

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 19 MARCH 1970

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 19 MARCH, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

GRANT FOR TEMPERANCE EDUCATION

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

Under section 47 (2A) of the Liquor Act relating to assisting in an educational programme to discourage intemperance—

(1) What amount was expended on the programme for each fiscal year since 1961?

(2) What amounts of such yearly allocations remained unspent at June 30 each year?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "I table the information requested by the Honourable Member. Examination of the contents will reveal that expenditure exceeded the allocation in the years 1966, 1967 and 1968. To meet this situation, additional funds were provided in 1968-69, from Department of Health allocation, amounting to \$10,000 and in the current year Cabinet has made provision of an additional \$15,000 from revenue."

Paper.—Whereupon Mr. Fletcher laid upon the Table of the House the information referred to.

GRANT FOR HEALTH PROGRAMME IN RELATION TO ALCOHOLISM

(a) Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

Under section 47 (2A) of the Liquor Act relating to assisting in a health programme on the problem of alcoholism—

(1) What amount was expended on the programme for each fiscal year since 1961?

(2) What amounts of such yearly allocations remained unspent at June 30 each year?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The Health Department expenditure for the years requested by the Honourable Member was as follows:—

Financial Year	Expenditure	Balance carried forward
	\$	\$
1960-61	Nil	Nil
1961-62	2,500	12,500
1962-63	9,711	2,789
1963-64	22,983	9,806
1964-65	7,869	31,937
1965-66	16,291	45,646
1966-67	24,290	51,357
1967-68	20,179	61,178
1968-69	29,328	51,850

The programme approved by the Department for 1969-70 and 1970-71 will completely absorb the balance shown at June 30, 1969, and will in fact require additional allocations to implement it in its entirety. I wish to indicate to the Honourable Member that the above figures do not disclose the total expenditure incurred by the Department of Health in its programme of treatment of alcoholism. There are large sums of money being expended in the maintenance of pavilion 4 in the grounds of the Royal Brisbane Hospital and in the operations of the Wacol Rehabilitation Clinic where a daily average of 46 patients are under treatment."

(b) Mr. Lloyd, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

Will he itemise expenditure during the year 1968-69 of moneys received from the Justice Department under section 47 (2A) of the Liquor Act?

Answer:—

"Expenditure from the Liquor Act Trust Fund for the year 1968-69 was as follows:—

	\$
Salaries and Wages—Professional and Clerical Staff	22,205
Travelling Expenses and Fares ..	914
Printing, Stationery, Office Requisites and Equipment	1,270
Symposium Expenses	504
Patients' Amenities	931
Institutional Films	969
Motor Vehicles—	
Capital	2,310
Maintenance and Running Costs	225
	2,535
	<u>\$29,328"</u>

CONTRIBUTIONS THROUGH FISH BOARD TO QUEENSLAND PROFESSIONAL FISHERMEN'S LEAGUE

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

(1) During the last three years, how many professional fishermen have signed an authority to have one per centum of the net value of their fish returned to the Fish Board taken out and paid to the Queensland Professional Fishermen's League?

(2) Concerning (a) the Fish Board and (b) the North Queensland Fish Board, (i) what is the total number of such authorities now held, (ii) what total sum has been collected by this means, (iii) what sum was collected in 1968 and 1969, (iv) what were the monthly collections in 1968, 1969 and to date in 1970, (v) how much

has been paid out by each Board to—
(a) the Queensland Professional Fishermen's League, (b) the North Queensland Master Fishermen's Association and (c) any other Association and (vi) how much is at present held in trust?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Details of payments authorised by professional fishermen to be made to the Queensland Professional Fishermen's League should be sought from that organisation. The Fish Board and The North Queensland Fish Board act purely as agents in this matter, and it is considered that any information in their records relating to these payments should not be treated as public information."

NATIONAL TRUST HISTORICAL EMBLEM

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

(1) Does Queensland possess a National Trust emblem or symbol for buildings and/or places of historic interest? If so, will he describe it for the benefit of the public generally and tourists in particular?

(2) If no emblem, symbol or sign exists, will he arrange to have one commissioned and adopted?

Answers:—

(1) "I am not aware of any action taken by the National Trust of Queensland in the matter raised by the Honourable Member."

(2) "It would appear that this is a matter for the National Trust of Queensland in the first instance."

PENTLAND SAWMILL

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

(1) Have the buildings which were part of the Pentland sawmill been sold? If so, to whom and for what amount?

(2) Were tenders called for the sale of the buildings? If so, in what newspapers did the advertisement appear and for how long did tenders remain open?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "None of the buildings which were part of the Pentland sawmill have been sold. A notice inviting tenders was posted on the notice board at the Post Office in Pentland for two of the buildings, but none of the tenders received has been accepted. Tenders will be invited by advertisement in the *North Queensland Register*, the *Townsville Daily Bulletin* and the *Northern Miner* on Saturday, March 21, 1970, for the purchase for removal of the buildings and tenders will remain open for a period of two weeks."

DRIED MILK PRODUCT, "DUTCH JUG PLUS 7"

Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

(1) Are his Departmental officers aware of a dried milk product in crystalline form coming on the Australian market and known by the name "Dutch Jug Plus 7", a product of Foremost?

(2) As the company claims, *inter alia*, that the new product is not only tastier but healthier, with more vitamins, minerals and proteins than bottled milk, will he have samples tested to ascertain if the claim is valid wholly or in part and, if it is not, make an appropriate statement because successful promotion of this product could be detrimental to the liquid milk supply by factories or individuals?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "My Department is equipped to analyse such products for mineral and protein content when samples become available, but not for vitamin content. Like all foods for human consumption, this product will have to satisfy the requirements of the Food and Drug Regulations."

ETON IRRIGATION SCHEME CHARGES

Mr. Newbery, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a pamphlet headed "Eton Irrigation Scheme"?

(2) If the quoted figures of \$8 per acre-foot of water and 75 cents per ton cane farm peak are not correct, what are the correct figures?

Answers:—

(1) "I have examined a copy of the pamphlet and note that it contains a number of inaccuracies. The Irrigation Commission is currently preparing a set of notes, which will be forwarded to all landholders and the various sugar mills affected by the scheme. Subsequent to the despatch of these notes, a public meeting will be held in the area at which any points in doubt may be raised. Pending the issue of these notes and the holding of the public meeting, I would suggest to landholders that they disregard the pamphlet and its contents."

(2) "The charges quoted in the pamphlet of \$8 per acre-foot and 75 cents per ton farm peak cane, are both incorrect. However, the error in respect of the water charge can be attributed to my Press statement of February 19, when this figure was incorrectly quoted. The correct charges are as follows:—(a) Water Charges—(i) For water supplied from proposed reticulation scheme (Water Rights and Sales)—\$7 per acre-foot; (ii)

Private pumping from Mirani Weir—\$2.50 per acre-foot. (b) Charges to sugar mills in respect of farm peak on holdings served by the scheme—75 cents per ton of sugar. The pamphlet also contains references to the minimum charges for water. The correct situation with these is as follows: (A) Supply from Mirani Weir—Landholders obtaining supply in this way will be able to obtain a total water allocation, by way of license, of 1.2 acre-feet per acre of gross assignment. Two-thirds of this allocation, i.e. 0.8 acre-feet per acre of gross assigned area, would require to be paid for annually whether used or not. In other words the minimum annual charge is \$2 per acre of gross assignment. (B) Supply from Channel System—Here again a total water allocation of 1.2 acre-feet per acre of gross assignment is proposed. Two-thirds of this will be regarded as a water right and would require to be paid for annually whether used or not. Thus the minimum annual charge for farms supplied in this way would be \$5.60 per acre of gross assignment."

AIR POLLUTION, SILKSTONE

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

With reference to the article in the *Telegraph* of January 12 headed "Our Smog Bad, But Improving"—

(1) Has he noticed that, of the 19 locations tabulated in the article showing district recordings of atmospheric fall-out for the years 1959 and 1969, only two locations, namely, Petrie Terrace and Silkstone, had recordings showing an increase in air pollution?

(2) Why has the position at Silkstone deteriorated during the period mentioned whilst there has been substantial improvement in other areas?

(3) What are the locations of the air-pollution gauges at Silkstone and Ipswich?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The slight increase at Silkstone can be related to the extensive building operations which took place in the immediate vicinity to the gauge during the sampling period."

(3) "The Silkstone gauge was situated during the sampling period in the S.E.A. Electricity Sub-station yard, Station Road, Silkstone. The Ipswich gauge was situated on the roof of the Commonwealth Bank, Brisbane Street, Ipswich."

BUNDAMBA RAILWAY STATION PLATFORM

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

With reference to his Answer to my Question on August 27, 1969, that an investigation was being held into the lengthening of the "up" platform at the Bundamba railway station, has the investigation been completed and when is it likely that the platform will be lengthened to accommodate passenger trains of eight suburban coaches which regularly stop at this station each day?

Answer:—

"The investigation has been carried out and the question of extending the platform will be considered when it is known what money is available for works of this nature next financial year."

MINERS' PENSION RATES

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

(1) Have miners' pension rates in (a) Queensland and (b) New South Wales been increased by way of "flow-on" from the social service increases provided for in the 1969 Federal Budget?

(2) As the mining unions agreed on May 13 last to the application of a means test on miners' pensions in certain circumstances and the Government has not announced any intention to introduce progressive, far-reaching changes in the miners' pension legislation during this Session, will he grant relief to recipients in this State by legislating during the current Session to provide, as an interim measure, that increases at least equal to those provided for in the 1969 Federal Budget for social service pensioners will be granted as a "flow-on"?

Answers:—

(1) "The rates in Queensland have not been so increased. I am under the impression that rates have been increased in New South Wales but official advice to that effect has not been received."

(2) "The proposals put forward by the Queensland Coal Owners' Association and the Combined Mining Unions for changes in the miners' pensions legislation were more extensive than anticipated and contained a number of alternatives and areas of disagreement which have required extensive study and will require further discussions. Endeavours have already begun to arrange a meeting of the Miners Pension Tribunal at the earliest possible time to commence these discussions. In the meantime it is not possible in the time available to introduce interim legislation in this short Session."

NORTH ROCKHAMPTON STATE HIGH SCHOOL

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

(1) On what priority has an assembly hall at the North Rockhampton State High School been placed, considering that the Parents and Citizens' Committee has over \$12,000 towards it?

(2) Is a library building contemplated for the school in the 1970-71 financial year? If not, has any decision been reached as to when it may be expected to be built?

Answers:—

(1) "The North Rockhampton State High School Assembly Hall has been placed twelfth on the priority list. This is not related to the amount of money raised up to the present, but it is due to the fact that eleven other applications were lodged before that made by the North Rockhampton State High School Parents and Citizens' Association."

(2) "According to current planning a Commonwealth library building should be provided at the North Rockhampton State High School before the end of the 1971 school year."

RAIL FARE CONCESSION CARDS FOR PENSIONERS

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

Are half-fare concession cards for railway travel issued to all age, invalid and widow pensioners and, if not, where does his Department draw the line of demarcation?

Answer:—

"Persons in receipt of a full pension under the Means Test are entitled to the concession."

STUDENTS AND TUTORS, QUEENSLAND CONSERVATORIUM OF MUSIC

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

(1) How many students are enrolled at the Brisbane Conservatorium of Music?

(2) How many tutors are employed there and how many hours are considered a fair day's work for a tutor?

Answers:—

(1) "300 students are enrolled at the Queensland Conservatorium of Music."

(2) "Seven full-time lecturers are employed and twenty-four part-time teachers. The full-time lecturers teach for twenty-five hours per week. The time spent by part-time teachers varies according to the number of students receiving instruction from each teacher."

S GIO INVESTMENTS IN PROPERTY AND LAND

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

With regard to (a) Brisbane and (b) Townsville, how much (i) has the S GIO invested in property and land and (ii) does it propose to invest on plans and estimates already envisaged and publicised?

Answer:—

"The State Government Insurance Office has invested \$18 million in property and land in Brisbane and \$1.3 million in Townsville. Detailed costs of likely expenditure to be involved have not yet been finalised."

USE OF BANDS ON BRISBANE RIVER BANKS IN WELCOME TO H.M. THE QUEEN

Mr. Davis, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

As Press reports dealing with the Royal Visit in 1963 deplored the fact that there were no bands at strategic points along the Brisbane River, have bands been ordered for this occasion so that the sound of music across the water can add a desirable note to the Royal welcome?

Answer:—

"I do not recall any serious criticism about the lack of bands along the banks of the Brisbane River on the occasion of the 1963 Royal Visit. Organisers believed then, and believe now, that the cost and effort of positioning bands along the river would be wasted because those on board "Britannia" would scarcely hear the music. The reasons for this thinking are:—(a) The distance of "Britannia" from such points; (b) The positioning of many hundreds of craft, which will be participating in the organised aquatic welcome, between the river banks and "Britannia"; and (c) The noise emanating from such craft as part of the welcome. However, at Newstead wharves it is intended to position a band or bands which will play as "Britannia" approaches and berths."

SCHOOL TEACHER RESIGNATIONS; TEACHERS' COLLEGE ENROLMENTS

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

(1) How many (a) male and (b) female teachers have resigned in (i) the Central region and (ii) the State since January 1?

(2) How many were (a) primary and (b) secondary teachers?

(3) How many bonded teachers have resigned since January 1, (a) 1969 and (b) 1970?

(4) What is the present total enrolment of trainees at teachers' colleges?

Answers:—

(1) "The numbers of teachers who resigned during January and February, 1970 were:—

	Male	Female	Total
Central Region ..	13	63	76
State	131	542	673

Of the female teachers who resigned, some 300 did so for marriage, family or personal reasons."

(2) "The numbers of primary and secondary teachers were:—

	Primary	Secondary
Central Region ..	59	17
State	411	262

The Honourable Member will, no doubt, be pleased to know that this represents an improvement on the situation for these months in 1969."

(3) "To obtain this information would require a special investigation of the records of each teacher who resigned during the period. It is considered that deployment of staff for this purpose is not warranted."

(4) "There are 3,178 departmental and 34 non-departmental teachers undergoing courses of teacher education in teachers' colleges. In addition there are 900 departmental teachers in courses at other tertiary institutions."

ARCHER PARK RAILWAY STATION BUILDING, ROCKHAMPTON

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

Further to my Question on December 5, 1969, concerning the use of Archer Park railway station—

(1) Who was the successful tenderer when tenders were called on January 30 and what was the amount?

(2) For what purpose will the (a) building and (b) area be used?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "One tender only was received from Mrs. S. M. Martin of 66 Rundle Street, Rockhampton, who desired the lease for catering purposes. The tender was not accepted and the building is being retained for departmental purposes."

STUDENT NURSE RESIGNATIONS

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

(1) How many (a) first, (b) second and (c) third-year student nurses have resigned since January 1?

(2) What was the total number of resignations during 1969?

(3) Has any assessment been made of the reasons for the resignations and, if so, what are they?

Answers:—

(1) "This information is not readily available. Approved training hospitals would have to be circulated to obtain this information."

(2) "The Nurses Board has advised that from returns received, 920 resignations were tendered, but of these 238 students sought re-enrolment in another training hospital. These figures are on a State-wide basis."

(3) "With respect to State-controlled training hospitals, the information sought by the Honourable Member appears, for the 1968-69 year, on page 95 of the Annual Report of the Health and Medical Services of the State of Queensland. Information concerning private training hospitals is not available to the Department."

CAPRICORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ROCKHAMPTON

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

(1) Will he take appropriate action against the Capricornia Institute of Technology where, for some reason or other, correspondence to the Institute is not answered and enrolments with fees are accepted but study papers have not been forwarded to accepted nominees for correspondence courses?

(2) Will he assure this House that the nominees in courses who have not as yet received study papers will receive sympathetic consideration when the examination dates for their courses are set?

Answers:—

(1) "Full enquiries will be made into this matter. It would assist my Department if the Honourable Member could inform me of actual cases, including relevant course and subjects. External students are enrolled at the Institute, which approves the course and authorises the supply of lesson papers from the Technical Correspondence School, Brisbane."

(2) "If there has been any delay examiners will be instructed to give sympathetic consideration in such cases."

SOFT-DRINK BOTTLES

Mr. F. P. Moore, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health,—

(1) Has he been approached by the Queensland Soft Drink Manufacturers' Association seeking legislation to make illegal the re-use of the 13-ounce non-returnable bottle?

(2) Are all the officers in this Association from large Brisbane firms and are the smaller country bottlers not represented?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "The State Health Department has no record of the persons who hold office in the Queensland Soft Drink Manufacturers' Association."

BOOK AND UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR
ABORIGINAL SCHOOL CHILDREN

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

Is any allowance made to Aboriginal families for the purchase of school books and uniforms for their children attending State primary and secondary schools or other educational centres? If not, because of the lower per capita income of Aboriginal families and the consequential hardship caused in the provision of these necessities for their children, will he make an allowance for this purpose?

Answer:—

"From my Department, aboriginal school children are entitled to the same financial assistance which is available to children of European descent. In the primary school this takes the form of a Remote Area Allowance of \$140 per year for each child in grades 6 or 7 who has to live away from home to attend school. In secondary schools they are entitled to claim assistance according to the contents of the departmental brochure, which is available to the Honourable Member. In addition, the Commonwealth provides generous assistance to aboriginal students remaining at school after the compulsory leaving age. Where matters of social welfare are involved, the aboriginal parents may seek assistance from the Department of Children's Services and the Department of Aboriginal and Island Affairs."

NURSING STAFF OVERTIME, PRINCESS
ALEXANDRA AND ROYAL BRISBANE
HOSPITALS

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

(1) What was the collective amount in hours of overtime worked by nursing staff at (a) Princess Alexandra and (b) Royal Brisbane Hospitals, including the maternity and children's wards, in 1968-69 and 1969 to the latest available date?

(2) What is the average individual amount of overtime worked by nurses per week?

(3) How much overtime was paid at each of the hospitals in 1968-69 and 1969 to date?

Answers:—

Advice from the North Brisbane and South Brisbane Hospitals Boards indicates—

(1) "The total amount of overtime worked during 1968-69 and for the period from July 1, 1969, to January 31, 1970, being the latest date for which figures are available was:—

	Princess Alexandra Hospital	Royal Brisbane Hospital Royal Children's Hospital Royal Women's Hospital
	hours	hours
1968-69 ..	50,372	83,278
July 1, 1969, to January 31, 1970	24,213	43,606

(2) "The average amount of overtime worked per week for the same periods as indicated in (1), based on the average employment of all nursing staff was:—

	Princess Alexandra Hospital	Royal Brisbane Hospital Royal Children's Hospital Royal Women's Hospital
	hours	hours
1968-69 ..	1.22	1.47
July 1, 1969, to January 31, 1970	0.98	1.25

I wish to emphasise that these figures are the average weekly hours of overtime worked by nursing staff. The Honourable Member would realise, of course, that there would be instances where weekly overtime worked by a nurse would exceed this average and in other cases could be less than the average. The availability of staff and the needs of patients during peak periods would be influencing factors."

(3) "The total amount paid in overtime for the same periods as indicated in (1) and (2) was:—

	Princess Alexandra Hospital	Royal Brisbane Hospital Royal Children's Hospital Royal Women's Brisbane
	\$	\$
1968-69 ..	72,358.00	140,092.00
July 1, 1969, to January 31, 1970	41,078.00	87,027.00

LYTTON PROPERTY DAMAGE FROM
EXPLOSION AT AUSTRAL-PACIFIC
FERTILIZERS LTD.

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

(1) Is he aware of the damage caused to homes in the Lytton area by the explosion which occurred at Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Ltd. in November, 1969?

(2) How many householders have complained to the company in relation to damage caused to their homes by the explosion?

(3) What compensation is Austral-Pacific Fertilizers Ltd. prepared to pay these householders for repairs to their homes?

(4) Have all precautions been taken to ensure that an explosion of this magnitude cannot again occur?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2 and 3) "This information is not available to my Department."

(4) "Yes, so far as is practicable in relation to matters coming within the administration of this Department are concerned. A further examination will be made during the next maintenance period."

MANLY STATE SCHOOL

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

(1) Will he consider having the infants' section at the Manly State School repainted and floor covering provided in an endeavour to overcome the depressing effect these classrooms have on such young children?

(2) Will he have the old furniture removed from these classrooms and replaced with new, modern furniture?

Answers:—

(1) "Approval has been given to expenditure for internal painting and floor covering in the infants section of the Manly State School. It is anticipated that the work will commence at an early date."

(2) "The old furniture is serviceable and funds are not available for its replacement at this stage."

ROLL-ON, ROLL-OFF CONTAINERISATION
TERMINALS

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) What roll-on/roll-off containerisation terminals in Queensland provide for both road and rail facilities?

(2) If some ports do not provide for each method of transport, what is the reason and will consideration be given to having both road and rail facilities available at all existing and future terminals where this type of cargo is handled?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Where there is a demand for rail services these have been arranged."

USE OF DIESEL-HYDRAULIC LOCOMOTIVES

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

Will he consider using diesel-hydraulic locomotives during the wet season for ballast purposes and for maintaining essential services?

Answer:—

"Yes."

LIQUOR CANTEENS FOR ABORIGINAL
RESERVES

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

In view of the continuous responsibility placed on the management to keep liquor off Aboriginal reserves, missions and communities and the strong objections by people to having their luggage searched, has he considered changing the Act so that the present unsatisfactory arrangements may be overcome? If so, will he consider the canteen method, where practicable, if the wish of these people is that they be allowed to purchase liquor in their area?

Answer:—

"The whole question of liquor on reserves is continually being reviewed. The canteen system for reserves is one to which I would only agree to on a trial basis if requested by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders' Councillors themselves."

MACKAY DISTRICT ABATTOIR

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

(1) How many tenders have been received for the (a) lease and (b) sale of the Mackay District Abattoir?

(2) How many were from (a) local sources, (b) Queensland sources and (c) interstate sources?

(3) Have all tenderers undertaken to (a) provide facilities for all local butchers and (b) allow the existing tenancy of the Mackay District Saleyards to continue?

(4) When will the successful tender be announced?

(5) If the abattoir is sold or leased, will the local authorities comprising the Board be relieved of any financial loss incurred by the Board?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) "A report on the tenders received for the Mackay District Abattoir will be submitted to Cabinet shortly. At this stage of the negotiations I do not feel free to disclose details of the tenders received. However, I would assure the Honourable Member that the interests of local parties, including employees at the works, will be safeguarded."

"PENTAVITE" FOR CHILDREN ON ABORIGINAL RESERVES

Mr. B. Wood, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

(1) Is the product "Pentavite" which is recommended for infants, available at stores or the Medical Aid Post on Aboriginal reserves?

(2) As this, or a similar product, would assist in improving the health of Aboriginal and Island children, will he ensure that it becomes available, preferably at the M.A.P.?

