed with the possibility of using the points system with "P" plates instead of the present systems that apply in those States. In other States where the commission of any one of 19 to 25 offences immediately leads to a charge and, upon conviction, to the forfeiture of the "P" plate, an enormous amount of litigation is entailed because a person who commits what is regarded in other States as a minor offence and runs the risk of losing his licence fights the case in court. Of course, he is not guilty until he is proved guilty. Some people use their "P" plates while waiting for their cases to be heard. On conviction they may appeal and carry on in this vein for a period much longer than the actual period of issue of the "P" licence. Thousands of people are queued up in the other States to fight convictions for comparatively minor charges. On that score alone, we felt that the points system was more attractive in the use of "P" plates than the more cumbersome system used interstate. After we told officers in the other States what we were thinking about, they are now looking at this system because we were the first State to introduce the points system. In the last 18 months all States have introduced the points system, but the "P" plates, in most instances were introduced before they adopted the points system. On this occasion we may well be pioneering what could become a uniform system in Australia by attaching the "P" plate system to the points system. It will be interesting to see how it works as it will be integrated with the existing demerit system. We will have a very clear picture of what happens day by day.

Mr. Casey: You mean that you hope it works?

Mr. KNOX: We hope it works because we will certainly reduce the great queue for litigation, remembering that New South Wales has a one-year provisional licence. A conviction can be fought and, with a delay of up to two years in getting a hearing, a person actually qualifies for a full licence. When the appeal comes on for hearing he has a full licence, not a provisional licence. That is a serious weakness that has arisen in the systems in other States.

The "P" plate system applies to all ages. All new licence holders, regardless of age, will be issued with provisional licences.

One or two members suggested that reminder notices should be issued for the 10-year and 5-year licences. That suggestion has been made to me on several occasions. We are trying to find a simple administrative way of reminding people that their licences are due for renewal. Some people allow their licences to lapse for more than 12 months. The position is a little difficult in that a law-abiding citizen who has gone about his business, who has not needed to look at his licence, and who has neglected to renew his 10-year licence—12 months may lapse before he does so—is issued on renewal with a provisional licence. He has to undergo a test—and I can see no objection to that—but I do not see why he should get a provisional licence simply because he overlooked renewing his licence. It is usually the law-abiding citizen who forgets because he is not looking at his licence continually.

Mr. Casey: When did you look at yours?

Mr. KNOX: I looked at it the other day to ensure that it was current.

Mr. Houston: The suggestion of the hon. member for Tablelands had merit.

Mr. KNOX: That is so. That suggestion has been made by quite a number of members.

Mr. Houston: It is the first time I have heard it advanced in the Chamber.

Mr. KNOX: The hon. gentleman should not be ridiculous. The suggestion has been made on a number of occasions, since the suggested introduction of provisional licences. Representations have been renewed from a number of quarters on both sides of the committee.

I felt that I should make certain explanations tonight, and I will deal with other matters at the second reading stage.

Motion (Mr. Knox) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Knox, read a first time.

The House adjourned at 3.41 a.m.