(3) How many centres for supplementary feeding have been established on reserves and are they to be established on all reserves?

(4) Can all schools on reserves be supplied with powdered milk?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "The matter of vitamin supplements is based on their requirements and the advice of medical officers consistent with local circumstances and conditions. "Pentavite" and/or other vitamin compounds are available and the Member is assured that everything possible will continue to be done in the best interests of Aboriginal and Islander children."

(3) "Supplementary foods or vitamins are available at centres where circumstances justify, having due regard to medical advice and other requirements."

(4) "All centres sponsored by the Department have powdered milk available."

ELECTRICITY CHARGES, CAPE YORK PENINSULA

Mr. B. Wood, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

When electricity is supplied to homes in the Northern Peninsula area, will residents be required to pay for the electricity consumed? If so, will wages be increased so that no hardship will be imposed on people whose income is already low?

Answer:—

"Yes. The exact terms and conditions have not yet been determined but, in accordance with the Government's policy of doing everything possible to encourage Aborigines and Islanders to enjoy full rights as citizens and of course accept responsibilities, it can be expected that the charges will be consistent with their ability to pay."

OUTLYING ISLANDERS PRESENTLY RESIDENT ON THURSDAY ISLAND

Mr. B. Wood, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Conservation,—

Why is his Department insisting that many Islanders on Thursday Island return to their home island when they would prefer to remain on Thursday Island?

Answer:—

"Accommodation and facilities at Thursday Island are already strained to their limits and those Islanders who come from outlying islands for specific reasons and are on Thursday Island unemployed are encouraged to return to their homes on their home islands where they can live under reasonable circumstances and conditions which would not apply if they continued to remain at Thursday Island. The Department cannot accept responsibility for the accommodation of persons who desire to migrate to Thursday Island."

MILK BOTTLES AND CARTONS

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

As considerable and increasing supplies of carton milk are now being sold in this State, have there been any representations from interested bodies to have the cartons dated or coded? If so, what decision has been made by him or his Department?

Answer:—

"The Food and Drug Regulations require the container of pasteurised milk, whether a bottle or a carton, to show the date or day of bottling. The State Health Department has extended this requirement to milk other than pasteurised milk. The term 'milk' does not include flavoured milk."

TOURIST DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

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

(1) Has his Government undertaken any investigation into overseas countries providing specific incentives for tourist development and, if so, have any submissions been made on behalf of Queensland through the Australian Tourist Commission and/or to the Federal Government for direct assistance by way of grants, loans or subsidies?

(2) If not, have any specific requests been made to the Federal Government for tourist development assistance, to operate through the taxation system by way of taxation rebates, comparable with incentives offered to our nearby tourist competitors by the Governments of Fiji and New Zealand?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The Queensland Government and the Australian Tourist Commission are aware of the incentives situation in regard to tourist development as it applies in some other countries and appropriate representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government."

CROWN OF THORNS STARFISH

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to an article in the *Telegraph* of March 13 headed "Nuclear tests—Starfish link" and, if so, has anyone fully investigated this theory in relation to the control of the *acanthaster planci* (Crown of Thorns starfish)?

(2) Has any consideration been given to the theories of the late Noel Monkman, F.R.M.S., who claimed that the netting of sardines by fishermen for bait near tourist centres had depleted the natural predators of the eggs of the starfish, upsetting the balance of nature?

(3) If not, will these two aspects be investigated?

Answers:—

(1) "I have seen the newspaper article mentioned by the Honourable Member. To the best of my knowledge the theories mentioned have not been investigated. It is known that there has not been a plague of the Crown of Thorns starfish at Bikini or Eniwetok."

(2) "I am advised that Mr. Monkman's hypothesis is not in agreement with the facts as known and that it is considered highly unlikely that netting of sardines has any significant bearing on this matter."

(3) "The possibilities envisaged under all the hypotheses put forward will be kept under review in the light of fresh knowledge becoming available from investigation and research."

BROWN SUGAR PRICES

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

(1) Further to his Answer to my Question on March 17 concerning refined sugar prices, what is the retail price for a 2 lb. pack of brown sugar in comparison with Brisbane and Cairns prices for refined sugar, quoted respectively as 21-22 cents and 25 cents?

(2) As the freight differential is always being cited as a reason for high cost factors in North Queensland, what is the reason for the discrepancy in the price of brown sugar which is literally grown and produced in our own backyard?

Answers:—

(1) "It is not clear to what product the Honourable Member refers. The retail price of soft brown sugar in two pound packs is 27-28 cents in Brisbane and 29-32 cents in Cairns. In both centres raw sugar in one pound lots is understood to be retailing at 13 cents."

(2) "Soft brown sugar is a refinery product not made by raw sugar mills. It is understood a Cairns trader is purchasing raw sugar from a nearby mill for packing into one pound lots to meet a small local market. Freight differential naturally does not enter into the price of this product."

EXPENDITURE ON CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS

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

(1) What was the total expenditure on school construction work other than maintenance from (a) State and (b) Commonwealth funds for the financial year 1968-69?

(2) What is the total amount of anticipated expenditure on school construction works approved by the Executive Council since January 1, 1970, and how much will be financed from (a) State and (b) Commonwealth funds?

Answers:—

(1) "(a) \$13,199,674.48, (b) \$1,778,767.77."

(2) "(a) \$571,266, (b) \$2,182,029, total: \$2,753,295."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The Explosives Acts, 1952 to 1963.

Medical Act 1939-1969.

Regulations under The Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1968.

FORM OF QUESTIONS

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The question appears to seek information on Government policy.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It would appear that the hon. member is seeking advice on an Act.

Mr. HANSON: On behalf of my constituents.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Act is readily available for the hon. member to peruse. One part of his question is in order, but the remainder is not. I suggest that he read the Act.

ORDER IN CHAMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation on both sides of the Chamber. I ask that it please cease.

LIQUOR ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.43 a.m.): I move—

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

During the introductory debate, I drew attention to the main principles contained in this Bill. However, now that hon. members have had an opportunity to peruse the Bill, I should like to explain in more detail the amendments embodied in these principles.

The extension of facilities for the consumption of food with liquor was one of the most important principles to receive consideration. An amendment is proposed to permit of the sale in all bars of all types of food that are in a condition suitable for immediate consumption. This will overcome the present situation whereby food can be purchased only in a bottle department, passageway or entrance foyer of a hotel and will also encourage patrons to consume food whilst drinking liquor.

The hours for selling or supplying liquor to be consumed in the dining-rooms of hotels or in restaurants have been extended from 11 o'clock to 12 midnight on each day from Monday to Saturday, and on Sundays, when it is not Christmas Day, the periods have been altered from between the hours of 5 o'clock and 7 o'clock after noon to between the hours of 6 o'clock and 10 o'clock after noon.

In a further effort to minimise the effects of liquor on an empty stomach, a person is allowed one hour after the hours prescribed for the sale of liquor to consume it in a leisurely fashion with the balance of his meal. Other forms of licence, including bistro, cabaret, function-room and tavern licenses are introduced, all of which make provision for the sale of food with liquor.

The provision of a high standard of accommodation, and other modern facilities for tourists and other members of the travelling

public, is another objective of the Bill. With this thought in mind, provision is made for the granting of international hotel licences. Hotels that meet international standards in service and accommodation must be provided in Queensland if this State is to remain in the forefront of the tourist industry. A licence will be issued only if the planned hotel meets the high standards and conditions that will be required of international hotels. To facilitate their construction, the granting of a licence will not be subject to the hearing of objections or the taking of a local option poll.

A further inducement to tourists and travellers is the provision that is made for a limited hotel licence. This type of licence will be granted in respect of motels, and will enable liquor to be sold in the restaurant of the motel and in a reception area directly attached to the restaurant, during the same hours as those in which liquor may be sold in the dining-room of a hotel. A further provision permits the sale and supply of liquor to a lodger, and any guests of the lodger, for consumption in the lodger's unit.

With the enormous popularity of this modern type of accommodation, it is considered that such facilities are highly desirable. To protect the motel-owner, a concession similar to that at present applying to licensed victuallers has been provided so that a motel-owner is liable to make good any loss or injury to goods or property brought on the motel only if there is default on his part.

As the Federal Government is at present giving consideration to handing over the Commonwealth airport at Coolangatta to the local authority, and other Commonwealth airports may be similarly transferred in the future, provision for a new type of licence, termed an “airport licence”, has been included in the Bill.

The hours of trading in the bar and restaurant at an airport that is licensed have been made uniform with the present hours of trading at the Commonwealth airport at Eagle Farm, Brisbane. The advantages of the provision of liquor facilities for tourists and travellers at an airport will, I am sure, be appreciated by everybody.

Another matter to receive attention in the Bill is the bringing to Brisbane of the facilities that exist elsewhere in the State by removing the social injustice to Brisbane people of the denial to Sunday-drinking rights. This provision has received a thorough airing in all quarters. I can only add that Sunday drinking has been permitted outside the Brisbane area since 1961, and from all accounts has been acceptable and has worked well. No substantial reasons have been advanced as to why the people of Brisbane and visitors to this city should be deprived of facilities enjoyed by the rest of the State merely because of a geographical barrier.

Another aspect involved with Sunday drinking concerns licensed clubs. At present licensed golf and bowling clubs can trade on Sundays everywhere in the State, but a licensed club (other than a golf or bowling club) situated within the Brisbane area can only sell liquor in the dining room to members and guests partaking of a meal. This discrimination will be removed under the Bill, and all licensed clubs, including principal sporting clubs, will be able to trade on Sundays during the permitted hours.

Under the provisions of the Bill, drinking will no longer be confined to the lounge bar of a hotel on Sundays, as all bars, including private and public bars, will be able to trade in accordance with prescribed conditions during the permitted hours.

Another desirable social reform is the provision of more lengthy periods and more comfortable surroundings for relaxed and civilised drinking. A period of 15 minutes' grace is provided for the consumption of liquor sold to the legal closing time in hotel bars, clubs and cabarets, and a period of one hour is allowed for consumption of liquor with meals in restaurants and hotel dining-rooms. This will overcome the difficulty experienced at present by a late arrival who finds that, to consume the liquor purchased by him, it is often necessary for him to swill it down before the closing time to avoid breaking the law. It will also assist in promoting more civilised drinking habits.

The hours during which hotels and clubs may trade from Monday to Saturday may be varied by the Licensing Commission to allow flexibility of trading, provided that the period of trading does not exceed 12 hours in any period of 24 hours. In respect to a Sunday, the Licensing Commission may vary the permitted hours provided that the variation applies to all hotels in the district. These provisions will enable the needs of the public to be catered for and will permit of trading during periods which will be determined in the best interests of the community.

Permits issued for dancing and singing on licensed premises may be extended from the present period of three months to a period of six months. Provision is made also for the playing of live music and the showing of travel, documentary, educational or other prescribed films in the lounge of a hotel. This should assist relaxed and civilised drinking and make an evening more enjoyable for those partaking of lounge facilities.

Drinking in comfortable surroundings is encouraged by permitting golf and bowling clubs to trade on a Sunday between the hours of 10 a.m. and 7 p.m. and increasing the number of late-night permits which may be issued to a licensed club from 12 a year to 26 a year. Included in this increase is permission for a function of a member to be held at a golf or bowling club under the authority of a late-night permit.

The good of the general community is paramount in framing most legislation, and the interests of the community have been kept well to the forefront in the provisions of the Bill. One matter of great importance affecting all members of the community is the location of a new hotel. At present the Licensing Commission determines the area to which it proposes to remove a licence and then places an appropriate advertisement in the Government Gazette and twice in a newspaper circulating in the locality concerned. Objections may then be lodged, and if 10 per cent. of the electors in the locality petition for a local option vote poll, the poll is held. If all objections are dismissed and if a local option vote poll is held and the electors vote in favour of a hotel, the Licensing Commission then calls for public tenders.

The big disadvantage of this system is that the objectors, and the electors voting at the poll, are not aware of the specific site within the locality where the hotel will be erected subsequently. Under the provisions of the Bill, the procedure is changed and an application may be made for a specific site. If the Licensing Commission then considers that there is a need and it is in the public interest, public tenders are called. When the Licensing Commission decides which tender to accept, it then declares an area around that specific site of a three-mile radius for the taking of objections and a local option vote poll.

The advantage of the altered procedure is that people objecting and electors voting know the exact site where it is proposed to erect a hotel and are therefore in a better position to assess what action they make take. Another advantage is that, in addition to the Licensing Commission determining an area to which it proposes to remove a licence, a person may initiate action by applying to erect a hotel on a specific site.

Similar provisions apply in respect of an application by a licensed victualler to remove a subsisting licence to another site in the same or an adjoining district where it would better serve the convenience of the public, the only departure in this case being that public tenders are not called and other applicants are not considered.

At the hearing of any application by the Commission for the grant of a licence, the views of those in favour of the grant will be heard in addition to the views of objectors. This will enable the Commission to have the benefit of a more balanced opinion in its considered determination.

The interests of a small but important section of the community are acknowledged by the provision of a spirit merchant's (retail) licence for remote areas where no other form of licence exists. These licences may be conducted in conjunction with another business, as the number of residents in such areas usually does not make it economic to establish separate facilities.

There is a growing demand throughout Queensland for the issue of an authority to permit of liquor being consumed after normal trading hours at certain celebrations, such as New Year's Eve, when they are celebrated in specified parts of hotels and restaurants, and licensed clubs, cabarets and night clubs.

Mr. Hanlon: What would be another such occasion, apart from New Year's Eve?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It could be the celebration of the end of the Vietnam war, just as we celebrated the end of the Pacific war. It would have to be some outstanding occasion.

This demand will be met by the grant of a "festivities permit", which will permit of liquor being consumed until 3 o'clock on the following morning at New Year's Eve or other suitable festivities. Permits will not be granted when New Year's Eve or the other celebration concerned falls on a Sunday.

Each year the Governor in Council authorises the payment of a sum not exceeding \$60,000 from the trust fund established under the Liquor Act for the purposes of assisting in an educational programme to discourage intemperance and to assist in a health programme in relation to the problem of alcoholism.

As these educational and health programmes are of vital concern to the community, the present limit of \$60,000 is abolished so that increased amounts may be authorised for these purposes. In addition, provision is made for a grant to be made to the Road Safety Council to assist that council in its campaign to promote road safety.

Several new types of licence have been introduced for the purpose of converting old-fashioned drinking habits to modern civilised surroundings. Included in this category is a "theatre licence", which will authorise the sale at a live theatre of an approved standard of liquor during the period of one hour before the commencement of the performance, during the intermission and for one hour after the completion of the performance.

Another new licence is a "cabaret licence", the grant of which will enable the sale of liquor in a cabaret or night club of an approved standard from Monday to Saturday between the hours of 7 p.m. and 3 a.m. the following day.

Mr. Hanlon: Would it be possible for a licensed victualler to procure a cabaret licence that would attach to some section of his licensed premises?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: If he fulfils the conditions.

There is a demand for such a licence, which is of a type similar to that in force in other States. The habit of eating and drinking together is again encouraged in this form of licence, as meals and entertainment must be available before and after 12 midnight.

A modern, progressive innovation is the introduction of provisions relating to the sale of liquor in reception areas of restaurants, cabarets and motels. The reception area must have direct access to the dining-room, and persons purchasing liquor must intend bona fide to partake of a meal in the dining-room of the relevant restaurant, cabaret or motel.

With the disappearance of many hotels from the inner city, it is apparent that some alternative form of drinking outlet is desirable. This is provided for by a "tavern licence", which is similar to a licensed victualler's licence but without the necessity for accommodation and dining-room facilities. A meal service must be available during all times when the tavern is open for business, to maintain the association of food and drink. This sophisticated style of drinking should prove acceptable to those people who do not care for the crowds usually associated with the large community-centre type of hotel.

Whilst the travelling public needs accommodation, it seems no longer necessary to look to the hotel-keeper to provide it unless he is clearly in the accommodation business and is actively promoting that as the main feature of his business.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Long-range private conversations in the Chamber are not condoned.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: With the tremendous increase in motel accommodation, there seems to be no future for the old-style hotel in the accommodation business. Provision is therefore made for the licensee of such a hotel to convert the hotel to a tavern and thus maintain a public facility, whilst at the same time operating at a profit because of the reduced overhead.

The removal of the sex barrier from the provisions of the Liquor Act will mean that women will be permitted to purchase and consume liquor in private and public bars as well as in the lounge. In this modern society no compelling reasons can be advanced as to why women should be disbarred from service in any part of licensed premises.

An important consideration is that the amendment will enable women to purchase liquor at a lower price than the price they now pay for it in the lounge bar.

Care has been taken to ensure the amendments recognise the change in habits of drinking in the home, in public facilities and in connection with sporting and social activities.

Public facilities have been kept in mind, and the following provisions will improve them.

Authority is given for the Licensing Commission to order a licensed victualler to provide a bottle shop which opens onto a public thoroughfare. At present some bottle departments can be reached only by passing

through a crowded bar or negotiating a narrow passageway, and it is considered that anyone desirous of purchasing liquor should not be required to walk through any other section of licensed premises but should be able to purchase it at a bottle shop opening directly onto a roadway.

A licensee will be required to keep in stock reasonable quantities of all classes, kinds, brands and descriptions of wines and spirits that are usually sought by the general public in the locality in which the licensed premises are situated. At present some licensees have an agreement with a registered brewer or a licensed spirit merchant to restrict the freedom of stocking and supplying all brands of wines and spirits. Any such agreement will be void as regards the restriction on the sale of all wines and spirits.

Changing habits have been accommodated by amendments incorporating the sale of liquor by the glass in restaurants instead of by the bottle, as at present; the provision of entertainment machines in licensed clubs and hotel bars; and the removal of the limitation of hours on the playing of billiards in licensed clubs.

Several new forms of permit provided for in the Bill include permits for function rooms and national days, and unlicensed club permits. Function-room permits will provide for the supply of liquor in approved function rooms for weddings and other parties, and thus add to the comfort of persons attending such a function.

National-day permits will permit certain persons of a stated nationality to consume liquor at a function to celebrate their national day. This will be beneficial to members of national bodies when the national day falls on a Sunday.

Unlicensed-club permits will be of benefit to members of sporting and social clubs who desire to consume liquor at a function of the club.

An amendment which will be appreciated by many people, particularly those in the country, is the extension of booth licences to functions held on a Sunday—for example, rodeos—for a period not exceeding five hours.

Mr. Hanlon: And football matches?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: All sports, everywhere. In view of Sunday hotel trading, there does not appear to be any valid objection to this provision.

The foregoing has covered the main principles of the Bill. The remaining provisions consist of minor amendments and machinery provisions which have been included for the purpose of streamlining the administration of the Liquor Act. This category includes annual renewal of licences, delegation of certain of the Licensing Commission's functions to a single member or

the secretary, and increases in the minimum penalty for unlawful consumption of liquor by minors.

As I stated previously, the Bill is an attempt to completely review and overhaul the existing Act in keeping with social reforms and changes in social conditions and conventions.

I propose moving three minor amendments at the Committee stage. These amendments, in brief, are—

(1) Providing that a licensed spirit merchant need not make an annual return in respect of liquor purchased, sold or disposed of, where he is exempt under the Act from the payment of any fee;

(2) Re-wording to simplify a proposed amendment to ensure that all licensed victuallers stock and supply all brands of wines and spirits irrespective of any agreement between the licensed victualler and a registered brewer and extending the provision to agreements between licensed victuallers and licensed spirit merchants;

(3) Clarifying a proposed amendment to ensure that objections may still be lodged in relation to the removal of a licensed victualler's licence to premises situated or to be situated in a tourist area.

These amendments will be explained in greater detail at the appropriate time during the Committee stage.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (12.5 p.m.): This Bill will implement major changes in the Act. The Opposition regards it as regrettable, having regard to the extensive alterations to be made to the Act by the 70-odd clauses in the Bill, and the fact that there are to be, for example, seven new types of licence (which almost doubles the existing number provided in the Act), that the Minister did not use this opportunity to consolidate the Act. By doing so he would have given Parliament the same opportunity as the Government parties have had to determine the major amendments or changes desired in the Liquor Act. This Bill, unlike a number of other Bills amending the Liquor Act, does not implement only a few minor amendments or machinery changes. The Minister has been forthright in declaring, both inside and outside the House, that it represents a major review of the Act.

An examination of the Liquor Act discloses that, to a great extent, it has become a virtual patchwork-quilt Act in that it has a certain historical basis, and bits and pieces have been added to it over the years. One item may be covered in a number of sections. Furthermore, apart from tidying up that sort of thing, if the Act had been consolidated and some of these matters covered by single sections or provisions rather than being scattered throughout the Act, the Opposition would have had an opportunity to advance suggestions on amendments. I will not enlarge on that, because it is not part of the

Bill before us. But the Bill does not deal with Part 7A of the Liquor Act relative to price control that may be exercisable on licensed victuallers and booth licences.

Mr. Hughes: Are you suggesting that we throw out the whole 300-odd pages and start again?

Mr. HANLON: I am suggesting that when we are considering major amendments to an Act, as has been done previously when we have completely reviewed an Act and more or less thrown the whole thing up in the air and brought it down again, it is an opportune time to bring the whole Act before Parliament. In effect, that is what the Minister has done. His committee, his advisers and the Government caucus have done that. They selected, as was their right in the theory of government, the particular sections of the Act that they wished to amend, and our opportunity to move amendments relates only to those sections of the Act that are covered by the Bill.

We cannot move amendments to sections of the Liquor Act that are not covered by the Bill. If the Act had been consolidated we would have been able to move amendments. For example, we might have suggested the licensing of breweries, which is not provided for in the Act. We might also have suggested an extension of price-control provisions, which at present are limited to licensed victuallers and which, on my reading, do not extend to the other existing licences in the Act or to the new types of licences that will be available.

Only last week, in the course of hearing a matter, the chairman of the Licensing Commission made some comments about what he regarded as outrageous charges in some restaurants on the Gold Coast. I do not wish to impugn the Gold Coast, but I understand that someone was applying for a licence and the chairman said that he considered some of the charges in these places—I presume he was referring to liquor, although he may have been referring to food as well—

Mr. Hinze: I have noted some excessive charging here.

Mr. HANLON: I am not saying that this would apply only to the South Coast. But the context of the chairman's remarks, as reported to me, suggested that he felt that this matter was outside his control. The Act at present does not seem to relate to other than a licensed victualler, although it could be extended somewhat by proclamation.

I mentioned that example, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for your tolerance. I do not intend to endeavour to debate parts of the Act that are not covered by the Bill, but I again point out that, had there been a consolidation of the Act, we could have had that opportunity.

I think we said at the introductory stage and we repeat, now that we have seen the Bill and have been given information that we have been able to assess, which we did not have an opportunity to do at the introductory stage because of the Minister's very limited introduction, that it seems that quite a substantial amount of what is contained in the Bill is an adoption of Labour policy; for example, deleting the 40-mile limit on Sunday trading and giving the Commission an opportunity, at its discretion, to vary the hours of operation up to a maximum of 12 hours, either in broken periods or in continuous operation.

At the introductory stage, the Minister waved the report of the Labour Party conference at Surfers Paradise in the air and said, "You people wanted 24-hour trading". That is not so. What the Labour Party conference suggested and what the Leader of the Opposition envisaged in his policy speech last year, was, in effect, what this Bill sets out to do. The Leader of the Opposition said—

"The Licensing Commission will be further empowered to vary hours according to the proven need and circumstances of a particular area."

We see in this Bill that, in certain circumstances, the Commission will be able to allow the opening of a licensed victualler's premises for the serving of liquor to accord with special needs, such as those of shift workers, during hours outside the normal 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. operation. That is our understanding of it.

Mr. Hinze: It is a sensible proposal.

Mr. HANLON: As the hon. member for South Coast interjects, it is a sensible proposal. It is another sensible proposal in Labour policy that the Government has adopted, and I am pointing this out.

At the introductory stage, the Minister seemed to be alarmed at the fact that there might be a provision for trading during certain hours over a 24-hour range. The Labour Party did not suggest, either in its conference decision or in its policy, that there should be a 24-hour operative licence at any particular premises. It suggested that, whatever is being done in this instance, there should be provision for certain premises to remain open at certain hours other than between 10 a.m. and 10 p.m. to meet the needs of the locality and the people in that locality.

If we turn to the changes to be made in the taking of a local option poll, the stand taken by the Opposition in the celebrated Inala hotel site selection dispute is vindicated. Some years ago, we moved an adjournment motion on that matter. We endeavoured to point out, not so much in criticism but because of what was done at the time, the very ill-conceived procedures that were operative in the transfer of a licence to a new site and the associated local option poll provisions. We said it was simply ridiculous to go through

all the paraphernalia of machinery, including perhaps a local option poll, when people were voting without knowing where the hotel would be sited, what it would look like, what sort of hotel it would be and what services it would provide.

On that occasion we were not very well received by the Government. It was alleged that we were trying to criticise the Commission, or something of that nature. We said that there should be a selection of a tenderer and an identification of the site, and that it was at that point of time that a local option poll should be held and an appropriate area declared in which the poll would be conducted. Again we find that a suggestion of ours has been virtually adopted by the Government in this Bill.

We also see the abolition of the nonsensical provision relative to the consumption of food in bars. We remember that the Minister introduced some weird provisions, for example, that a licensed victualler could not allow a person to consume a pie in the hotel bar unless he stood behind a line that the licensed victualler had drawn somewhere. On the introduction of that provision the Opposition pointed out that it was a lot of nonsense, and the Government has now made a similar recognition and removed it.

I now come to the matter of Sunday trading, and I am not going to repeat at length the statements made clearly by the Opposition at the introductory stage. I am, however, going to direct a question to the Minister on the way in which Sunday trading will be conducted. We heard, or read in the Press, suggestions that the Government intended to remove the 40-mile limit, but was going to require that doors and windows of bars be closed during Sunday trading. We thought that if the Government proposed to persist with that requirement it was nothing but hypocrisy, and we examined the Bill with a view to moving an amendment for its removal. We were also interested in ascertaining whether bottle departments will be allowed to operate during the permitted hours of trading on Sundays.

The clauses will be dealt with in detail at the Committee stage, so I do not now propose to go into the various pros and cons of them. Our examination of the Bill suggests that it contains nothing that will require the closing of bar doors and windows during permitted hours of trading on Sundays, nor have we been able to find anything that will prevent the operation of bottle departments during the same hours on Sundays, except the power that is given to the Licensing Commission to impose certain conditions on such trading. The Opposition would be loth to move an amendment that would have the effect of removing that discretion from the Commission, either generally or in relation to specific premises.

We appreciate that, because of circumstances associated with particular localities, there might be trouble with bottle sales.

Before discussion on the relevant clause is reached, we would like an assurance from the Minister that the Bill is not designed to provide for the closing of hotel doors and windows during permitted hours of trading on Sundays, nor is it designed to limit the normal operations of bottle departments. It would be rather ridiculous if I could go to a hotel and drink for four hours on Sunday, but could not buy a couple of bottles of beer to take home for my family or friends because I had forgotten to buy them on Saturday.

It may be said that some people might object to bottle sales on Sundays because after hotels close people could sit in the streets and drink half a dozen bottles that they had bought. That situation is covered by the ordinary laws applying to drinking in a public place, and would be the subject of police attention. I noticed a statement in the Press, by either a Police Union official or an unnamed spokesman, that the provisions of the Bill will mean more work for police officers. I do not doubt that, but it is the Government's responsibility, just as it is in the enforcement of peace and order generally, to see that there are sufficient police to deal with the situation.

I should like the Minister in his reply to give the Opposition an assurance that the Bill will leave no doubt about the rather ridiculous and hypocritical suggestion that doors and windows of bars be kept closed, and that restrictions be placed on bottle sales.

Members of the Opposition are prepared to accept the integrity of the Minister and to accept any assurance that he gives in that regard in a direct answer. On the other hand, if he indicates that it is his intention to leave the question unanswered or to leave it to the Licensing Commission as a matter of principle, the Opposition will be obliged to move an amendment.

Hon. members on this side of the Chamber do not wish to do that, because they wish to retain the surveillance of the Licensing Commission, which, I should imagine, has roughly similar powers under other sections of the Act. For example, the Act now contains provisions that give the Commission power to order screens to be erected in certain locations during ordinary hotel trading hours so that drinkers will not annoy people who are in the hotel but who do not wish to make use of the bar facilities of the hotel. On an ordinary day, a licensee is not permitted to set up a bar anywhere that he wishes in the hotel. He must have regard for both the people inside the hotel and others who are outside.

The Opposition has no objection to surveillance of that sort; but if the Government is either side-stepping the question or leaving

it to the Commission, so that hon. members will not know until after Parliament is finished with the Bill whether or not the Licensing Commission will suddenly say, "No, we do not think that bottle departments should be open on Sundays", the Opposition believes that, as a matter of principle, it should be dealt with by the Minister now. It seems to be stated fairly clearly in the Bill that the licensee must supply liquor in other parts of the hotel when the bars are open—I exclude, of course, the provision giving the Licensing Commission power to impose special orders—and I should like the Minister to answer the question that I have posed.

I do not intend to go back over the philosophical or ethical question of Sunday drinking as such. As was pointed out at the introductory stage, an A.L.P. Government did not introduce Sunday drinking in Queensland. It was introduced up to a 40-mile limit by the Nicklin Government in 1961. The question now is one not of Sunday trading but of whether the people of Brisbane should be dealt—I use the Minister's own words—a "social injustice" by being debarred from a facility that is available to people elsewhere in the State.

It is interesting to have an admission from a Minister—I suppose one could refer to it as "Confessions of an Attorney-General"—that the Government of which he is a member has perpetrated a social injustice on a certain section of the people of the State. The Minister for Justice has pleaded guilty to that quite openly by saying that the Government now proposes to remove a social injustice, and I again stress that it is a social injustice introduced by statute by a Country-Liberal Government.

I do not know what steps will be taken by hon. members who still believe that a referendum or something similar should be held on the question of Sunday trading. The Opposition will wait and see what action they propose taking at the appropriate stage, whether during the debate on the clauses of the Bill or at some other time. However, the Opposition did examine the question very carefully before arriving at the decision that it could not accept the proposal to hold a referendum. The Opposition's responsibility to those persons in the community who thought that they had been taken for a ride and had been misled by the Premier in his declarations relative to this matter in his policy speech was examined very carefully, and hon. members examined very searchingly for some hours, as a combined caucus, the question of holding a referendum. I do not intend to go back over that question—it was dealt with fully at the introductory stage—but the holding of local option polls and other suggested action was considered, and the Opposition decided that the proposals were not practicable in these circumstances.

Although the Opposition believed that it had a responsibility to that section of the electorate which may have thought it had been

misled by the Premier's policy speech—whichever way one looks at it, I think it is impossible to arrive at any conclusion other than that they were misled, and I do not know what section of the electorate or how many people voted solely on their assumption from the Premier's remarks—the Opposition, of course, has no responsibility, because the responsibility must rest fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Premier. However, I say in all sincerity that we did endeavour to look at their case.

We endeavoured to discover any practical grounds on which this suggestion could be implemented at this time and, in all honesty, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, we decided on a basis of practical reality in the matter that a referendum on Sunday trading could not be satisfactorily introduced at this stage. Of course, it still remains with the Premier, as he sees his own responsibility, to justify himself to the electorate, particularly to those who felt that they were misled by his about-face in this matter.

At the introductory stage, when the Premier was not here, the Deputy Premier, to his credit—and the Attorney-General—endeavoured to defend him in the light that, after all, the Premier is a private member in the Government caucus and, as a member of the combined Government parties, is bound by any decision that is reached, irrespective of his personal feelings in the matter. Incidentally, the Premier is here now although the indications are that he desires to attend some other function during the day. I say that merely to indicate that he is here now.

Mr. Hinze: Do you agree that individuals should be bound by the majority decision of caucus?

Mr. HANLON: I agree with that because it is, once again, a question of practical politics. It is the way in which democratic government works. It may not be entirely desirable, but it is the same approach as that made by the Labour Party. In fact, it has been adopted by other parties from the Labour Party. But the point I wish to make is this: it is fair enough if, on this liquor question, that is the situation in which the Premier finds himself, but both his own parties and the public of this State must be beginning to wonder how many times this can happen, with the Premier remaining in the position of being able to say, "I am the leader of this State. I am the man leading the Government." No-one can lead a Government if he is being perpetually dragged along on a string.

This happened on the question of margarine, on the question of conservation, and on the question of liquor reform. I could go on because repeatedly we find that the Premier, in the Government caucus, is virtually the sole Indian riding round and round the outside firing his arrow-thoughts

but generally not hitting anybody. This is what has happened in connection with the Liquor Act.

The Premier, as leader of the State, has strong opinions on this matter. I concede at once that he could be outvoted but, on a number of matters apart from liquor, he has indicated that he has very strong opinions. For instance, in connection with margarine he went virtually to the edge of the cliff.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not propose to allow this second-reading debate to develop into a personal attack on the Premier or any other individual member of this House. We are discussing a Bill that has been clearly outlined and presented to hon. members for examination. I propose to see that hon. members stick religiously to the provisions contained in the Bill.

Mr. HANLON: I have no desire to conflict with you, Mr. Speaker. I acknowledge that I am prepared to be hard hitting where necessary, but I endeavour to be as fair as possible in my comments. I can say that we are a very responsible and very honest and moral Opposition in our attitude on personal remarks about this Government. If you like to read your "Hansard" and see what we had to "cop" when we were in office—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I trust that the hon. member is not reflecting on the Chair when he says, "If you like to read your 'Hansard'."

Mr. HANLON: It is not a reflection on you at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member pointed to me and said, "If you like to read your 'Hansard'." I do not like those remarks.

Mr. HANLON: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was using the collective plural when I said, "you". I am not suggesting it should be you personally who needs to read "Hansard".

I do not want to get into a discussion about the rights or wrongs of the matter but, as I mentioned, there is a responsibility on the Opposition, to the extent to which it is necessary, to deal personally with the Premier in this matter. Many people outside, including those who marched to this House recently, are criticising him personally, and I should imagine he would want to answer them. As I understand it, that is why he is taking the opportunity to do so if time permits before he has to go away somewhere. The Opposition's view is that he should make time to do so, and I assume that he will want to make some answer. We cannot get away from the personal aspect of some of these things.

I suggest to the Premier—perhaps this could be postponed until the time when some action is taken by certain Government

members—that he put to a vote the matter of a referendum, or whatever it might be, because I wonder whether the Premier will be here then. If he is, perhaps I could deal with it then. If such a situation arises, no doubt the Premier will recall his remarks on 31 October, 1961, in the debate on certain amendments to the Liquor Act. The then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan, moved that the 40-mile limit be deleted. At that time the Opposition opposed the second reading on the ground that the Bill was sectional legislation, but when the Bill had passed through the second-reading stage Mr. Duggan moved an amendment that the 40-mile limit be deleted on the ground that the law should be applied uniformly throughout the State. That is exactly what the present Government, of which the Premier is the leader, is doing.

On 31 October, 1961, the Premier, then a private member, said—

"A much more important effect of extending these facilities,"

that is, on a Sunday into the metropolitan area, as contained in the amendment moved by Mr. Duggan,

"—if it is carried out as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition and his supporters—will be the breaking down of the value of what Sunday means in our community, and making it more like any other day, thus destroying one of the Christian principles on which society has been built and is maintained."

I ask hon. members to note these words. The Premier concluded by saying, "For those reasons, I strongly oppose the amendment."

In the light of those comments, we are entitled to ask the Premier on what grounds he has changed his mind. In 1961 he said that the removal of the 40-mile limit, which is the very provision contained in this Bill, would break down something on which society has been built and maintained. Surely it is fair to ask him what is the change in circumstances that has led him to break down a strong statement such as that.

I do not want to go into matters of conscience in this debate, but we are being towelled with them. It is all right for us to "cop the crow" on some of these things—for some of the old Labour Party members to be "given the crow"—so I want to see that the comments apply equally to both sides. A few minutes back the hon. member for South Coast asked me if I agreed with the caucus system, under which a decision is reached and all members subsequently vote accordingly. Of course I do. Otherwise, what would be the worth of having a decision and what would be the value of the system to anybody who had his decision endorsed if nobody accepted it? It would not be worth having a decision at all.

I do not want to be personal with the Premier, Mr. Speaker, but I point out that I am not the one who has put him in this situation; I am not the one who said that society would virtually fall if the deletion of the 40-mile limit was introduced when the Labour Party sought to do it. It was very smart of the Premier, when he was a private member, to get up and—

Mr. Hinze: At least there is some difference when a member is a private member.

Mr. HANLON: What is the difference in a matter that is spoken about as strongly as that? The Premier could have said, "I think this might be undesirable." To be quite honest, I share some of the concern that has been expressed about the way in which we are moving towards a Continental Sunday. But there is a difference between being concerned about something and saying that it will bring down society, as the Premier claimed at that time.

I accept and acknowledge the fact that if the Government caucuses have made a decision in this matter the Premier can be expected, in the normal way, to do as anybody else has done, namely, vote for it, with one qualification. The same qualification applies to me, to other members of the Labour Party or to any other hon. member. If it is a matter of conscience, the position of any member of Parliament is quite clear; either he goes against his conscience on the matter—and it is not for me to examine anyone else's conscience; each one of us is responsible only for his own—or, if he is a Cabinet Minister and feels that he cannot in conscience agree with some collective Cabinet decision and is outvoted in Cabinet and caucus, if he is to abide by his conscience he surely has a clear responsibility to say, "I will resign from my position, which more or less ties me to this situation, and I will go outside and try to convince my own people."

Mr. R. E. Moore: You chopped Gair's head off because he would not conform.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HANLON: The same principle applies to Mr. Gair, to me, or to anyone else. It makes no difference who it is.

I say this because the Premier has set this situation up although not deliberately. This is the image that has been created in the past era, and we have been hammered with it. What is the use of people saying these things? I am fed up to the back teeth with the situation in which people indirectly "rubbish" Jack Houston by saying what an upright fellow somebody else is. It is useless for people to try to gain an advantage by implying that someone is not something by saying that somebody else

is. If Government members want to establish their complete integrity and good conscience in these things they must be prepared for the traffic lights when they meet them, and be answerable for their actions. I will not go further into that aspect of the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I was about to suggest that the hon. member should deal with the Bill.

Mr. HANLON: This is part of the Bill, for reasons I have outlined.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not know that it is part of the Bill, but I was going to suggest that the hon. member has developed his argument along those lines. I now suggest that he should proceed with the debate on the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. HANLON: That is easy enough to do, Mr. Speaker. I will not debate that matter further. I have said what I wanted to say about it.

The member for Cooroora said, "Don't blame the Premier; blame the lot of us." Some members of the Government parties have made pronouncements. I do not know whether or not they intend to pursue them, but they have indicated in the Press that they feel bound by the Premier's declaration in his election policy speech and for that reason they feel bound not to follow the course that the Government is now pursuing. They have said that they will approach it as private members. In those circumstances it is not much good for the hon. member for Cooroora to say, "Don't blame the Premier; blame the lot of us."

I do not want to take up any more time than is necessary in dealing with the provisions of the Bill, because we will have an opportunity when debating the clauses to deal with the details as they come before us. I have referred to Sunday trading and I have asked the Minister for Justice to give us a direct answer on bottle departments, doors and windows, and so on. I now move on to some matters not referred to by the Labour Party on which we have had to come to a conclusion because the Government introduced them as distinct from anything to which we had given previous consideration. For example, I refer to the deletion of the previous restriction on the serving of liquor to females and its consumption by them in bars. We have given considerable thought to this matter.

We believe, particularly in the light of pressure for equal rights at various levels, that it would be inconsistent for the community today to maintain such a barrier. We do not think that many females will avail themselves of the opportunity given to them to enter an ordinary public bar. However, we do not consider that this can be rightly denied to them in the light of other developments relative to the granting of equal rights to them in a number of

ways. But we say that the Licensing Commission will have an obligation to be realistic in the demands it may impose on licensed victuallers.

I do not intend to get to the stage to which some female rights advocates rightly object, of introducing toilet facilities into any discussion relative to equal rights for men and women and thus turn the question of equal rights into one of essential differences. However, it is obvious that the Commission must consider these matters when the provision is deleted. Surely it would be ridiculous for the Commission—I do not imagine that it would do this—to call on hotels to provide extensive toilet facilities appropriate to a potential need when there may not in fact be such a need. Firstly, I feel that the Licensing Commission should make a common-sense approach to this matter, and I feel sure it will.

At the same time, I feel that the granting of the right to females to enter a bar might well cause the Licensing Commission to have a look at some of the bars—and I stress “some”, because I do not want to include all licensed victuallers in this. To some extent, men perhaps have been prepared to put up with conditions that women would not be. They are the two matters I wanted to mention relative to females in bars.

It is the intention of the Opposition to move a number of amendments in the Committee stage.

We are not opposed to the concept of the seven new licences, such as cabaret licences, tavern licences and limited hotel licences. However, we feel that the ordinary licensed victualler, who, after all, has carried on the conduct of his premises by providing accommodation or drinking facilities over a long period, might feel that he is being made something of a “bunny”. If that expression was put to me I would have to agree with it. It is regrettable that, owing to the lethargy of the Government in making up its mind on these amendments to the Act that we now have before us, the licensed victualler has had to carry on in a limbo, uncertain as to what might happen in the future, particularly relative to other licences that might be made available. In the meantime, he could not go before the Licensing Commission and protest against its requisition on some basis or another.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hooper): Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. HANLON: He has had to abide by the provisions of the Liquor Act and regulations and the requirements of the Commission. He could not say, “We all know that the Government is thinking of changing this drastically, so how about holding off for a while until we find out whether, after I spend all this money that you want me to spend, I will have a half-baked hotel licence

or some other limited licence granted beside me, or an international hotel”—which is even worse. I shall speak on that later. He would have had to spend money to retain his licence, whereas in hindsight he probably would not have been asked or compelled to do those things.

I offer my personal sympathy to the ordinary licensed victualler in this State because I think he has been “used”. True enough, he has enjoyed certain privileges under the Act over the years. However, I think it is unfortunate that those who have provided these services now find themselves the “tail-end Charlies”. There will now be licences for every possible avenue of liquor sale with the exception of a couple that could be mentioned. That is a fact of life, and I think the licensed victualler is big enough to face up to it. He has been given recognition in some parts of the Bill in the granting of festivity permits, late hours, and so on. This will at least be some consolation to him.

I now want to deal with the important question of the transfer of a licence to a new site. In the December debate on the Liquor Act the Opposition criticised the purported trafficking in new hotel licences. We suggested that the Act should provide something similar to the provision in the Land Act, namely, that a person must carry on for a certain period when a licence is granted unless there is some good reason, such as ill-health, why the licence should be transferred. We have found—I do not think that the Minister can deny this—that since this Government has been in office new licences granted on transfer to a new site have repeatedly finished up in the hands of either one brewery or the other. We are entitled to a statement from the Government on whether it considers this is good or bad.

Let the Government say whether it considers that is a good thing or a bad thing, and we will be able to see the operation of the Act in that context. In those cases where the licences are granted to breweries, that is fair enough, but, if the Licensing Commission does not grant a licence to a brewery, it seems a bit silly that the brewery is able to act, as it were, as a wicket-keeper standing behind the Commission and, after the hotel is established, come in and take it over, irrespective of whether or not a profit is made. If it is purely a matter of trafficking, the problem is accentuated.

We think that this question should be brought up, although I do not want to bring it up in the context of any specific licence. However, I have been informed that the Homestead Hotel has already been sold tentatively to the Gold Top brewery, and that that fact will be made known in due course. If what I have said is not true, it can be denied.

In an attempt to deal with this situation, the Opposition intends, on the opportunity provided by the relevant clause, to move an amendment the effect of which will be to extend the security bond, where such a bond is required of the tenderer selected by the Commission to receive the licence, and apply it to ensure that the licensee constructs the premises and carries out the terms of the licence for a minimum period of five years.

The Opposition will also move an amendment to the clause dealing with the fees to be paid by licensed retail spirits merchants. If such licences are to operate, as it appears that they will, in the remote and sparsely populated sections of the State, it seems to us ridiculous that the same licence fee of \$400, plus 6 per cent. of gross purchases per annum, should be paid as is paid by holders of wholesale spirits merchants' licences who have large businesses in the larger centres.

The Opposition therefore intends to move an amendment at the Committee stage to allow the Commission in appropriate cases to remit part of the fee of \$400 per annum to retail spirits merchants who, compared with others, have comparatively small turnovers. We accept the proposal for retail spirits merchants' licences purely in the terms in which it is stated in the Bill. If we felt that it would provide a back-door means of allowing retail spirits licensees to crop up here, there, and everywhere, we would not accept it. We do, however, accept it on the principle that it will apply only to the very remote parts of the State, and we will move an amendment accordingly.

We will also move an amendment to provide for a minimum licence fee for taverns. The Bill provides, with the exception of the \$400 to which I have already referred, a flat 6 per cent. licence fee for all new licences except tavern licences, for which the fees are left entirely to the discretion of the Commission. We think that there is merit in leaving that to the Commission, in that it would be reasonable to require, for a licence for a tavern, which does not have to provide accommodation and indeed is not allowed to, a fee higher than that payable in respect of an establishment that provides other facilities that might be in the community interest. But we do not consider that Parliament should say to the Licensing Commission, "You can make tavern licence fees anything from nothing to 100 per cent." We intend to move an amendment providing for a minimum fee for a tavern licence.

We also have a machinery amendment to move. I shall not take time on it now, because it is a minor one.

We are concerned about the variation in the penalties to be provided for under-age drinking. I stress that we approve the increase in penalties for under-age drinking, and I feel that the minimum of \$60 will be a deterrent to young people. Although some may feel at times that young people do not

have much sense of values, I think that to a person under 21 years of age a fine of \$60 is a fairly strong deterrent.

Mr. HINZE: Isn't it A.L.P. policy to lower the drinking age to 18?

Mr. HANLON: The policy of the A.L.P. in that regard relates to a broad spectrum of legal entitlements and to many other matters that do not arise for consideration under this Bill. For that reason, the Opposition could not deal with the question at this stage, even if it wanted to. The need for a consolidation will arise. As the matter is not covered by the Bill, the Opposition cannot do anything about it. However, it does call into question many other matters, and the general consensus of opinion among the Attorneys-General—the Minister for Justice can correct me if I am wrong—other than on voting rights, is that these matters will be better dealt with as a whole rather than in bits and pieces.

The Opposition believes that there will be a deterrent, but it is greatly concerned, as is also the union, about the onus that will be placed on a bar attendant or an employee of the licensee relative to under-age drinking. It has always been difficult to gauge whether a person is 21 years of age or under 21; it is even more difficult today because of the wearing of long hair, and so on. By coincidence, recently I saw some young people approached by police on the subject of their age. Not until they were approached and I had another look at them would I have said I thought they were under 21. It was necessary, really, to lift the hair back and picture their faces without all the hair round them before one could say, "Yes, they would be a bit baby-faced." Just looking at them, one would not have thought that they were under 21. Standing and looking at them is one thing; it is much more difficult for a bar attendant who has a sea of faces and hands coming at him with orders for three beers and two shandies, a scotch and a rum and coke and three beers, or something of that sort, in peak hours, or even when there is a rush in the bottle department. He cannot go away and think about it for half an hour and decide whether or not a person is under 21 years of age. He has to make his decision in a split second.

As I said, the union is concerned about the position. I shall quote further remarks that the union has addressed to the Opposition when I move an amendment at a later stage, but the union does say that it seems to be a travesty of natural justice that a worker earning his living in an industry should be fined for carrying out the function for which he was engaged, namely, the serving of liquor to the public. It believes that the onus on its members in that regard and the defence it has to enter on their behalf in cases in which a breach is alleged is unfair in that context.

I do not think that much can be done under this Bill about the onus, because it is covered by another section of the Act that is not dealt with in the Bill. However, the Opposition does intend to move an amendment to the proposal that the Minister has made relative to a certificate of age and to seek to exempt bar attendants from the onus. The amendment will provide that the attendant himself will not take the responsibility, unless he wishes to do so voluntarily, of asking for the certificate of age. He will be able to draw the attention of the licensee or bar manager, or whoever is in charge of the premises, to the situation and ask him to secure the certificate. I shall have more to say about that when the amendment is moved.

I have mentioned the six amendments that the Opposition proposes to move. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber will examine the amendments foreshadowed by the Minister when he actually moves them at the Committee stage. I have endeavoured not to take very long. I have covered some matters only for the purpose of preventing repetition or to make it unnecessary, perhaps, for them to be brought up at a late hour of the night, and I shall reserve further comments till the individual clauses are being dealt with.

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (12.54 p.m.): Down the years, of course, whenever this subject has been debated when amendments to the Liquor Act have been brought down in this Chamber, a number of speeches have been made and much has been said one way and the other. This occasion is not unusual in that respect.

A great deal was said at the introductory stage of the Bill, and I took the opportunity over the week-end of reading the "Hansard" proofs of what had been said. I was very interested to read the comments of all hon. members, and it was quite obvious that, as might be expected, hon. members on the Opposition side of the House tried to make all the political gain and capital that it was possible for them to make.

That could be expected, and that is what they did and/or are still trying to do. Of course, they traversed a wide field in order to try to achieve this, and I compliment members of the Opposition who devoted so much time to me. I thank them for their great efforts on my behalf. It was very kind of them. Of course, bearing in mind what I read over the week-end, it goes without saying that I have very little regard or respect for the Opposition's contribution to the debate up to this point of time. In fact, I would go so far as to say that it amounts to nothing but political humbug and hypocrisy. That is clear.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Hon. members opposite know this, and it hurts when they are reminded of their general attitude and what it amounts to. For the Labour Party to come out in support of the churches would be laughable if it was not such a serious matter.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: As could be expected, the Opposition once again sought to gain cheap publicity during the introductory stage of this Bill. They again resorted to the usual tactics of asking me to resign, just as they have done on many other occasions—after the Albert by-election and at other times. Of course, we know that they are most anxious—they can hardly wait—to seize power in order to control, regiment and socialise the people of this State.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: After their attempt to gain some political publicity they are, just as one would expect, supporting the legislation when it comes to the final show-down. In the meantime, they have been running very true to form. I have been here a long time and have watched them. Members come and go but I have watched their form generally, and on this occasion they are running true to form.

In spite of what hon. members opposite have said about supporting the churches and people who have protested, they are, at the same time, trying to make political capital by shouting and proclaiming that we are copying their policy, what they would do in government. When this legislation was announced we did not hear anything about repudiation, but the hon. member for Townsville North very quickly claimed that we were, in effect, stealing the Labour Party's policy.

Mr. Tucker: You have no imagination of your own.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I should not like to depend on the hon. member's imagination.

Mr. Tucker: I would like to have your imagination when it comes to oil shares.

A Government Member: What you are trying to say is that you would like to have the Premier's ability.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Hooper): Order!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I would certainly not like to have the hon. member's imagination at any time.

In December last, of course, hon. members opposite claimed that we were not going far enough when we introduced our election policy amendments to the Liquor Act. That was the attitude they adopted on that occasion. They wanted us to go much further than we were prepared to go in the matter of liquor reform "at that point of time", to

use the now famous words. Their policy—I emphasise this for the benefit of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat—is drinking 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Mr. Hanlon: That is your policy.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Hon. members cannot get out of it that way. I have here their platform and policy, decisions arrived at during the Labour in Politics Convention on the Gold Coast, in which they say—

“Labour would legislate for a 24-hour day, seven days a week liquor service in recognised tourist areas provided the hotel could show that there was need for it.”

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: They do not like to hear these things.

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

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: Before the luncheon recess I had drawn attention to the fact that, contrary to what the hon. member for Baroona tried to tell us, the policy of the Australian Labour Party, as decided upon at its Southport convention, provides, under certain circumstances, for a 24-hour-day, 7-day-week hotel service. Of course, this is in line with its policy of nationalisation of the breweries, of drinking facilities and of the hotel associations.

Mr. Davies: Boot brushes and boot polish, too.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: If the hon. member for Maryborough reads the booklet from which I am quoting he will find that practically everything is included for nationalisation and socialisation. It is very interesting to be reminded of these things at this time.

Much has been said of the criticism levelled by people outside Parliament at the Government's proposals to amend the Liquor Act. To those who are critical, I say that it is a very simple matter to stand far removed from the problem and condemn the Government for its decision, reached after long and serious discussions by the joint Government parties; it is very easy and very simple indeed. I point out that the proposed amendments are not one single man's ideas but are based on a policy agreed to by the majority of Liberal Party and Country Party members.

The decision to introduce these amendments was arrived at as a result of collective deliberation and agreement. While I am Premier and hold my own views—and for the benefit for the hon. member for Baroona, who said that I had completely changed—I assure hon. members that anyone who knows me is aware of the fact that I do not change on matters like this. I have personal and very definite views about Sunday drinking.

Mr. Bennett: You are the best acrobat in the House.

Mr. Chaik: Are you really in the House? You are rarely here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Armstrong: He won't be here very long if he doesn't behave himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Mulgrave will not be here very long if he does not behave himself.

Hon. members, I state very briefly that certain charges have been made against the Premier, and I propose to allow him a sufficient hearing to answer those charges. I do not want any interruptions from either side of the House.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I do not think that it is appropriate for hon. members opposite to talk about acrobats. At the start they supported the churches; now they have left the churches and support the Bill.

I reiterate that I hold personal views on Sunday drinking, and I have not changed them. As the hon. member for Baroona said, I must accept the majority decisions of the joint parties and abide by them, just as on most occasions any other hon. member should do.

Amendments to the Liquor Act are an issue that no Government takes lightly. It is strange that over the many months during which this matter was raised and discussed, both in Parliament and at party meetings, and received very wide publicity, the Opposition did not at any stage suggest that the Government was repudiating its election promises. Hon. members opposite did not say anything about repudiation until this point of time. It was not until the intervention of certain church leaders that the matter of repudiation was recently taken up by the Opposition, for the sole purpose, as I said before, of attacking the Government, and me personally.

In the light of events leading up to the presentation of this Bill, extending, as I said, over many months, I say that the Opposition's accusations are groundless and grossly unfair. There was ample time for anybody who cared to read, and to sit down and think about it, to take some action. Hon. members opposite know it, just as hon. members on the Government side do. It was in the Press in big print. The people did not protest. I ask why people did not protest when the Government introduced legislation in 1961—and I am referring particularly to the people outside who are protesting at this point of time.

Mr. DEAN: I rise to a point of order. The people outside did protest, both last year and long before that, too.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: When liquor was allowed to be served in an area beyond the 40-mile limit of the city, no doubt people protested. I agree with that to a point. But, as I recall it, they did not

protest to any great extent. I think the hon. member will agree with me on that issue.

Even when this Government took office in 1957, snide, under-cover Sunday drinking had become an established fact under Labour.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is so. That is what led to the introduction of legislation in 1961. That is when the whole of the State, outside the particular area of Brisbane, was given the concession, or whatever people like to call it, of drinking on Sundays during certain hours. That concession is being extended to the Brisbane area by the legislation now before us.

Mr. O'Donnell: You mean that you have evidence of snide drinking in Brisbane?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: There was plenty of it it Labour's day.

The joint Government parties have not concealed the intention to implement changes in the Liquor Act. No attempt has been made to do so. The Government's intention has been quite open and clear.

I also said on a previous occasion that after weeks of discussion complete agreement between the coalition parties was not likely before the 1969 election. I made it clear that we could not reach agreement on certain points; that we had not finalised the decisions on matters that we were discussing at that time. The Opposition and certain church leaders have sought to make an issue of the words "at this point of time" in the election policy speech. This morning's issue of "The Courier-Mail" reports the American State Department as saying—all hon. members no doubt read it—that the United States would not supply planes to Israel "at this time". On the Opposition's argument, and on the argument advanced by many people—

Mr. Melloy: That is a lot of rot.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The hon. member says it is a lot of rot. It suits him now to say that.

Does that Press statement refer to the life of President Nixon's Parliament, which covers a five-year period, or does it not imply that the decision may be reversed at some future time during the life of his Parliament? The Opposition cannot have it both ways.

It is quite clear that had the Government not intended to go beyond the three main election issues there would be no point in using the words "at this time" when referring to Sunday trading. The Government need only have said, "We do not propose to vary Sunday hotel-trading arrangements", if it was not intended to look into this matter during the next three years. Every member of this House understood quite clearly, even though he may have been in Opposition,

what the position was. However, as all hon. members know, we qualified it by adding the words that change "at this point of time" was not warranted. That was a very clear indication that some change would be introduced by the Government at some future time, but before the next election.

Mr. Bousen: That is about as clear as mud.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: To people like the hon. member, it would be; that's for sure.

Hon. members opposite can say what they like. I repeat that, if the Government did not intend changing its attitude on Sunday drinking, there was no need to add the qualifying words, "at this point of time". This is the crux of the whole argument.

Opposition members want 20c each way. On the one hand they are asserting that the Government is adopting their proposed liquor reforms, yet on the other hand, they are trying to gain the sympathy of the church people by supporting their claims and saying that the Government has broken its election promises.

Again I say: why did the Opposition not raise these points before the churches made their claims? They did not say anything about them at any time. Why did they not say it last November? They did not say it then, when the issues were before this House. Indeed, at that stage they urged us to go much further. Therefore, today, their claims are simply cheap and blatant political humbug.

Contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition said, I did not write to His Grace, Archbishop Strong, last November saying that the matter of Sunday trading would not come up in legislation.

Mr. Houston: I quoted from a newspaper.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition quoted from a newspaper, but, like many things that are said by hon. members opposite, there is no substance in the statement whatsoever.

The House might care to hear what I said in my letter of 10 December. I know that my colleague the Treasurer quoted from this letter the other night. I, too, shall state what I wrote.

My letter reads—

"Your Grace,

"I was absent from Brisbane last week and this is the first opportunity I have had of acknowledging receipt of the telegram forwarded to me on 4th November, 1969, by your good self and leaders of several other denominations, expressing your views on the proposal that the State's liquor laws might be amended so as to make provision for Sunday trading.

"I should like to assure you and the co-signatories of your telegram that I am personally very conscious of the motives prompting your representations in this regard and fully appreciate that your attitude is based on your deep religious convictions and concern for family life.

"It is the responsibility of a Government, of course, to make laws for the benefit and welfare of the community as a whole and you may be certain that the objections you have put forward will receive full and careful consideration when we are looking at this question of amendments to the State's liquor laws."

And we did. That is the letter I sent to Archbishop Strong, and nowhere did I say, as appeared in the Press and as the hon. member stated, that Sunday trading would not come up in legislation.

This, of course, was just prior to when there appeared in the Press, in very big headlines over the names of both the Treasurer and myself, an article claiming that amendments to the Act would be considered by the Government in the New Year. As was stated in the Press, this included the question of Sunday trading.

The point I am making is that it was reported in "Hansard" at that time—and I say it again—that neither the church leaders nor the Opposition claimed that the Government was breaking its election promises.

Mr. Hanlon: I did, in the debate on 2 December, and during the introductory stage.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I make it quite clear to the church leaders that I do not argue with or question their right to express their views, and to express them forcefully.

I also said—and this is a point I want to emphasise here; I hope it gets good publicity throughout the State—that it would have been much more to the point if these people had expressed at a much earlier time the opposition that they have expressed since the Government parties arrived at their decision. Then they would have had some purpose in objecting. I will argue this matter at any time and in any place. After an event is not the right time to protest.

I want to say also to the church leaders that not one of them came out and supported me on the Gold Coast when attacks were made on my stand against "one-arm bandits" and casinos. Not one of them supported me, and I told them so. In fairness to some of them, they said that they had written to the Press but their letters had not been published. I said that did not help me very much when certain people, including Opposition members, were talking in terms of being prepared to introduce a casino on the Gold Coast. I think it is fair to emphasise a few of these things at this time.

I would have expected people who are now complaining to have said earlier what they are saying now.

I am not the slightest bit interested in, or concerned with, what Opposition members have to say about me. They have, of course, attempted to destroy me politically in the past, and they will no doubt try to do so again in the future. Those attacks are what is to be expected from the Labour Party. Members on this side of the House never do that sort of thing, although they have had ample opportunity to do so in the past.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: No member on this side makes personal attacks on others.

Mr. Sherrington: You smear our characters at every opportunity.

Mr. Bennett: Think what the Treasurer said about me.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: The hon. member for South Brisbane said I was afraid to meet church leaders, and that was the reason why I went up to the "Oceanic Grandeur", off Cape York. I want to say that I am not afraid to meet anybody, including the hon. member for South Brisbane, even on a dark night—and that would take some courage, too!

Opposition members tried to prove that they are champions of the church by supporting them at this time. On the other hand, of course, they promised to make sweeping changes in the liquor laws far exceeding the amendments brought down by my colleague. As I have already outlined and emphasised, that is clear to all who have read Labour's programme. The A.L.P. wants to capitalise on, and make money from, the sale of liquor. It wants to nationalise this industry. These are some of the things the people ought to know.

The proposed amendments now before the House represent the majority decision of the combined Government parties. I say again that I personally have never been in favour of Sunday trading, nor have I changed my views. But, as Premier, I accept the decision of the majority. In this, as on other issues, the A.L.P. has become emotional. Hon. members opposite are trying to jump on the political band wagon to such an extent that they are falling over the side on top of each other. That is typical of their attitude.

I rose mainly to outline the position as it affects the Government and me personally. I have made it quite clear that everybody was given full opportunity earlier, right back in November and December last, to make his opinions known. It was made quite clear to everybody, by large headlines in the Press, what was proposed. Whilst I do not object to protests being made now, if

people outside the House want to be effective there is a time when protests can be made to better advantage, and that is before decisions are made.

Mr. Melloy: We never know what you are going to do next.

Mr. Sherrington: We can't keep up with you; that's the trouble.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: That is the progressive type of Government this State now has.

Mr. Sherrington: No wonder they call you the Artful Dodger.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warned all hon. members earlier, and I warn the hon. member for Salisbury under Standing Order No. 123A that if he continues to interject and disrupt the proceedings of the House, I shall have no hesitation in dealing with him.

Mr. Sherrington: I just want to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will not argue with the Chair.

Mr. Sherrington: I seek leave—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I shall conclude on this note: I have made it quite clear where I stand and where the Government stands. I have made it quite clear that it was known to the people of Queensland that this issue would be raised at some period of the Government's life. As I said to the people who came to me representing the churches, there is no doubt in my mind, or in the mind of the Government, about that. I made that quite clear to them. The issue is now before the House, and I am sure that the great majority of the people of this State appreciate exactly what is before the House and why it is before the House.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (2.36 p.m.): Naturally, I am pleased that the Premier saw fit to enter the debate, but his argument has not persuaded anyone that the speeches made at the introductory stage by members of the Opposition were not right on the ball and in accordance with the facts of the case.

The Premier waved around a book that sets out convention decisions of the Australian Labour Party. I do not deny the accuracy of what is contained in that book, but I do say that the Australian Labour Party is the only political party that has the fortitude to put its policy into print. Neither the Liberal Party nor the Country Party has any written policy. The only time when one can pin them down as to what their policy is is at election time. I repeat that, in my view, and in the view of the Opposition as a whole and many

people in the community, the Government has repudiated the promise it made by using the words "at this point of time".

Let me examine what those words really mean. Incidentally, the Premier said that, in his view, "point of time" meant "not at this moment". He attempted to draw an analogy with a statement made in the United States of America, but I do not know what a statement relative to the supply of arms to Israel has to do with a liquor Bill in Queensland. If the Premier wishes to accept American ideas, I suggest that he accept a decision of the High Court of the United States of America relative to gerrymandering when considering the Bill to provide for the redistribution of electorates. The Opposition will support his acceptance of that decision.

The Premier said that the policy of the A.L.P. is to supply liquor 24 hours a day, seven days a week. I do not deny that that is the party's policy in tourist areas. However, there is nothing in that policy which ties it to the one hotel.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen: Here is the book.

Mr. HOUSTON: I know the book. It has a very good photograph on the front.

The A.L.P. says that there is justification for its policy in tourist areas. The difference between the A.L.P. and the Government is that I stated at election time that an A.L.P. Government would legalise Sunday drinking. If the churches now have an argument against Sunday drinking, it can truthfully be said that they did not approach me before I delivered the policy speech, after I announced the policy of the A.L.P., or at any time during the election campaign. To say that the A.L.P. did not accuse the Government of repudiation until recently, of course, is to draw a red herring across the path of this debate. The fact is that the Government, when it introduced legislation in December last, did not indicate that there was going to be Sunday drinking, and at that time there was no repudiation of the Governments' election policy. The Government may have indicated through its spokesman that it would go further, but at no time did that indication include Sunday drinking.

It is true that church leaders put an advertisement in the Press at about that time, suggesting that they were opposed to Sunday drinking and many other things. Therefore, it is not true to say that the Government believed that church and other groups opposed to drinking did not make a protest. Surely a paid advertisement in a newspaper with a State-wide circulation must amount to a protest. On the other hand, immediately this legislation became known, people outside this Parliament started to take an interest and the churches and others protested. It is also true that the Labour Party immediately realised that there had been repudiation of an election promise.

To take the matter further, at the introductory stage the Minister did not outline to us one provision contained in the Bill.

Are we to take it that "The Courier-Mail" and other newspapers are official publications of this Government? It is just as well that, at times, newspapers do publish these things, otherwise we would not know what was going on. I repeat that on the introduction of this Bill the Minister gave us virtually no details of it at all. I point out, too, that today, only a few days after the Bill was introduced and, according to the Minister, after two years of careful analysis and preparation, he sees fit to introduce amendments to his own Bill.

Let me make it very clear that the Labour Party made certain promises during the election campaign and when we now say that the Government has stolen our policy, that is, in the main, true, particularly in regard to some of the clauses in the Bill. The hon. member for Barooka, who is chairman of our committee that investigated this matter, when opening the debate on behalf of the Opposition, made it very clear that we did not like the way some provisions of the Bill were being implemented but that the principle of sane drinking and sane Sunday drinking was certainly Labour's policy.

The Premier said that he intended his remarks to apply "at this point of time". When I refer to the Premier, I mean his Government. When he announces his policy speech he does not mouth words in relation to what he himself wants; they are the sentiments of his party. I accept that, but I also believe that when a newspaper column is put out under the name of a political party, the statements in that column have to be taken as the sentiments of the party—in this case, the Premier's party.

This is what was published under the Premier's name, or perhaps I should say under the name of the Leader of the Country Party, in "Sunday Truth" of 23 February, 1969—

"Labor pours out supposed remedies with both hands—but, in Brisbane's case, thinking people would surely agree that an 'open go' on Sunday trading could be a greater infringement of individual rights than the existing situation. Has the A.L.P. considered the interests of the many people who treasure their Sundays whether for personal, family, religious or, not least, for trade union reasons? In view of the present Saturday shopping hours dispute, has the A.L.P. leader at all considered the union viewpoint?"

It goes on further—

"This, together with the A.L.P.'s attitude to liquor, is the most cynical form of electioneering. Its implementation would turn the clock back years in traffic policing in this State and we would be branded as one of the world's most irresponsible communities in combating the road toll. The A.L.P.'s promise of an 'open go' for irresponsible drivers makes a mockery of the words 'road safety'."

I do not deny the Premier the right to make those statements, but surely such a forceful statement would carry through for at least 12 months. Nothing has arisen to indicate that the thoughts expressed on behalf of the Country Party were designed purely and simply to attack the Australian Labour Party politically on its policy relative to Sunday drinking.

Mr. TUCKER: The toll of the road is steadily mounting.

Mr. HOUSTON: As my deputy leader has has pointed out, there is no evidence to show that the problem created by the toll of the road has been tackled successfully. Surely the Premier's statement as contained in the article I have just read holds good at this time.

A Government Member: That is not an "open go".

Mr. HOUSTON: It is certainly a criticism of what I have suggested on behalf of the Labour Party. I am sure that the Government will admit that if those views were held at that time by any particular person, by any political party, or even by the Country Party, they would still be held today.

The Premier traversed the history of this State, prior to 1957. Not having been in Parliament or toured this State prior to that year, I cannot argue with the Premier; but, having been a member of Parliament since 1957, I agree that from that year until 1961 conditions and circumstances in many country areas were bad. I do not deny that people were illegally buying liquor and drinking it at hotels. The situation was not good. However, it can be remedied in two ways, first by an increase in the strength of the Police Force to stamp out illegal drinking, or, alternatively, by the legalising of drinking under certain circumstances so that it is not an offence against the law. Whether it is a moral offence is not for me to argue.

The Government of the day introduced certain legislation, and is the Premier trying to tell us that the Government introduced the 40-mile limit because it knew that liquor was being sold illegally in country areas but not in Brisbane and the surrounding area? Liquor was being sold illegally within the city under the same circumstances as those that existed in other parts of the State, so why did not the Government introduce appropriate legislation then to apply the law uniformly throughout the State? The answer is simple: at that time the Government's attitude was the same as its election attitude, namely, to fool those who were opposed to drinking—the anti-drinking element in the community—into believing that the Government was only trying to overcome a situation, and not, as has been revealed, moving gradually towards liquor trading 24 hours

a day, seven days a week. That is the Government's objective; anyone can see it opening up.

The Government claims that it is not providing for drinking 24 hours a day. I claim that it is. The Bill paves the way for drinking 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Dr. Delamothe: That is your policy.

Mr. HOUSTON: No. The Government is doing it in the tourist areas.

Dr. Delamothe: It is your policy.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Government is doing it everywhere. Look at its legislation.

Dr. Delamothe: Have a look at what is contained in your book. You will see all you want to.

Mr. HOUSTON: I know what is contained in the book. That is the Australian Labour Party's policy until its next convention. As the Minister knows, our conventions are held every three years, and after each convention we publish our policy and are quite prepared to let the world know what we have in mind. But the Liberal Party is not; it has not published a document that reveals its policy because it twists and turns in trying to keep on side with its bosses, the big businesses and the breweries, who dictate to it. Shortly we will see what the Government will do with one of the Bill's clauses that takes away the tie to certain merchants who supply wine and spirits. We will look at that amendment with interest. Contrasted with the Liberal Party's policy, that of the Australian Labour Party has been completely consistent.

Let us look at the Government's attitude on hotels. At present, anyone in this State only has to hire a room and say that it is his room, and if he pays rental for the night he can have as many people as he likes in that room and, if they so desire, they can drink and be served with alcoholic beverages for 24 hours. Under the proposed legislation this will be permitted not only in licensed hotels, but also in motels, because the provision is being extended to cover them.

The main difference between a motel and a hotel is that at least people have the right to a local option poll in the case of a hotel. Motels are being built in residential areas—they are part of the residential complex—yet any body of men and women can go to a motel in any district, provided it has 16 units or more, and hire a room for a night costing about \$3 or \$4, which, divided between 20 people, does not amount to much. Under this legislation they will be able to drink for 24 hours a day, right in the middle of a residential area.

Mr. Hughes: They have always been able to do that.

Mr. HOUSTON: It could be done only in hotels. Government members are accusing us of all these things. One would think that the Opposition introduced this measure.

Mr. Hughes: You brought that part in.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Government has extended it to motels. I repeat that at least a hotel has to comply with local option poll provisions, but motels can and will be built anywhere at all, particularly in residential areas. The Government has extended drinking in motels to 24 hours a day.

Mr. Hinze interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member can make his own speech. He has been here today, but he has not spoken yet.

The Government's idea is to try to camouflage the issue by saying that this is the Labour Party's policy. But at least we are straightforward and the people of the State know exactly where we stand. If they do not like any part of our policy they have an opportunity at any time to say, "We don't like that; we suggest you should amend it." We have three-yearly conventions, and if any member of the community decides that he would like to take part in arriving at convention decisions to make the Australian Labour Party policy better, he has only to join a branch or, if he is a member of an affiliated union, accept his membership rights. We do not bar anyone, and members of the Press enter our conventions without any trouble.

A Government Member: What about Roy Dent?

Mr. HOUSTON: If the hon. member wants to know something about chopping heads off he should have a yarn with the hon. member for Toowong, who can tell him how to beat the issue by one vote. The hon. member need not try to tell us how to run our affairs.

Speeches made in 1961, and on later amendments, show very clearly that the Government told us, "You cannot have cabarets because they create all types of trouble." But in the terms of this Bill they will be open till 3 a.m. That is the Government's decision, but we have not been told why cabarets are to open till that time. If the Government has an idea that it believes is in the public interest it should say quite clearly, "We have extended drinking hours in cabarets till 3 a.m. for these reasons." The public should be given the reasons. But neither the public nor the Opposition has been given the reasons for doing these things.

Mr. Chinchin: What are your reasons for 24-hour drinking?

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member is trying to be facetious. He is the one member in this House who tells us on many occasions that he knows our policy. I suggest that he knows our policy as well as I do, and he also knows the reasons for it as well as I do.

The Government has not told us why it wants to have 24-hour drinking in motels, nor have we been told the reasons for many other things that we will debate in detail at the Committee stage.

It is not my intention now to deal with clauses and details, but I repeat most emphatically that it is no argument for the Government to wave Labour's document in the air and say, "This is our argument in reply to your statement." There is no doubt about it. The Government made certain statements during the election campaign to try to fool the public into thinking that our policy was to their detriment and that the Government would have no part of it. That is what the Government tried to get over to the public. It now comes out in its true colours and says, as the Minister said, "For two years we have been investigating and trying to find ways and means of creating a completely open house for liquor consumption in this State."

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (2.56 p.m.): The Leader of the Opposition has been making something of a virtue out of necessity. He says that his party is the only one that has the fortitude—I think that was the word he used—to publish its policy. The fact is, of course, that it is the policy, not of the parliamentary wing, but of a group which forces it on the parliamentary wing.

The Leader of the Opposition also said that they on that side of the House do not repudiate their policy. The fact is that Labour has constantly repudiated enormous parts of its policy, and is doing so consistently at the present time. The Opposition's attitude to centralism is quite the reverse of what its policy says. So I suggest that, in making the statements that he has, the Leader of the Opposition is trying desperately to assume a cloak of respectability, because in fact the Opposition has repudiated, and is repudiating, policies wholesale.

The Opposition's whole role in this debate, particularly at the introductory stage, has been to grope—indeed, one could almost say "wallow"—in the mud, hoping to find something. And, of course, all they have come up with has been more dirt. For the Opposition to attack this Government on any aspect of the Bill is almost a high farce.

In the introductory stage, some members of the Opposition based their attack—I took particular note of this—on the fact that this Bill will aggravate some of our social problems. When one considers the Opposition's policy and contribution in this same field, one finds that they plumb the very depths of hypocrisy. They have advocated in this field—and they cannot be separated from others—the full gamut of permissiveness. I say that in this matter the Opposition is playing politics in a very squalid and unsavoury way.

It must be a matter of great regret to all of us, except those who have an inbuilt prejudice in this matter, that so much that is sensible, advanced and necessary in liquor reform should be largely obscured by the concern of a great many people over only one section of all of the proposals covered by the Bill.

I certainly concede that I would have been a good deal happier, in a personal as well as a political sense, if we had not spoilt our very good liquor reform ship for this ha'p'orth of totally unwanted tar, because, with others, I have always made my own views on this matter of Sunday bar trading quite clear. From the time when it was first discussed, I have made it quite clear that I would vote against it, if necessary. So, to clear up any doubt, let me say now that, in the Committee stage, I shall join with other hon. members in challenging, by amendment, this provision of the legislation.

In saying this, let me hasten to make it very clear that, in viewing the matter in this light, I am not contending that I am right and that those who say otherwise are wrong. Let me freely concede that I may well be the one who is wrong in this, and that others are right. But, unfortunately for me, this particular aspect of liquor amendment is an area of moral judgment, and I find I can do nothing but vigorously resist it. I suppose that, in these vaguely defined areas of moral judgment, it is reasonably fair to say that every man is the prisoner of his own conscience; the prisoner, as it were, of his early upbringing and accumulated attitudes. I can no more escape mine than others can deny theirs. The Premier concedes that, and the Deputy Premier also concedes it. But because I take a certain stand, let no-one try to interpret it as in any degree condemnation of others who take a different stand.

Mr. Bennett: They have softened you up a lot.

Mr. PORTER: The hon. member for South Brisbane may regard it as "softening up". I regard it as mere rational common sense.

My repugnance is particularly for Sunday bar trading. I have never been opposed to dealing with some of the lounge-trading anomalies that exist, but not during the term of this Parliament. For me, our mandate is quite specific, and I am not one who believes that a change in Sunday lounge trading can be interpreted to permit the totally new principle of Sunday bar trading. This is a new and alarming principle. We have not had it before, nor has any other State. What is worse, I find it a complete negation of all that we are striving to do with the other liquor law changes.

We aim, quite properly, at putting drinking into a rational social context, allying the consumption of liquor with the eating of food, and that being done over the passage of

several hours. What is the aim of this one provision? It is concentrated directly on what most would consider the very worst aspect of our drinking habits, that is, encouraging bar swilling by men separated from the womenfolk, in the cold, clinical atmosphere that so many hotel bars generate. Although it is true that women will be permitted to enter bars, if anybody thinks that this provision will mean the wholesale entry of women to bars I can only say that I think he is deluding himself.

I find this one aspect of the Bill quite incompatible with all the other aspects and concepts that we have striven to introduce, and that are clearly expressed in so many other constructive features of the Bill.

In the debate on the introduction of the Bill it was contended, as it has again been contended at this stage, that we should not be concerned about this provision, because all it does is legalise what has been going on illegally for many years, and that that is ample justification for the change. Apparently the argument is that inability to police a law properly is justification for abandoning it.

I find that argument quite untenable. For instance, we are currently engaged in strengthening the laws against the drug traffic. But we all know that no matter how good our laws are, and how effectively we police them, we will not completely check this vile traffic. Does that become an argument, then, for throwing overboard all those laws and giving the drug trade an open go? If course not. We have stringent laws against rape, but we know that it will continue. Is that adequate reason for wiping out laws prohibiting rape, and so leaving our wives and daughters vulnerable to the animals that all communities will always have in their midst? I do not think that argument can be justified. To me, it is a very horrible one, and I regret any suggestion that a valid justification for introducing Sunday bar trading throughout the State is that the law prohibiting it cannot be enforced. It is a matter of simple fact and record that the laws in other States against Sunday bar trading are enforced, seemingly without undue difficulty.

I now wish to make brief comment on the principle of local option. I am a great believer in it. Let the people speak. I think we have all noted the strong surge of public opinion seeking what is virtually a State-wide option poll on Sunday liquor trading. I agree with those who suggested at the introductory stage that normally Governments should not resort to the referendum device to evade what is properly an area of their responsibility. But I think that we have here a situation in which there is very real argument as to electoral mandate. In the minds of many decent, sensible people there is grave doubt as to whether or not they were misled—intentionally or unintentionally is beside the point—although I am quite sure it was unintentionally. I accept, as the Premier said, that it was unintentional.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. PORTER: I accept what the Premier has said—that it was unintentional—but it does exist in the minds of people. I believe, therefore, that under these circumstances the decision not to permit an expression of community view is not a wise one. I believe that the Government would have gained in many ways by permitting it, under these exceptional and unhappy circumstances.

Mr. Murray: By permitting a referendum.

Mr. PORTER: Yes, as the hon. member for Clayfield adds, by permitting a referendum. It is unfortunate, of course, that such a course cannot be proposed under the terms of this amending Bill. I am sure that many hon. members on both sides of the House would have been constrained to support such a proposal.

There has also been some criticism of the role of the churches in displaying opposition to Sunday trading, and I was delighted to hear the Premier's strong defence of their right to play to the hilt that particular role. We should never, in any degree whatever, deny the role of the church in matters of moral determination. Surely that is what the term "pastoral care" means. In my view, the church has not only the right but also the obligation to give a lead fearlessly on moral questions.

None of us can avoid the fact that in this age of growing governmental preoccupation with cradle-to-grave services, it follows that many moral problems do now become political ones. And this inevitably means that if the church is to do its job properly, now and again the church will tread on political toes. I say that we should never decry this; on the contrary, we should applaud and encourage any church action that makes people think about politics and about social problems.

Mr. Murray: Possibly the concept of the secular State has been overdone.

Mr. PORTER: I believe it has. This is one of the great problems of the present permissive society.

That brings me finally—I have no desire to speak other than briefly—to the matter of the election statement. Here again, unfortunately, I find myself in an area of moral determination in which, with great regret, I must differ from most of my colleagues.

To me, the election pledge not to alter Sunday liquor trading arrangements was straightforward and definite. I am afraid that no-one suggested to me at the time that it was not, that there was an escape clause. I am—unfortunately, I suppose—old-fashioned enough to believe that a specific promise—the only specific promise when seeking an electoral mandate—not to do something becomes a public undertaking that I find I must honour in the spirit as well as in the letter. Again I readily concede

that these are personal views. Perhaps they are outmoded, conservative views, but they are mine and I am stuck with them.

All hon. members know only too well, when legislation ventures in new moral directions—and legislation dealing with aspects of changes in liquor trading is in this field—how difficult it is to decide for oneself how one should act—whether to go warmly along with the majority party view, even if one does not like it, or whether to take the colder course of standing perhaps alone for what one deeply believes.

In this regard, it is quite useless for the Opposition to make mountains out of molehills by suggesting that because a couple of members on this side see this particular matter differently there are rifts in the Government ranks. Suggesting that only shows that the Opposition is besotted by its own Q.C.E. power mechanics. It cannot see past them. What it sees as our weaknesses are our strength and our glory. We are free men on this issue. We are not robots controlled by an outside vicious political machine.

I say that the A.L.P. is hopelessly out of date and hopelessly out of tune with the times if it believes that people today want rigidly disciplined parties in which somebody off-stage gives an order and all the politicians do is goose-step together and say "Seig heil" in unison. That is not what the people want, and that is why the A.L.P. cannot win elections.

I believe that when one is in a quandary on matters of moral judgment there is an important rule of thumb. If you wish to decide how important an issue is, whether it is so important that, if necessary, you have to stand on your own, you ask yourself, "Is what is proposed good for the family?"

I do not think that any hon. member on either side of the House would deny that our society depends totally on the sanctity of family life, on the concept of preserving the family unit as the basis of a Christian community as the bulwark against the forces that are threatening to break down our moral fibre. I therefore ask myself on this issue of a much more "open go" for liquor on Sundays, "Does this in any way help the family? Will it truly assist the father and mother who are desperately trying to protect their children from the sickening tide of permissiveness that constantly threatens to engulf them?" I am afraid I cannot convince myself that vastly enlarged Sunday liquor trading and the apparent dismissal of an election promise are not examples that harm and most certainly do not help the family.

I am afraid I must say that I find it a cause for deep political, as well as personal, concern that in this matter of Sunday trading we on this side of the House should find ourselves in the situation where we are about to implement what was precisely the A.L.P.

policy for last year's election and what is precisely the opposite to what I, for one, believed was our policy.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (3.12 p.m.): Unfortunately, I did not listen for very long to the hon. member for Toowong, but I did gather that the Labour Party's policy, as is quite often the case, was under strong attack by him, particularly in regard to our attitude towards Sunday drinking and the attitude of the Government parties in introducing legislation closely resembling the policy of the Australian Labour Party.

When we consider the comments made by the Premier and the hon. member for Toowong, it is quite obvious that the Government has failed to maintain its own policy and also to police adequately the existing laws as they refer to the liquor trade. There is sufficient evidence that the Premier, who is privately of the opinion that there should not be Sunday drinking in Queensland, has found it impossible to influence his Government's attitude. Possibly many people in the community, including myself, do not favour the drinking of alcohol on Sundays or the opening of places that are licensed to sell liquor and employ labour to do so.

I have my own opinions on this matter. I believe that a man who works for his living is entitled to have his Sundays off. I do not say that people who wish to have a drink on Sundays should not do so, but I think a man is entitled to one day a week off and not be forced into the position of working on that day in his own industry. However, these are my opinions and they possibly differ greatly from those of many other people. They are most certainly different from those advanced by the hon. member for Toowong in his approach to Sunday drinking.

I think the courage of the individual member of Parliament and his sincerity are not shown by what he says or by the fact that in certain issues he can openly oppose his own Government, but in what he does in the final analysis. It depends on whether he believes he is securing some political capital in his own locality; or whether, because he is openly opposed to Sunday drinking—and when it is safe for the Government for him to cross the floor of the House and vote against the Government—he will be securing for himself some political gain.

Mr. Murray: Do you think that is necessary in Toowong?

Mr. LLOYD: It is hardly necessary in Toowong at the moment. But one doubts the sincerity of many back-benchers on the Government side when, time after time, they have been given the opportunity by the Opposition in this Parliament—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members, I feel that I allowed quite a deal of time to the hon. member for Baroona. I then

allowed the Premier time to answer some of the accusations and insinuations made against him and the Government. In addition, I allowed the Leader of the Opposition ample time to develop his arguments along those lines. I point out that debate at the second-reading stage is confined to the principles of the Bill. I feel that sufficient has been made of the slanging match between both sides of the House, so unless hon. members confine themselves to the principles of the Bill I will have no alternative but to ask them to discontinue their speeches.

Mr. LLOYD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I was reaching the stage of developing an argument from the attitude of the hon. member for Toowong and even the individual opinions of the Premier and the many pressure groups within the community.

The argument that I intend to develop is that over the years the attitudes of many of the minority pressure groups have perpetuated archaic liquor laws in this State. Those laws have created circumstances in which people have been forced to go into hotels and swill beer in over-crowded conditions, reminiscent of the liquor laws that were framed in about 1880 to cope with the set of circumstances in which the tavern-keeper was an impoverished inn-keeper who could not afford to introduce into his tavern or hotel comfortable conditions for drinking, eating and entertainment for people, who in all probability could not afford to pay for them in any case.

The whole of this country's liquor laws have been adapted over the years to meet circumstances that may have existed at the commencement of this century. Even in the period 30 or 40 years ago, prior to World War II, the majority of licensees in this State were not exactly prosperous people. Many of them were forced to hawk their licences in an attempt to get somebody to take them over at no cost. In those days, owing to the economic conditions that governed the spending of the people of Queensland, they could not afford to drink very much.

How, then, could we have a set of liquor laws that insisted that the licensee provide luxury accommodation and dining and drinking facilities if he could not afford to provide those facilities? But now the people of Australia live in comparative prosperity and they are not required to work as many hours in the week as they were previously. They demand places where they can spend their rest and recreation hours, and they demand comfort and facilities. These they are entitled to, but not at the cost at which some places provide entertainment, dining and drinking facilities.

The Government has introduced an amendment to permit females to drink in hotel bars. Why was the ban placed on women in the first place? The reason was that in many public bars drinking conditions were

unsuitable for women. Men who finished work in the afternoon were forced to swill beer in a stinking and stuffy bar. That was no place for a woman.

Mr. Hinze interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LLOYD: Never mind the interjections, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to develop an argument to rebut many of the contentions that have been advanced by people in the community against some of the features of the Bill. The time has long since passed when the Government should have introduced legislation to alter the conditions that have obtained in this industry. The time has been reached when working people are entitled to drink and dine in comfortable, even luxurious, surroundings, but they cannot afford to pay for them at the present time. Places which provide those amenities charge such high prices that many working members of the community cannot afford to go there. If we are to provide the means by which the working people in the community can enjoy these comforts, the liquor laws of Queensland must be drastically revised.

For quite a long time the Labour Party has recognised that it is essential to draft a completely new set of liquor laws to permit sane and sensible drinking throughout Queensland. We admit that parts of the proposed legislation go some way towards achieving that objective, but unfortunately the history of our liquor legislation shows that Governments have been frightened of minority groups and have not taken the necessary action to create these conditions. Minority groups, by their electoral strength, have forced Governments to refrain from passing sensible amendments to the liquor laws. People who understand these things—I think the Minister is one man who has a worldly outlook on many aspects of this legislation; he is obviously a man who has knocked about—realise that better conditions must be created. But the legislation must first be altered so that working people in the community can enjoy the amenities they deserve.

The club legislation originally introduced by Labour was one of the best things to happen for working people. It permitted people to get together and form a workers' club or a servicemen's club. Conditions were created whereby a husband and wife with adult children could drink and dine under decent conditions. That is possible in many of the clubs being built in Queensland, with semi-luxurious fittings.

Many club members are working people, such as waterside workers, postmen, carpenters and other tradesmen, and labourers. They enjoy conditions which some years ago they did not think would ever be available to them—conditions they would have had to pay for dearly to enjoy only once or perhaps twice a year.

Any legislation that makes it easier to create these conditions reduces the number of alcoholics within the community. It minimises drunkenness and does all of the things that the pressure groups in the community claim they are trying to achieve. The incidence of drunkenness is immediately reduced when people can enjoy their recreation time in decent surroundings. These are conditions which people in the community, particularly those in the minority groups, should be acclaiming as reducing the incidence of alcoholism.

How different it is for a man who knows that his wife cannot accompany him for a few beers in a hotel after he finishes work. He goes into a hotel, guzzles for an hour or two, and becomes semi-drunk before going home. He would not want his wife to be with him in the conditions under which he has had to drink. In all probability his wife would not accompany him, whereas she would like to if conditions were sufficiently attractive. Proper liquor laws will make it possible at all times for a man and his wife to be together in a hotel in decent circumstances. Until we get legislation creating those conditions, many people in the community will continue to carry on in the way they have.

I have my own club at Gaythorne. It is the Gaythorne Services Club, which has spent \$130,000, during the past six months on facilities such as carpets, luxurious surroundings and fittings. Ninety per cent. of the club members are working people who live in that locality. They have these conditions, and they are proud of them and maintain them. Members bring their wives along in the evening, and at about half past 8, they are in the lounge enjoying a yarn and having a few drinks in air-conditioned premises. On some evenings, musical entertainment is provided.

These are the conditions for which we must strive. In the past, pressure groups have prevented this by their electoral strength and because the Government has been frightened of them. Year after year, the liquor laws have not been enforced. The Premier accused the Labour Government of not enforcing the liquor laws, which at that time did not allow any Sunday drinking. This Government introduced that amendment in 1961. Let me point out that, since 1957, illegal drinking has taken place in some areas of Brisbane, for certain reasons. I do not know what those reasons are, but I have some thoughts on the matter. It is possible, in some parts of Brisbane, to obtain a drink on Sunday, even though it is illegal. In many cases, sporting clubs operate illegally because there are no complaints. If a complaint is made, there is a great flurry for a few Sundays and the law is enforced. It is also enforced if the inspector in charge of the licensing squad is opposed to drinking. But in many cases the sudden flurry of activity by the Police Force is only temporary, and then it ceases for a while.

Mr. F. P. Moore: For only one reason.

Mr. LLOYD: For the ridiculous reason that the hours are limited to between mid-day and 2 p.m. and between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., during which hours people must swill their drinks in a great hurry to satisfy their thirst, instead of being able to drink quietly and comfortably, as the Bill proposes. This is sensible.

Some of the damage has been caused by licensing. It seems that licensing is necessary to control the industry against overcrowding. There are many other systems of licensing. Liquor licensing is no different from other forms of licensing. However, there are not sufficient safeguards in the liquor legislation against such problems as trafficking, and I do not see anything in the present legislation to prevent this.

I wish to preface my next remarks by complimenting the Licensing Commission and personnel on their administration of the Liquor Act. This has presented a difficult task for many years for people like Jack McCoy, who retired some time ago as secretary of the Licensing Commission, although he is still a member of the Commission, and Leo McQuillan, the present secretary. The Government should be proud of the service they have given and the manner in which they have undertaken the very difficult task thrust upon them.

The licensing law is no different from any other law. There are many difficulties and anomalies in its administration. The same features can be found in this law as in any other licensing law. It is necessary to license to prevent overcrowding in the industry or creating a substandard industry. When the Licensing Commission advertises the establishment of a hotel, tenders are received and the successful tenderer embarks on his project.

However, in some cases there is no intention on the part of the approved tenderer to continue with the erection and running of the hotel. Once the licence has been granted, the person who has obtained it can proceed to hawk it, internationally, intrastate or interstate, and make a profit for himself from the transaction. In one case in my district, a licence was transferred immediately after the commencement of construction of the hotel. The successful tenderer had plans prepared and construction commenced, and a few months later the licence was sold by him, almost certainly to the highest bidder.

That practice is not confined to the liquor trade; I have no doubt that it happens quite frequently with mining and oil leases that the Government has awarded from time to time throughout the State. There are no legislative provisions to prevent such actions. In areas in which there is competitive tendering the successful tenderer may be the one who intends to speculate, and the unsuccessful tenderer may be the one who was prepared to complete construction of the building and run the business. It is the speculator who, immediately on

obtaining the licence, is able to find sufficient capital to take the project to a certain stage, when he sells the licence at a considerable profit. I do not think that that should be regarded as genuine business trading.

If the people of Queensland decide that an industry requires a licensing system and revenue is obtained from it in licensing fees, those who should receive a return from the industry's worth are the people of Queensland, through the Government, not speculators who enter the industry for immediate gain and who put nothing into it. That has happened with mineral and oil leases, and I think that some provision should be inserted in the legislation to prevent the speculative tendering for licences and their later sale.

Much has been said about whether people should drink during certain hours on Sundays. I do not think that having a licensing system necessarily means that only one group of people should have the right to sell the commodities covered by the licence. I do not think that hotels, simply because they are licensed, should have the exclusive right to sell bottled liquor. Under a system of licensing, it is natural that there will be considerable distances in some areas between licensed premises, and this can be the cause of great inconvenience to many people. If people live handy to a hotel, they can go to it and take home a dozen bottles of beer. But if they live six or seven miles from a hotel, they have to travel that distance to obtain liquor. If they want a loaf of bread, they go to the nearest shop to obtain it.

If people wish to have a drink, and what they want to drink is not dangerous, such as bottled beer taken in moderation, why should they not be able to go to a licensed retail store and buy it, just as they do to buy other commodities in general use? Why should they be forced to travel 10, 15 or 20 miles to secure the commodity?

The Government has included in this legislation a provision covering retail spirit merchants' licences. It states that they shall be granted only in remote areas of the State, and what the interpretation of "remote areas" will be hon. members will not know until the Minister replies. Perhaps the Government has in mind a certain mileage. Perhaps it might be said that Birdsville is remote from Charleville or from Brisbane. I think that the provision as it stands is open to many interpretations.

In many parts of Queensland there is a need for a supply of bottled beer. Why should not a local store be allowed to sell beer under a separate licence and be assured of an adequate supply? The retail spirit merchants' licence may cover that position, but hon. members do not know at the moment whether the interpretation of "remote areas" will prevent that from happening. Neither I nor any other hon. member knows whether a remote area is one in which one

has to travel 100 miles to a hotel. If the Government introduces into the legislation a desirable extension of the licensing system, why restrict the licence in such a way that many people who could make good use of a service provided under it will not be able to do so?

I do not think there can be very much criticism of the other types of licence that are being created. For example, theatre licences will, I believe, promote civilised drinking. However, there are one or two points that I wish to raise relative to licence fees and the prices that will be charged. I think that prices charged for liquor in a licensed restaurant will be higher than those charged in hotels. Hon. members are aware of the price charged for liquor under an airport licence, and I expect that prices charged under the other licences that are to be created will be similar to those now being charged at an airport. In other words, while the Licensing Commission has no control over liquor prices, exploitation will take place. I have no doubt that prices charged under theatre licences and restricted hotel licences will be exorbitant, but the licence fee will be no higher than that paid by licensed victuallers. A licence fee of 6 per cent. of purchases has to be met by licensed victuallers and licensed clubs, most of which charge what is close to a reasonable price in their public bars. But licensed taverns and licensed dining-room and reception areas will be used by people who can afford to use them, and their profit margin will be much higher than that of licensed victuallers.

It is laid down that 6 per cent. will be the fee paid by licensed clubs and hotels. The tavern licence fee will be on a sliding scale; low in some cases, high in others. The point I make is that the profit margin under some of the restricted licences will be much higher than it will be in clubs and hotels. In my opinion, that would warrant the imposition of a higher licence fee.

I suppose I have been subjected to as much pressure from minority groups as have other hon. members, and in many cases implied threats have been made electorally against members of the Opposition, as I have no doubt they have been made against Government members. The amazing thing is that members of the Australian Labour Party are accused of being hypocritical because they intend to vote for the legislation.

One would think that, in fact, we were responsible for the legislation. If we are responsible for legislation that is good—and I think that only history will prove that—then it is something of which we can be proud. If in this legislation the Government has copied many of the ideas of the Labour Party, this is a great compliment to the Labour Party. At least we have had a policy of sane and sensible drinking since 1953.

People who are in these pressure groups know the Labour Party's policy and have known it for some time. They knew it

was our intention, immediately we became the Government, to introduce a completely revised set of liquor laws to provide for sane and sensible drinking in an attempt not to extend the practice of drinking but to provide facilities that would alleviate the present incidence of drunkenness created by the present drinking conditions forced upon the people by a set of liquor laws that for many years have been archaic and lacking in any pragmatic approach to the prosperity that the people of Queensland and Australia are presently enjoying.

I think it will take some time to discover whether the liquor laws introduced by the Government do, in actual fact, succeed in achieving the objective of the Minister. We realise that prior to the last State election the Minister for Justice intended introducing this very Bill into Parliament. He had the full intention of introducing legislation similar to this some 18 months to two years ago, but was prevented from doing so by the sudden return from overseas, of the Premier, who panicked to some extent when his attention was drawn to the fact that the liquor laws were to be revised along the lines of the present Bill.

I do not think we can accuse the Minister for Justice of being hypocritical in his approach to this matter. He has at all times been consistent in his intentions, but unfortunately, like many other people on the Government side, he had to surrender to pressures within his own party and also from outside Parliament. These pressures are quite conveniently available to Government members when they require them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LLOYD: The Bill can do nothing but some good at the present time. Whether or not we favour Sunday drinking, this must be a matter of experimentation and experience in the Brisbane area, to see what actually happens with it. Only time will tell if it is the intention of any licensed clubs to open on Sundays. Perhaps their members will insist that they do. Only time will tell whether the facilities they have will be available for the enjoyment of members and their families. This could be a good thing. If facilities provided in hotels are sufficiently improved and made comfortable for people, it could be a good thing to have, close to people's homes, places in which to enjoy a comfortable afternoon.

I have some disagreement with the trading hours. I think these have grown up over many years. They were probably brought down from ancient English times when the local inn was open between the hours of 12 noon and 2 p.m., and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. Maybe these hours were necessary at that time and were introduced because of industrial conditions; we do not know. But where broken periods like these operate, rush drinking results, and I am opposed to this

sort of drinking. If hotels are to be open on Sunday, families should be left to enjoy their mornings together. Hotels should be open in the afternoon so that people can enjoy comfortable, unrushed drinking, where the comfort of the place can be enjoyed by the family and not, as will be the case now, have the man racing to the hotel at 11 o'clock, drinking beer until 1 o'clock and then racing home for his lunch, half an hour late. This could be fostered by the broken drinking hours that are being introduced. If we are to have Sunday drinking, let it be comfortable drinking which starts in the afternoon, when all members of the family can enjoy it leisurely and in comfort.

Mr. TOMKINS (Roma) (3.44 p.m.): I desire to speak on certain measures in the Bill, but before doing so I should like to comment on some of the remarks of the hon. member for Kedron. We normally find that Opposition members attack the principles of a Bill, but the hon. member actually supported the Bill in substance. If he had any complaint it was that the legislation does not go far enough. The Bill contains many worth-while provisions, as the hon. member for Kedron said, and he virtually agreed with most of them. He concluded by making the mis-statement that the Premier stopped this legislation when he came back from overseas last year. That is not true.

Mr. Davies: What happened?

Mr. TOMKINS: I will tell the hon. member. Just as members of the Australian Labour Party argue in caucus, members of the Government parties in caucus disagreed on certain points, and it was considered best to hold our horses. The delay had nothing to do with the Premier; I make that quite clear. Before members of the Opposition accuse the Premier of something, they should be sure of their grounds.

Mr. Houston: You wanted to make sure you got the election over before you told the electors the truth.

Mr. TOMKINS: It had nothing at all to do with the election; it was purely and simply a matter of disagreement. Since then Government members have reached agreement, and the legislation has now been introduced.

I should like also to comment on the remark of the hon. member for Toowong that he was morally opposed to Sunday bar trading. It is impossible to argue with anyone on moral grounds; however I point out that I have observed what has gone on on Sundays in the bush since 1961. I did not realise just how welcome this facility would be until it was introduced, and it has proved to be extremely popular. Owing purely and simply to economic circumstances, country hotel proprietors have allowed people to drink in their bars. Many of them are only licensees, and they cannot afford to do up

hotel lounges for Sunday trading, so the practice is for them to allow people to drink in the bars. Most hotels have well-appointed, air-conditioned bars, and, whereas some people believe that it is morally wrong to drink in bars on Sundays, I do not think so. Men who are employed for six days in the week should be allowed to drink on the seventh. Some men mow their lawns on Sundays and then like to go to hotels. They do not like to mix with women because, generally, they are not suitably dressed for female company. Although some people do not like the legislation, on a broad view of it I cannot see very much wrong with it.

Mr. Bennett: Do you meet your constituents in the bars of the Roma hotels on Sundays?

Mr. TOMKINS: No, I do not. I do not know whether the hon. member for South Brisbane does, but he will soon get the opportunity under this Bill.

Mr. Houston: Are the doors and windows going to be opened in the bars in Roma?

Mr. TOMKINS: The Leader of the Opposition had an opportunity this morning of asking the Minister that question.

Mr. Houston: Don't you know?

Mr. TOMKINS: The Minister will tell the hon. member the position.

Mr. Hanlon: We did ask him, and we are waiting for his reply.

Mr. TOMKINS: He will tell the Opposition; it is his job to answer questions.

The amendments cover a very wide field, and place the accent on eating and drinking. That approach to the matter is a very sensible one. Whether a certain clause applies to taverns, hotels, restaurants or licensed motels, it relates to eating and drinking. The big issue is the 40-mile limit from the Brisbane G.P.O.

Sections in the community are very strongly opposed to the legislation. I believe that their view goes beyond banning Sunday drinking within the 40-mile limit and extends almost to complete prohibition. There are many people in the community who will not have anything to do with liquor of any kind. I respect their views, but they are in the minority. This Government displayed great courage in carrying on with this legislation, and I believe the majority of people want it.

Mr. Hanson: Are they all dying of thirst?

Mr. TOMKINS: They would not die of thirst if they lived near Gladstone.

Experience in the United States proved that prohibition is undesirable, and that has been proved in Australia, too. In years gone by, when there were insufficient licensed premises, sly-grog shops flourished. When

hotels of acceptable standard were established, however, drinking patterns and behaviour became much better. The Government had no alternative but to proceed with legislation on these lines.

As the hon. member for Kedron said, we are living in comparative prosperity. That has come about through many of the Government's policies. We must be "with it" in all ways and must ensure that people who are obviously a good deal better off than they were in the old days enjoy conditions applicable to their lot. That is the way of things. People should be made to feel, whether they drink in clubs or hotels, that they are drinking under the best possible conditions.

I was very surprised on an overseas trip some years ago to see the different drinking conditions in countries such as Spain, Italy and France.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. TOMKINS: I did not study their legislation but very little action is taken on liquor at all. The laws have been framed so that people fit into the picture. In other words, people can go to an average cafe or restaurant and have a whisky and soda while their neighbours are having a cup of tea or coffee. That is the sensible way and the person who drinks is not isolated from the one who does not.

Mr. Hanson: Do you think that would be desirable in this country?

Mr. TOMKINS: I do not say that it would be desirable, but in those countries it appeared desirable. I believe that, in dealing with our liquor laws, we should proceed step by step.

Mr. Lee: If you go to the Royal Hotel in Gladstone you have to drink on the footpath.

Mr. TOMKINS: That may be so.

The Minister studied conditions overseas to determine what conditions should apply in Queensland. He also had the advantage of visiting the other States of Australia. The legislation proves that he has done a very good job.

After this legislation is passed, the liquor issue, which has been far too much in our minds recently, will settle down or die, just as it did in European countries. In a few years' time there will be no action on it.

The hon. member for Kedron said that there should be other changes, and that may be so. They may come later, but I do not think the issue will be of such magnitude again. In proceeding with this legislation the Government has been very wise. It will be well accepted by the people.

Mr. Bennett: One thing is sure; your Government will not be dealing with it after 1972.

Mr. TOMKINS: I think that the hon. member is quite wrong there. Any Government that has courage to face big issues, which his Government seemed to run away from when it was in power, is usually returned with a good majority. I have no worry about that. I think this is courageous legislation.

Mr. Houston: Did you tell them, in the 1969 election campaign that this Bill was coming in?

Mr. TOMKINS: I did.

Mr. Houston: Why did you argue against—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TOMKINS: When I was campaigning in the Roma area, I told the people that this type of legislation was coming in. But I did not say it would be as good as this.

Mr. Houston: You must have said it at 2 o'clock in the morning outside the pub when no-one was around.

Mr. TOMKINS: The Leader of the Opposition must have been there.

Mr. Houston: Yes, and I heard you. I was trying to sleep there.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. R. E. Moore: He is treating it as a practical joke.

Mr. TOMKINS: He is doing something like that.

One of the provisions that appeals to me is the extension of the hours of trading in golf clubs and bowling clubs. Representatives of those clubs asked me if they could have a little more time, to suit their type of game. I think the hours are to be 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. in these clubs. This will be extremely well received, and I think the Opposition will get its answer in the 1972 election. I made several representations to the Minister on this matter and I am happy to see that this provision is in the Bill.

The legislation goes a little further. Clause 74 deals with unlicensed club permits. A golf club or a bowling club is set up with facilities for drinking as well as playing. However, cricket clubs, football clubs, and, I suppose, tennis clubs, are not and miss out. As I read the legislation, this will not be the position in the future because a club will be able to apply for an unlicensed club permit.

In this regard, clause 74 reads—

“The court shall not grant an unlicensed club permit to any person unless it is satisfied that the premises on which the function concerned is to be held are so constructed and situated and have such amenities and facilities as to be suitable

for use for the purposes of such a function at which liquor is supplied and consumed having regard to the facilities which might reasonably be expected to be provided for such purposes in the locality in question.”

In future these clubs, if they have suitable premises and facilities, will be able to give their patrons the conditions enjoyed in other sporting clubs. It is a most desirable feature. It will help the clubs financially as well as give them a club atmosphere. Cricket clubs, football clubs and tennis clubs are the poorer clubs financially.

Mr. P. Wood: Did you say they will operate on the same basis as golf clubs and bowling clubs?

Mr. TOMKINS: No. They can apply for an unlicensed club permit and, if they have satisfactory facilities, they will get it.

Mr. P. Wood: It is for only one function?

Mr. TOMKINS: Yes, although I suppose it will be possible to get a licence for a whole season. This means that country people will be able to enjoy the same facilities as Rugby league footballers at Lang Park and cricketers at the Brisbane Cricket Ground.

One thing that I like about the legislation is the way in which it will tend to bring amenities to country areas. That has always been the policy of the Government, and I am glad to see it continued in this manner.

I am interested in the introduction of taverns. They are a type of small hotel seen in the English countryside. They are very popular places, where not too many people congregate. I cannot foresee what the future will be for taverns in Queensland, or where they will be situated. Motels have been constructed in many areas, and taverns will probably find a place in areas where there are many motels. That seems to me to be a logical development.

The requirement that taverns must provide at least two-course meals gets back to the principle of combining eating and drinking. I think the Minister deserves full marks for introducing that provision, as he does also for previously allowing motels to have licensed restaurants. I now note that there is to be a further extension of that principle to enable liquor to be supplied to motel guests. All these things are sensible in our society of comparative prosperity, as the hon. member for Kedron described it. They reflect the attitude of this and other governments whose policies have brought Australia to its present very creditable state. Although we hear talk from some people about how bad things are, I think we would do well to count our blessings. By this legislation, which goes hand in hand with the progress now being achieved, I think the Government is keeping pace with its ideals.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (4.2 p.m.): In the four years in which I have represented Chatsworth in this House, no other single issue has aroused as much reaction as has the measure now before us. By telegram, letter, phone call and personal contact, I have been made aware of the reaction not so much to the over-all amendments but specifically to the question of Sunday trading.

I intend to address myself to that subject in just a moment, but it would be remiss of me if I did not, at this first opportunity, refer to those communications that have come to hand. They have come from close and dear friends, from respected associates, from political personalities both friend and foe, and from numerous constituents who till this time have never seen fit to contact or meet me. I want to say that I have a profound respect for those people and their points of view, and I want them to know that I have faithfully represented their points of view to the leader of the Government.

But it is interesting that this issue has stimulated public reaction. Since entering this place, it has been my endeavour constantly to solicit comment and question from my constituents, and indeed each year, by letter, I write to my new constituents inviting their interest in matters of public concern. The deplorable response to those invitations has always been a matter of great disappointment to me.

Therefore, because of this new interest, I want to express the hope today that this issue will usher in an increased interest in social questions, and that greater contact may be enjoyed between my constituents and me. I should like to see the churches arrange committees that meet regularly to apply themselves to some of these questions. I should like them to be stimulated by broad issues that will one day be legislated upon, rather than wait for them to reach the climacteric situation, like the one before us, when they have actually entered the legislative arena.

I can assure the churches in my electorate that I would consider contact with such groups the discharge of my parliamentary responsibilities. If such a move could emerge from the present controversy, something useful would have been achieved.

And so I come to the question of Sunday trading in Brisbane. In personal terms, I greet it with no enthusiasm. To me, it has no interest and no appeal. I try, with varying degrees of success, to share that one day of the week with my family; but most hon. members will agree that, with the heavy demands of a political life, even that is not always possible.

However, I support the measure on two bases. I accept the proposition that the citizens of Brisbane should be treated equally with their fellow-Queenslanders outside the metropolitan area. The 40-mile nonsense is a sad legacy left to us by our predecessors. I believe that Sunday drinking has been

accepted in country areas for the last nine years without any apparent concern or inconvenience being caused to those who have had no interest in it. But, more importantly, I support the measure because of the option to open that is vested in licensees on that one day.

This is a point that has not been brought to the fore sufficiently in the debate till now. Surely demand itself is going to be the determining factor in this matter. The patrons will vote "Yes" with their patronage or "No" with their absence, and that is an important distinction. For six days of the week the licensee must, without the option, open his premises during prescribed hours. On Sundays his trade, or lack of trade, will govern the judgment that he is allowed to exercise.

I make the prediction now that most city and several suburban hotels will not trade on Sundays. The city, in particular, attracts so few people to its midst that opening on Sundays would not be a commercial proposition. I express the pious hope that licensees will be free to make their own judgment on this matter, free from pressure from any of the liquor interests. Licensees should be able to make their own assessment according to demand and community reaction. They should not feel it obligatory to open for both periods when opening for one period may be deemed to be sufficient.

Now, the general tone of the Bill is towards moderation, and my particular references to the many machinery clauses will be reserved until they are debated at the Committee stage; but I wish to associate myself with the particular principles that the Bill spells out.

The Minister, in his second-reading speech, referred continually to the association of food with alcohol, pointing out, quite properly, that the effect of alcohol is minimised when it is associated with the partaking of food, and there is a great movement in that direction in the measure now before the House. I applaud it.

What, then, is the obvious result of these sweeping amendments? Apparently, liquor will be made accessible to those who seek it. What, then, is the judgment of the Government in taking such a step? I presume to answer my own question. In effect, the Government has said—and I remind the House that the Leader of the Opposition expressed these same sentiments in his speech at the introductory stage—that the overwhelming majority of drinkers are moderate in habit, acting responsibly and sensibly, restricting their intake, and conducting themselves in a fashion befitting civilised, sensible and rational beings. They need few restrictions to remind them of their responsibilities. Their own common sense can be depended upon to make sure that they behave themselves sensibly.

And so laws are relaxed in the expectation that they will still know when to take drink and when to leave it alone. Quite rightly, restrictive laws applicable to the few who abuse themselves should not, as a general rule, be applied to the many who do not abuse themselves. The moderate drinker now has laws moulded to his requirements.

But there still remains the problem of those fellow-citizens who are the victims and not the masters of drink. Is it now to be an "open go" for them also, without a tightening of the law, without any review of our problem drinkers, without alleviation of the distress of those who suffer from it? If that is so, I want no part of it. The human suffering, degradation and deprivation that are the direct consequences of over-indulgence must be the ground for continuing concern by any Government, particularly a Government that makes the remarkable claim that it is now years ahead of other States in liquor reform.

As far as law enforcement is concerned, my stand is quite unequivocal. If there are now to be better facilities and extended hours for the moderate drinker, then there must be enforcement of the law in full measure against the excessive drinker. As far as drink-driving is concerned, I would be proud of our police if they achieved the record of being the toughest in the Commonwealth. There can be no sympathy for the person who, while in charge of a motor vehicle, endangers his own life and the lives of others because of his over-indulgence. For the excessive drinker who damages his health, shatters his reputation and career, and inflicts suffering and deprivation on his dependents there must be a reappraisal of his problems. In theory, intoxication should be minimised by the Act itself. A section of the Act provides, on fear of penalty, that a licensee shall not serve a person in a drunken condition. Is it asking too much that this provision be enforced?

Only time will tell whether the Government's actions are vindicated. I, with many of my colleagues, will maintain a watching brief. I close on the plea that harsher laws for the irresponsible drinker are not inconsistent with relaxed laws for the moderate drinker. The Minister for Transport is fortified in this viewpoint by "The Sunday Mail" readers' poll on traffic laws. He has a part to play in this matter, and we look to him to see that the laws of our roads are strengthened.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (4.12 p.m.): The few Government members who are interested in speaking in this debate, or have the courage to speak in it, are endeavouring to remove the real issues from the principles of the Bill. The issues in the Liquor Act of 1970, as it will no doubt be called, are what the Government intends as part of its policy from time to time.

The real issue, in my opinion, is not whether drinking is evil or otherwise. We are not called upon in this debate to decide whether drinking to excess causes damage to one's mental or moral fibre, or whether there should be complete temperance, or what harm over-indulgence will have. That is not part of this Bill because, by its very nature, it presupposes that liquor intake in this State is sociable, reasonable and justifiable. The right to drink liquor is not in question. The only issue is when we should drink—at what times.

I believe that the hon. member for Chatsworth and other hon. members opposite have been beating around the bush in speaking generally about the evils of drink. What we are dealing with are the principles of the Bill and what the Government said about those principles during the election period and on 2 December, 1969. That is the real issue. The question of drinking is not at stake. If we were debating whether or not we should allow the consumption of liquor, we would be dealing with its consumption on every day of the week. Let us be logical and practical about the matter. If it is wrong and evil to drink liquor on Sunday, it is equally wrong to do so on any other day of the week.

Mr. Murray: It is right to drive, but there are speed limits.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. We are not debating the principle of whether it is right or wrong to drive or to drink; we are dealing with the qualifications that should be imposed either on drinking or on driving. That is the argument I am putting forward. It is utter rot—or, to be more temperate, completely irrelevant—to argue that drink per se is an evil thing. The point at issue is whether or not people should drink on Sunday. Statements made about over-indulgence in alcohol are simply a non sequitur. A person could be completely abstemious on Sunday and yet be as full as a bull for the rest of the week, but according to the reformers in the Government that is a satisfactory feature so long as the person does not get full on Sunday.

Let us put the whole matter in its true perspective. The matter involved is the credibility of the Government and, as well, we are debating the principle of Sunday drinking.

The Minister for Justice, who echoed his Premier's policy speech, said on 2 December, 1969, that the Government had decided to implement its policy of liquor reform, as contained in the Premier's policy speech. In addition to the Minister, the hon. members for Mt. Gravatt and Toowong spoke on the matter, and all three insisted that the principle in the Bill at that time was the complete implementation of the policy enunciated and espoused by the Premier during the 1969 election campaign. The hon. member for Toowong, who writes the speeches for most of the "ginger group"

and for newly-elected Government members, said that it was not intended by the Government to go any further with liquor reform or liquor legislation.

Mr. Houston: He is an ex-secretary of the Liberal Party; he would know.

Mr. BENNETT: That is so. Not only did he speak in Parliament on moral issues and matters of conscience, but through you, Mr. Speaker, he with others took an oath of office—

Mr. R. E. Moore: That is only his opinion.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not dealing with his opinion but his sworn statement; that is what it amounts to. The hon. member for Windsor should keep himself to rural issues; he is unskilled when dealing with liquor legislation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already said that I do not intend to allow the debate to develop into a slanging match. I ask the hon. member for South Brisbane to return to the principles contained in the Bill.

Mr. BENNETT: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling without equivocation, but during the course of the debate the hon. member for Toowong slang-whanged me and my party, and, subject to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I propose to defend myself. He certainly slang-whanged me, and had I believed that I would not be given the opportunity to defend myself—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! To which debate does the hon. member refer?

Mr. BENNETT: The present debate. A few minutes ago he said that we were men without conscience, and he accused us of accepting our directions from the Q.C.E. I resent that accusation, and I propose to answer him. We should be given freedom of speech when a serious charge is levelled at us in this Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Granted.

Mr. BENNETT: Today the hon. member for Toowong said that, although the legislation was not in keeping with his principles or conscience, it indicated to him that the Government was being honest and practical in the implementation of its proposal and that the Bill was in keeping with the policy enunciated by the Premier in May of last year. He also said it was in keeping with his statement in December last year that it was not proposed to implement Sunday drinking, or to further extend or liberalise liquor laws "at this point of time".

Mr. Porter: What about actually quoting what I said, not your version of what I said.

Mr. BENNETT: Through you, Mr. Speaker, I advise the hon. member for Toowong to learn the rules of debate in this House. I know that if I did start quoting—I have "Hansard" here but I do not propose to quote from it—you would be the first to rule that I was out of order.

It is high time that a responsible officer of the "ginger group" (the off-beat section of the Liberal Party), learnt the rules of debate in this House. I am entitled to call on my memory. He said there were three reasons for introducing the liquor legislation on 2 December, 1969. He said that it was designed to implement entirely and completely the policy enunciated by the Liberal Party and the Country Party through the lips of the Premier during the election campaign. The three reasons were to remove restrictions from restaurant licences, to provide for restaurant licences in motels, and to remove the numerical restriction on licences granted to clubs. He assured us and the people, the electors of Queensland, that that was the only reason, and he gave an undertaking himself that the Government—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already announced to the House that this particular stage of the debate has been amply covered by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier, and the hon. member for Baroona. I do not propose to allow hon. members to enlarge on the debate that has already taken place. We have before us a Bill that contains certain principles, and I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to those principles.

Mr. BENNETT: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly do my best to abide by your ruling, but it would be rather unfortunate if that ruling was strictly enforced and if the only ones who could participate in this debate, which is of vital importance to the State, and affects all our electorates and our constituents generally, were the leaders of the parties. I think it is a bad thing if the lips of back-benchers are to be gagged.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is implying that the Chair is gagging back-benchers. I ask him to withdraw the remark. Before calling on him to do so, I state that I have no intention of stopping hon. members from debating any matter that is appropriate to the second reading, namely, the principles of the Bill. I have already announced that the debate on the second reading of a Bill is confined to the principles of the Bill, and this Bill is no exception.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well, Mr. Speaker. The main principle—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has first to make a withdrawal.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw. I am not suggesting any improper motives. If your rule means, as

I understand it, that the leaders will be allowed to debate certain matters, but that back-benchers cannot enter that sphere——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am not implying that at all. If a remark is made by one hon. member in a debate, then another hon. member has a right to reply. I am saying that any further reference to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition relative to the Premier will be purely and simply tedious repetition, and I do not propose to allow such a reference.

Mr. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I take it that the most important speaker in this debate today would be the Premier, and I am only the second speaker from the Opposition benches to have an opportunity to reply to him. I listened intently to my colleague the hon. member for Kedron, and, whilst he made some passing reference to the Premier, no speaker on this side of the House has yet had an opportunity to answer the Premier's allegations.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: What about the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Chatsworth is only small fry. The Leader of the Opposition spoke before the Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member for South Brisbane had been listening at the time, he would have known that the Leader of the Opposition completely covered the subject in answer to the Premier.

Mr. BENNETT: There is one aspect of the Premier's speech that has not been dealt with as far as I know, and I have been sitting here all afternoon.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: He is certainly making history, because he stayed here only for the brief time that he spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members on my right will please not provoke the hon. member for South Brisbane or deter him from making his speech.

Mr. BENNETT: The Premier made the allegation that there has been snide Sunday drinking in Brisbane for a long time. That may be true, but it is a serious allegation to make as well as a damning indictment of himself and his Government. The fact is that, as part of his argument for the introduction of Sunday trading in this city, the Premier claimed that the law has been continuously flouted for a long period, and that, to avoid and obviate that illegality, it is necessary to amend the legislation and make it legal to trade on Sundays.

I preface my remarks and qualify them by making it quite clear that I support, in their entirety, the arguments and submissions of the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Baroona. The weakest

argument I have ever heard both as a lawyer and as a parliamentarian, for amending the law is that the existing legislation cannot be policed. That is a shocking admission; it is a damning indictment of the Government and a clear-cut plea of guilty by the Government that it is not equal to its administration and the problems that face it.

It is not long ago that the Premier controlled the Police Department. Apparently, that is how he obtained his knowledge that the liquor laws in this State were being persistently flouted by people who were engaging in illegal trading on Sundays. Regardless of what has been said about Dr. Wainer and others who have made certain allegations, surely it is logical to suggest that if the Premier had this knowledge and nothing was done about it, big protection money was being paid to some members of the Queensland Police Force. If there was not, does the Premier argue that no policeman or detective is sufficiently qualified or possesses the adequate standard of efficiency to police the Liquor Act properly and strictly on a Sunday? I refuse to believe that over the years there have not been men ready, willing and able in the Licensing Squad to police the liquor laws. If snide Sunday drinking was going on ad lib, those men, given the instruction, the authority and the entitlement, would have stamped it out. I think we have men with the ability and efficiency to do that.

Obviously somebody must have stopped them from carrying out their duties under the Liquor Act. The liquor laws are among the easiest laws to police. The police would only have to keep certain premises under observation to know whether or not a particular licensee was trading illegally on a Sunday or at any other time.

Apparently the Premier, who prates about temperance, had knowledge of this all along. He was not prepared to give particulars—I could perhaps assist him in this regard—of some of those who have been trading on a Sunday. No doubt he would agree that his records are filled with information and allegations of this illegal trading, but neither as Premier nor when he controlled the Police Department, has he been prepared to insist on the enforcement of the liquor laws.

I do not for a moment suggest that the Premier has been paid any protection money, but why has this snide trading in liquor been tolerated by him and the Government over a number of years, as the Premier admits it has been?

Mr. Dean: The liquor barons are the bosses.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: Do you not want me to reply to that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is making a speech more appropriate to the introductory stage. I ask him to deal with the Bill.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Toowong dealt in his second-reading speech with local option polls. I should like a ruling from you on this matter, Mr. Speaker. As the question of a referendum is not a principle of the Bill, I take it that I am not allowed to make any reference to a referendum?

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter of a referendum has been discussed fairly freely, and further reference to it would be tedious repetition. There is provision in the Bill for local option polls.

Mr. BENNETT: I propose to deal with local option polls. As the holding of a referendum is not a principle of the Bill, your ruling is that it cannot be discussed?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: The principle of the holding of local option polls, quite distinct from referendums, already resides in the present legislation, and has been there for a long time. The principle of local options relates presently to the taking of a ballot in a particular locality under the Electoral Act, and under the Liquor Act, to decide whether or not a new licence should be granted, or whether an existing licence should be transferred. In my opinion, that is quite a satisfactory principle, and I believe that there is no opposition to it among parliamentarians as such.

As I understand the confused argument of the hon. member for Toowong, he contends that the principle of the holding of local option polls should apply to Sunday trading, bearing in mind that there is no obligation on any hotelier or licensee to open his doors on Sundays. If I may say so as a matter of interest, I received my quota of telegrams, and one was from Mrs. Pitt, the licensee of the Boundary Hotel at West End, objecting to Sunday trading. The telegram purported to be signed by her. I immediately replied, pointing out that I thought somebody must have been playing a joke on me, because she earns a fairly good living from the sale of liquor and she would certainly not be opposed to its consumption. I thought therefore that her conscience would not be concerned over the consumption of liquor, and that she must be against the proposed changes because she did not like having the obligation to trade and employ staff on Sundays. I said that whilst I thought she was having a big joke with me, the remedy nevertheless was in her own hands because she did not have to open on Sundays.

In the matter of local option polls, it is my opinion that once the law provides licences for hoteliers generally throughout Queensland, the right to trade under the

licences cannot be taken from them individually except by legislation that applies generally throughout the State. In other words, it is my opinion that if the legislation contained a provision under which, by local option ballot, a hotel was forced to close on Sundays after being granted a licence, the Licensing Commission would have to award compensation to the licensee for his not being able to open on Sundays.

In other words, one could, by way of local option poll, deprive a body, authority, organisation or company of the right to a licence. But, having granted it a licence to trade on Sundays, one could not take it away by local option poll, just as one could not take away the right of a suburban storekeeper to trade on Sundays if in fact the legislation says that all other storekeepers throughout Queensland may trade on Sundays. It would be a question of damages and compensation for introducing legislation to deny him a right that he has already won under legislation that is uniform throughout the State.

Alternatively, if he was not paid damages because his store was closed under a local option poll—this applies to an individual or individuals throughout the State—he could take his case to the High Court, and it is my opinion that that section of the legislation would be held to be invalid.

I agree, as has been said by other hon. members, that the church authorities and others who have particular views, and determined views, on the matter have the right to object. I believe—I am speaking now for myself, Mr. Speaker—that parliamentarians and representatives of the people also have a right to declare their attitude and to make their decision. Although I respect the right of the churches to make representations and approaches or to demonstrate in a particular fashion, I still reserve to myself the right to comment on their action favourably or adversely, depending upon whether I think their technique has been suitable or proper.

The claim was made in this debate by the hon. member for Toowong, who was one of the later speakers, that members of the Opposition are directed by the Q.C.E. and that the policy of the Q.C.E. is to tell them what to do in relation to liquor legislation, or any other type of legislation. That was the allegation and charge that he made. That is typical of those who prate and preach in Parliament about morality. I do not say this in relation to people outside with their own private activities, but when one hears a parliamentarian preaching and prating about his own conscience and standards of morality, one immediately has grounds for being suspicious of him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I am dealing with the allegation that members of the Opposition are directed by the Q.C.E. It was on 2 December, 1969, that the same hon. member

who said that members of the Opposition take their directions from the Q.C.E. charged my leader with not carrying out the policy of the Q.C.E. and the Labour-in-Politics Convention on this very issue of liquor legislation. The hon. member is prepared to say anything. He is a political acrobat, and his conscience is certainly elastic; in fact, it must have become almost a leather conscience by this time. As I said, on 2 December, 1969, he accused the Leader of the A.L.P. in this Chamber of refusing to carry out the policy on liquor legislation of the Q.C.E. and the Labour-in-Politics Convention. His allegation was—I took down the words that he used—that the Opposition is directed by an outside, vicious machine. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber have been putting up with cheap allegations of that type for a long time. I do not propose to spend much time dealing with the hon. member's allegation—

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not propose to allow the hon. member very much time to deal with it, either.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not propose to spend much time dealing with it. Obviously, in order to have consistent government, government that is respected, and accepting the principle that there has to be government by majority political parties, Parliament can function successfully, with integrity and with the confidence of the people, only if in fact such parties have policies that are written down in documentary form. Those major political parties are expected in conscience—I am dealing with conscience—to follow, adopt and implement those policies because they contain the issues on which the people voted.

As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Toowong claimed on 2 December, 1969, that the Government parties were returned to office because of their undertaking and promises in relation to liquor legislation. He is on record as saying that.

I also believe that I should deal briefly and finally with the Premier's comment, "at this point of time". Surely Queensland politics have descended to a sorry state when the public, like a constitutional lawyer, has to examine every statement minutely.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled on the subject of comments. I think the Leader of the Opposition covered all aspects of the Premier's speech. Therefore, this is simply tedious repetition.

Mr. BENNETT: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was dealing with a vital and important issue. Parliament has not met for a long time, and it is likely to adjourn for Easter and not meet again until next session.

Mr. Hinze: Why don't you deal with the issue?

Mr. BENNETT: The main issue in this case is credibility, and I think the Premier has deliberately deceived the people in what he said today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is overstepping the bounds of parliamentary language and parliamentary privilege when he says that any member of this Parliament has deceived someone. It is unparliamentary language, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it, as there are other matters with which I wish to deal.

I have spoken in this House on other occasions about trafficking in liquor licences. Dealing in liquor licences is certainly a principle of this Bill, and it is time that the Minister for Justice and others insisted that the legislation be carried out with integrity.

We witnessed a sorry episode in the dealings in the Brook Hotel, which was granted a licence in the name of a man called McKenzie. He did not put a stake in the ground or turn a sod of soil. He trafficked in the licence granted under legislation condoned by this Government. He traded in that licence, I repeat, without turning a sod, for over \$100,000 to the National Mutual Life Association.

I have been charged in the Press by Mr. Sakzewski with uttering inaccuracies in Parliament, but the principle about which I spoke, in relation to dealing in licences, was absolutely correct except for one minor error. That was in relation to his being a director of the Sunnyside Hotel. Actually, when he published his interest in that hotel he failed to state the interest that his family also had in the same matter. In effect, he was telling the public, through the columns of the Press, only a half or a third-truth. I think Parliament generally has little regard for people who are not prepared to tell the full truth.

Mr. Sakzewski has his family in these deals either as nominal holders of shares or alternatively as substantial holders of shares, and when he is dealing with his interest in these matters surely he should publish the interests held by his family. This he failed to do, but I took the trouble to search in the Companies Office and discovered just what interest he had.

I dealt also with The Homestead licence. As sure as I am standing here, after this legislation is passed through Parliament but before it receives Royal assent the licence of The Homestead will be transferred for a fabulous sum of money—a fortune—from this coterie of businessmen to Queensland Brewery Ltd. Time has proved many of my allegations to be correct. I am sure that although the transfer of The Homestead licence has not yet been made public, all the agreements have been made and the transfer will take place after the Bill is passed and before it receives Royal assent.

Following comments that I have made during debates on the liquor laws—and I give credit to the Minister for Justice who, without admitting that my statements led him to make certain amendments to the legislation, obviously took notice of what I have said—the Bill contains a proposal that, on being granted a licence, a licensee will be required to give an undertaking and sign a bond that he will hold the licence for a period longer than three months. From now on, big coterie of businessmen and liquor barons will not be able to make fabulous fortunes overnight by trading, in effect, in a piece of paper that they obtain from the Licensing Commission.

I believe that the proposal of the Bill relative to an international-standard hotel is designed to enhance and enrich the bank balances of a certain section of businessmen who have the ear of the Government.

Mr. Hinze: Don't you think there is need for a hotel of international standard?

Mr. BENNETT: Certain people in this country are prepared to build premises of an international standard, and I believe that the standard of any premises constructed will speak for itself. As a private-enterprise Government is in control of this State, no monopoly or coterie of businessmen should obtain the statutory blessing for such an undertaking from legislation. There should be free competition in private enterprise, and if anyone conducts premises that are suitable for entertaining overseas visitors and international businessmen, such premises would be regarded as being of an international standard and should not be provided with statutory protection or authority.

This principle is similar to that under which Queensland Trustees Ltd. and the Union-Fidelity Trustee Co. Ltd. have statutory protection and authority. Why, I do not know. I fail to understand why they cannot exist without it. If members of the Country Party are fair dinkum, they will agree with me. It does not seem to be necessary to write into the Act a clause that will give a monopoly to what is known as international-class premises.

What will be the standard of these premises? I do not claim to be an authority on the standard of accommodation, but I should think that the Parkroyal Motel would qualify as a place of international standard. As far as I know, the location for the international-standard premises has been selected already, and I ask the Minister whether or not the premises that are constructed will be a cover-up for men who are granted a licence without a local option poll having been held. How many of these licences will be granted? Will gambling dens be allowed in such premises? Are they to be a sophisticated type of establishment where high-class brothels will operate?

Mr. Hinze interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: We know that happens in some of these so-called international-class premises overseas. If the hon. member for Gold Coast were to travel overseas instead of confining himself to his little dug-out on the Gold Coast, he would know what goes on.

It is true that all these features are to be found in some of the alleged international-class premises in overseas countries. That is the standard that some international tourists expect. Gangsters from certain countries will come here prepared to exploit and fleece the people of Queensland if we are not particularly careful to establish certain standards.

A Government Member: And you will defend them.

Mr. BENNETT: I would even defend the interjector, although I would have my personal views on his character and conduct. In keeping with his case I would put up the best defence I could for him, although I suppose he would not be prepared to pay the necessary fees.

This is a revolutionary departure from the existing provisions. I should like the Minister to say whether he has had discussions with businessmen who propose to construct these premises. I think that some business interests already believe that they will be the fortunate, favoured ones to get this licence without a local option poll; that they have already set their sites on the location and that they will use a public utility for it.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (4.52 p.m.): Opposition speakers have indicated once again that apparently they subscribe to most of the Bill's provisions, and it is obvious to everyone that they are trying desperately to find something to talk about. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat spent a lot of time referring to the Premier and his speech, and then to the licences granted to various people. He also spent some time delving into the background of those who constitute various companies.

I will not traverse the arguments I have heard so much about today other than to say that I commend the Minister on introducing the Bill. We have heard so much about it for so long and it contains so many worth-while provisions that I believe hon. members should talk about some of the matters referred to by the Minister.

The Minister is to be commended for stating at the outset that one of the main features of the Bill was an effort to have food provided with liquor at all times. Every hon. member would agree that it is an excellent idea to get those who drink liquor to take food with it. We must accept that people will drink; it has been proved in the United States and elsewhere that prohibition is a complete failure.

Hon. members will recall that prior to the Christmas recess, when we were discussing amendments to the Liquor Act, the Government indicated that it would approve licences for restaurants on a standard basis, rather than on the basis of granting only two new licences each year.

Mr. Aikens: Nobody has to drink. There is no compulsion about it.

Mr. HINZE: Perhaps I agree, and perhaps all hon. members would, but it is not an established fact, because people do drink. We simply cannot stop them. Irrespective of what the Government tries to do, there is nothing much that can be done to stop people from drinking, and they will drink illegally if they cannot do it legally.

The Government must be commended on the introduction of restaurant licences and cocktail-bar licences so that friends can meet and have a talk and possibly do a little business at the cocktail bar before sitting down to a meal.

The Minister referred to tavern licences, bistro licences, cabaret licences, and other licences that are quite new to us. I can see that there is a need for them. The tavern licence will become most popular. In olden days, when the means of travel was horse and coach, it was necessary to ensure that hotel accommodation was provided. These days there is a swing to motel accommodation, which has developed so quickly and well in Queensland.

Mr. Aikens: In my young days they had shanty licences in the West.

Mr. HINZE: Perhaps when we have more time the hon. member for Townsville South will tell us just what a shanty licence is. I have never heard of one.

Mr. Aikens: They were bark-and-bough sheds.

Mr. HINZE: That was a shanty licence?

Mr. Aikens: Yes.

Mr. HINZE: Approved by the Government?

Mr. Aikens: Yes. And they made their own rum, too.

Mr. HINZE: I shall now refer to motel licences. As all hon. members know, I have more motels in my electorate than any other three or four hon. members put together.

Mr. Bennett: And you have been thrown out of nearly every one of them, too.

Mr. HINZE: That was not last week, it was the week before. And the hon. member was on his way out before me.

Under the Bill, restaurant licences, cocktail-bar licences, and room service will be granted by the Licensing Commission, if it believes it is desirable, to certain motels, including international-type motels. Some

time ago I had the privilege of introducing to the Minister the representative of a company which indicated that it was prepared to spend \$5,000,000 in my area if it was allowed to provide these services. The Minister indicated that he thought it would be possible to introduce a proposal to allow for this type of service.

The Gold Coast City Council is proud that it has the greatest number of building approvals in Queensland. Approximately \$25,000,000 a year is spent on building in my area, mostly on high-rise buildings. I understand that in the next six months another eight buildings of 10, 15, or 20 storeys will be erected on the Gold Coast. That indicates that the private sector is prepared to make this investment in the Gold Coast area because of the privilege or right to provide room service and restaurant service.

The previous speaker referred to international-type hotels, which are something new to most of us. As I do not have a legal practice that enables me to travel overseas as frequently as the hon. member for South Brisbane is able to do, I do not have his great knowledge of this type of hotel.

I commend the Minister for his foresight in making provision in the Bill for an international-type hotel. I know that in my area, which is a tourist area, it would not be necessary to refer specifically to an international-type hotel, because local option polls are not required in tourist areas. In Brisbane, however, I understand that a local option poll would be necessary, and that requirement will be eliminated by the provision of an international-type licence.

Mr. Murray: Is there in Australia any international-type hotel such as you envisage?

Mr. HINZE: I cannot think of any. However, as Queensland is the leading State in the Australian tourist industry, I think it is only logical that the first international-type hotel should be built here.

Mr. Murray: What sort of facilities do you envisage it would provide, apart from what the hon. member for South Brisbane thinks?

Mr. HINZE: The hon. member for Clayfield will have ample time to put his case on an international-type hotel.

I want to make brief reference to the matter of airport licences. The Coolangatta airport has been taken over by the Gold Coast City Council, and rather elaborate plans are being made for that terminal. All who have been there lately know of the greatly increased traffic, particularly since the mayor has been undertaking so much promotional activity throughout Australia, and in New Zealand and Japan. Every week he is receiving people who are interested in bringing more people to the Gold Coast. Plans are in hand for developing the airport, and the granting of an airport licence will no

doubt provide some funds to be ploughed back into the coffers of the local authority. I think everyone agrees that local authorities need every cent they can get.

Mr. Casey: Only because they own the airport—not local authorities generally.

Mr. HINZE: If the council owns the terminal, it will have a right to the licence.

Mr. Casey: But it is no use talking about anything going to local authorities generally.

Mr. HINZE: The return will flow back to the local authority that has the right to conduct the airport. It must get something from the bar trading.

The Minister referred to the social injustice imposed by the 40-mile limit. Although there are many major items in the Bill and others that are perhaps not so important, the one concerning the 40-mile limit seems to be the subject of most argument. The Minister referred to the fact that people living in Brisbane have not been able to drink on Sundays, whilst those living beyond the limit of 40 miles have been able to do so. All in this House, except perhaps those representing metropolitan electorates, know that people living beyond the 40-mile limit have for some time had the right to drink on Sundays during certain hours.

Mr. Dean: That's why you have the problem of under-age drinking down there.

Mr. HINZE: The hon. member for Sandgate will have the right to say his little piece later, and, when the voting takes place, we will all be watching what he does.

What I have always found hard to understand is the way we say to people in Brisbane, "You cannot drink in Brisbane, but you can go out onto the highway to the Gold Coast or to Ipswich, drive 40 miles, and then you can have a drink. Then you can get back onto the highway and return home."

The provision in the Bill is a good one, in my opinion, because it will assist to overcome problems arising when people want a drink so badly that they drive 40 miles from Brisbane, drink, and then go onto a very congested road, with the highest traffic density in Queensland, and try to drive back to the city.

As I have indicated publicly and on the floor of the House at the introductory stage and again today, I do not see any need for the argument that has arisen relative to the 40-mile limit. The people of Brisbane should receive the same treatment as those living in my electorate and in electorates represented by most other members of this Assembly.

Sunday trading has been taking place in bowling clubs and golf clubs. If that is not an example of sectional legislation, I do not know what is. A member of a club can get a drink; a person who is not a member of a club cannot get a drink. I

cannot see any reason why legislation of that type should be allowed to remain in force any longer.

I appreciate, also, the attitude of the churches. I understand that it is their duty to place their attitude before Parliament and before the people of Queensland, and I have no objection to their doing so. However, as I have said before—I have confirmed it again today—I cannot see any reason for holding a referendum.

The Minister referred to allowing 15 minutes' grace after closing time at hotels. That is desirable.

I now wish to speak briefly about cabaret licences. I suppose that the South Coast electorate, which I represent, provides more opportunities for the establishment of cabarets than any other electorate in this State. I wish to refer particularly to a cabaret known as "The Playroom," conducted by Claude Carnell and his wife, Beryl. As far as I am aware, they have not done one thing wrong in all the years that they have been trading and providing a service for the thousands of people who look for entertainment of that type on the Gold Coast. The Bill provides for 3 a.m. closing, provided a meal is served after midnight. Again, that is progressive thinking. As long as Mr. Carnell, and others on the Gold Coast, can provide entertainment with a meal, at the right price, they are entitled to stay open till 3 a.m. People on holidays do not get up till 9, 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning, and possibly they do not go out till 9 or 10 o'clock at night. They do not want to be put to bed at an early hour.

The proposal to provide for cabaret licences is designed to overcome some of the problems that have arisen in the past. When I was speaking in the debate at the introductory stage, the Leader of the Opposition challenged me when I referred to the "clip joints" in Cavill Avenue. Strangely enough, when I arrived home I received a note from one of my constituents saying that she wanted to see me as soon as possible. What did she want to see me about? Right next door to her property was one of the places that I have described as "clip joints". She said, "Is there any way we can have it closed?" I made representations to the city council and to the inspector of police and the place was closed. The city council indicated that it was a fire hazard and should not have been allowed to operate as a cabaret. If people are given the right to have a drink in a cabaret, I believe that they are entitled to first-class entertainment and food. In my opinion, the proposed provision is very desirable.

The Minister referred also to flexibility of trading hours. Take the case of men working at the Brisbane Markets at Rocklea, or at the fish market. They finish work at 8 a.m. or 9 a.m. If they are to have the opportunity to have a drink, the hotel trading

hours in those areas must be different from those that are suitable for other sections of industry. Again that is progressive thinking, and I have not heard any member of the Opposition speaking against the proposal. They know it is desirable. This is one of the many provisions about which we have not heard anything today.

The Minister referred also to bowling clubs. I have more bowling clubs in my electorate than any other member has. There are 12 clubs in the electorate and they all do a wonderful job for the tourist industry. The winter bowling carnival that is held every year attracts some 1,400 bowlers from all over Australia. Many of them have settled on the Gold Coast.

This is the type of thing we need in this State. We want people to believe that this is the best State in Australia in which to settle. These people come from many bowling clubs and the Minister has made provision so that, if they want late nights, they will have a chance of getting them. He has increased the number of evening permits for bowling clubs from 12 to 26 a year. I was experiencing some difficulty in this regard, because bowling clubs like to conduct evening functions and some of them were running out of permits.

I cannot say that anything in my electorate is better run than the bowling clubs. I have never seen trouble at them and the people who constitute them are in age groups that are entitled to this provision. It will allow them to conduct functions to raise money for the upkeep of their greens or to improve the amenities for their members. They are entitled to do this, and the Minister has made provision for it.

I am greatly concerned about the Advancetown Hotel. The Minister referred to the right to remove licences. This little hotel has been conducted by Margaret Bruce and Yvonne McLean for many years. They have built what they call the "Pioneer House". Hundreds of thousands of visitors go to Advancetown through Numinbah Valley each year and they see this little old pioneer house, which is a great credit to my electorate. I am very proud of the people who conduct it and attract so many thousands of people, but the site is now to be submerged by the Advancetown dam. I want to be assured that the people who own the Advancetown Hotel will be given the right to transfer the licence to a site which they believe will be attractive enough for them to replace their pioneer house on it. I do not want tenders to be called and some high tenderer to put these people out of business. I want to protect the owners of this hotel because of the wonderful job they have done.

If tenders were called for a site adjacent to a newly constructed Gold Coast dam, one can imagine the type of tenderer it would attract. The proprietors to whom I have

just referred possibly may not be in a position to counter the tenders that one might expect to be received for such an area.

I should like the Minister to give me an assurance that the rights of these constituents of mine are protected. The Gold Coast City Council, in conjunction with the Albert Shire Council will shortly be resuming their land. I understand that a dam will be built in the area within the next two or three years, and it will be necessary for the people who own this hotel to look for another site.

The Minister referred to grants for educational purposes and for the Road Safety Council.

Mr. Dean: That is a laugh.

Mr. HINZE: The hon. member for Sandgate says, "That is a laugh." He might regard it as a palliative or something like that. I am sure that is what he is thinking, but I regard it as a genuine move by the Minister, who recognises the problem of alcoholism. I am sure that every responsible member of this House does, too, and although I suppose we could be charged with making liquor available in greater quantities, I think the Government must be commended for being prepared to allocate certain funds for these purposes. I should like to see the allocations doubled or trebled. As I said previously, it is highly desirable that we attack and counter-attack the great problem of alcoholism.

Mr. Dean: It is necessary.

Mr. HINZE: Of course it is necessary. Some people are not prepared to take food with their liquor, and they reach the stage where they cannot control themselves. It is the responsibility of Government to see what can be done for such people. I commend the Government for making these funds available, but I want to see increased amounts made available for that purpose.

The Bill contains a proposal to allow women to drink in public bars. I suppose the price factor is involved. Previously women were forced to buy drinks in saloon bars or lounges, where they had to pay more than males paid in public bars. I have always regarded the public bar as the domain of the male. I agree with the hon. member for Kedron that the public bar was the place for men to go on their way home from work to have a few drinks, and that possibly it was not a place for women. However, perhaps those old ideas are disappearing and the introduction of mixed drinking will lift the standard and atmosphere of the public bar.

The hon. member for Merthyr has just said that he has seen that type of bar in Sydney and that the standard has been lifted. I am prepared to believe that this will happen in Brisbane. Mixed drinking has been allowed in other bars, and it is desirable that a man should be allowed to take his wife to a bar for a few drinks.

The Bill will enable him to do so in a public bar. Perhaps I am old fashioned, but in time I may change my views.

I am interested particularly in the installation of coin-operated billiard tables in public bars. I want to make sure that the Bill contains a provision to allow that, and perhaps I will have to move an amendment to ensure it, as mini pool tables are manufactured in my electorate. Frankly, I cannot see anything wrong with playing mini billiards in public bars. Quoits and darts are played in them now. I do not think the hon. member for Port Curtis will mind my saying that he has purchased a small pool table.

Mr. Hanson: For my home.

Mr. HINZE: He is very happy with it.

Mr. Hanson: It is not coin-operated, either.

Mr. HINZE: I thought he might have charged his kids to play. I can see that the implementation of these proposals will create additional duties for the Licensing Commission. It is obvious that the varying types of licence will throw more work on the Commission's shoulders, so its status will have to be lifted. In the very near future it may be necessary for the Government to give further consideration to the constitution of the Commission. Its members work under shocking conditions, and the Commission needs an uplift in the atmosphere that surrounds it.

In addition, the Bill will create additional duties for members of the Police Force. If motels are licensed they must come under strict police supervision, as hotels do. The extra work involved will be realised; Therefore, I hope that the Government will make provision for more police. Some time ago hon. members were told that the Government would make funds available to appoint additional police officers. It is necessary to do so.

In conclusion, I commend the Minister on his introduction of the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (5.20 p.m.): As the Bill has been in hon. members' hands for a reasonable time, they should have been able to study it and consider all its aspects. They must now know that it contains many desirable and long-overdue amendments of the liquor laws. It should be remembered that those amendments have not been framed by any one member on this side; they have been framed by the Government, not by the Premier, who today expressed his personal views on Sunday trading. I respect his views, just as he respects my views and those of my colleagues. We on this side of the House are able to speak and vote as our conscience dictates.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: When it comes to the testing time, I wonder how many Opposition members will support or move amendments. The hon. member for Rockhampton South and other Opposition members have said that a referendum should be held. I wonder how many of those who have expressed opposition, such as the hon. members for Wynnum and Sandgate, and others (whose views I respect on certain matters), will be given an opportunity to express their views? Whilst they are men with certain ability, will they be given the opportunity to voice their views and vote as they wish? I dare to suggest that because of the platform of the A.L.P.—that is one reason, if there are no others—which contains a virtual big-brother attitude, they will be told, "You will wholeheartedly support without question, or else."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled that the canvassing of that particular type of debate is not in order. There are principles in the Bill that must be discussed at the second-reading stage. I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the principles in the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I will do so, Mr. Speaker. However, having been provoked by members of the Opposition I think I should point out that they have been adequately answered, and that they have to live with their consciences.

When discussing the 1961 amendments I said that they set the pattern for future legislation. In referring particularly to changes relative to licensed restaurants, I said that rather than adopt radical changes, the Government introduced those amendments. As Opposition members know, during its unbroken term of 25 years in office until 1957, Labour did not amend the Liquor Act once. In contrast with these proposed amendments, Labour tolerated swill shops and session drinking, and viewed all the iniquities that were practised and tolerated with a blind eye, patronage, or any other term that could be applied.

If ever the hon. member for Kedron paid a compliment to the Government and referred to his own party in a derogatory way he did so in his speech today wherein he praised the Government for present-day conditions in hotels brought about by its liquor legislation. A practical testing period has been allowed by permitting licensed restaurants to dispense alcoholic beverages. These restaurants were responsible for over-coming the wine-swilling shops, of which there were 18 at the time. We said that we would introduce drinking in restaurants and cultivate a mature, sophisticated and proper outlook, which of course is in line with what happens in other States. We do not force people to drink, but at least proper facilities should be available for them. They certainly are available in licensed restaurants, as distinct from the wine-swill shops that we inherited from the Labour regime.

A warning was given to those who provide a service, particularly breweries, which have monopolistic interests. The Bill indicates that we want them to provide a service. We said to the purveyors of liquor at that time, and subsequently, that a service and adequate and proper facilities must be provided. This cannot be done with the tied-house system under which brewery approved brands of wines and spirits are sold and those who desire to drink are told what to drink instead of being given a choice.

The Bill will overcome that very vexed situation by providing the community with a choice of brands. Having effectively achieved this, it is only a question of seeing that we adopt a tolerant attitude to community demand in the policing of many of these proposals.

Breweries and others can rightfully complain—and they do—that their monopolistic interests have been affected and weakened; so do many hotels which are becoming tied. Our view is different from that of the Opposition. The Liberal Party is anti-monopoly. That is Labour's platform, too, but we do not go to the socialistic extent of wanting to brew and dispense our own liquor.

The hon. member for Baroona mentioned the Homestead Hotel. I heard this on the grape-vine and I believe it to be true. Fewer hotels sell the brands and give the type of service that they want to than those that are tied and directed. The Bill will overcome this situation because many more licences of different types will be granted.

The Minister said that a tavern licence may be granted to a seller of liquor who does not provide accommodation, as long as he is prepared to serve snacks and meals. Many travellers have complained that they have been refused meals at hotels simply because hotel-keepers want to purvey their bottled and other goods and not provide meals and accommodation. This is one of the main reasons why motels came into vogue and became so quickly acceptable to the public.

Mr. Murray: Have you ever demanded a meal at a hotel and been refused?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, at the Capalaba Hotel and at other hotels. The present licensee was not the hotel-keeper at that time. Many hotels do not serve meals; the hotel-keeper only wants to serve liquor. The granting of tavern licences will ensure the provision of facilities that are not available at the moment.

The Minister said that accommodation need not be provided at hotels that are taverns, and that old-style hotels will not have to provide accommodation in future. I go along with this idea if it will upgrade the standard of some of the present hotels. But which hotels will still be obliged to provide accommodation? Can hotels be built with accommodation facilities if they are not taverns? I believe there should

be some grading of hotels which do not desire to be classified as taverns or simply purveyors of food and liquor.

It may well be that by regulation the Minister or the Licensing Commission will look at this question, because the tourist industry may tend to think, "We have motels and hotels. Hotels are those that provide accommodation, and we want to know what the classification of their accommodation is."

Because of the advent of the jumbo jet and the current economic situation, it is possible to foresee an influx of tourists to Australia, and particularly to Queensland. The Government is doing much to entice them. Tourism is an industry, and I believe that particular attention must be given to the type of accommodation provided, particularly by hotels, and to determining the number and type needed to meet the demand.

The Bill provides for the licensing of motels. But that does not mean, as was suggested by the hon. member for South Brisbane, that a licence will be granted to every place that puts up a shingle reading "Motel". There is, of course, nothing now in the Act about the licensing of motels, but when the Bill becomes part of the Act, the Licensing Commission, with the wisdom and discretion that it has, will enable every establishment declared to be a motel to apply for a licence. The Minister and the Commission no doubt have clearly in mind the type of motel that will be given a licence, and only a few of a sufficiently high standard will succeed. I know that the serving of guests in motel rooms will present policing problems. As the last speaker mentioned, this is a provision that will accentuate the problems of the Police Force.

The removal of the restriction on the number of licensed restaurants has brought about an awareness and an acceptance of the partaking of liquor with food in proper surroundings. When that provision was made, there were public outcries and a meeting in the City Hall. I attended that and other meetings, but since then licensed restaurants have proved themselves and become accepted by the public.

Continental-style cocktail bars and licensed restaurant will mean that greater policing of the Act will be required, particularly of under-age drinking in restaurants and motels. Clubs, the number of hours of trading in clubs, the permitted number of members, are dealt with in the legislation, and the provisions concerning them have been widened. Reception rooms will be entitled to receive special licences to enable them to cater for weddings and similar occasions. Such functions bring within the walls of premises where liquor is being consumed people who are under age.

Booth licences, which apply particularly in country areas but can also apply in the city, are also covered in the legislation. Live-theatre licences are completely new. All

these provide more competition, which is very good, and greater facilities, and also an increased number of liquor outlets. Again the problem of under-age drinking will be accentuated, and again I charge the police with not properly policing the Act.

Mr. Bromley: You broke that down on television the other night.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not say here what I am not prepared to say outside; I do not shelter behind the privilege of Parliament. I believe in my own convictions. I say again, as I said on television, that in my view the police are not effectively policing the Act, and doing so will become infinitely harder when there are a greater number of liquor outlets. If the hon. member for Norman had any awareness of what is happening around him, he would surely subscribe to my view that anyone can walk down Queen Street almost any night and go into almost any bar and see under-age drinking. It must be remembered that under-age persons do not have to drink for a breach to be committed; it is sufficient for them to be in certain sections of licensed premises.

Mr. Bromley: I don't go into bars in town.

Mr. HUGHES: Then the hon. member must drink at some other place.

My personal observation indicates that there is a tremendous amount of under-age drinking both in the city and in the suburbs. I have been reliably informed, and I know also from my personal knowledge, that trading outside legal hours and sly-grogging does go on in the city. If there is to be a law to control liquor trading, let it be policed and respected. I am not opposed to the provisions of the Bill that widen the sale of liquor and increase the number of outlets where public convenience is provided, but I stress that they should be properly policed.

It is well known that minors can obtain liquor at hotels and be served at hotel bars. There is nothing new in that; it has been going on for years. I hark back to the early part of 1966, when the metropolitan Press conducted a campaign against under-age drinking. At that time stories appeared in the Press about 15 and 16-year-olds drinking on licensed premises and obtaining bottled supplies. That has happened in the past; it still is happening. It is happening to such an extent that, in my view, the police are either inefficient or incapable, or are not policing the Act properly. If that is so, something should be done about it in the Bill now before the House or through the regulations that will be issued when it becomes law. People must respect the Act, and I think that the Minister can, under section 14A, make it possible by regulation for the Act to be policed through the Licensing Commission.

I know that the police have a difficult job and I am not laying the whole of the blame at their door. I know of cases in which they have taken home minors, particularly young girls, or sent them home and informed the parents. Recently an hon. member mentioned a case in which a policeman took home a young girl who he thought was in a situation in which she could get into trouble. He was then abused by the girl's parents.

Perhaps the law could be amended to allow greater questioning of under-age drinkers than is possible at the moment. Police are now permitted to ask only for a person's name and address. I believe that they should be entitled to ask at least for his or her age. Police would be fortified if they could ask for name, age and address.

I believe, too, that many parents would be jolted into realising the need to discipline their children or to be aware of their whereabouts if more prosecutions were brought by the police and parents were forced to attend the Wilson Youth Hospital and other places at which courts are held. Perhaps it would be better for a young person to be brought before the court and helped by parents and charitable and church organisations at an early stage instead of being allowed to slide downhill to degradation, from which they may not rise, or to alcoholism, of which there is too much in the community today. Parents should be made aware of the need to police the activities of their children.

In Hawaii and other States of the U.S.A., publicans can lose their licence for breaches relating to under-age drinking, and that is one reason why they employ their own doorkeepers. I have here the report of the Liquor Commission in Hawaii, which I have studied, and it states that the identification card that must be carried by all Americans should have on it a photo of the person possessing it. In addition, it states that there should be a photo of the licensee on the driver's licence and identity card, so that the publican can identify without doubt the customer he challenges.

Mr. Murray: Each citizen carries an identification card?

Mr. HUGHES: That is so. If a person wishes to have a drink, he cannot get it unless he produces his identification card if he is challenged regarding age. The publican is too scared of losing his livelihood to breach the Act for one of two juveniles who might come along. There are cases where a licensee has lost his licence on one conviction.

Involved in the extension of facilities for drinking is the question of determining the age of young drinkers. I think the Minister and the Government are to be commended for providing in the Bill that those who serve liquor can demand of the intending purchaser that he or she sign a declaration form as to age. This, to a great extent,

will remove the obligation from the bar attendant or other employee, upon whom it should not always have been placed. The way young people dress today, how can anyone tell whether or not a person is 21? About the only thing one can be sure of is distinguishing boys from girls because girls have short hair. Apart from that, how can one be sure in determining age?

In view of today's trends, I think the age for legal drinking should be kept at 21 years. The hon. member for South Brisbane said, "Let 18-year-olds drink." This is typical of the Labour Party and its policy, which advocates open house for 24 hours a day. In addition, it would prefer to brew and dispense liquor as well.

I believe that 21 is a reasonable age at which people should be allowed to drink, and retaining the legal age at 21 gives some reasonable opportunity of determining the distinction between 21-years-olds and 15 and 16-year-olds. It makes more possible the detection of 16-year-olds and probably 17-year-olds. If the age is reduced, we are opening the door to a set of immature young people who are not equipped physically, and probably mentally, to cope with the problems that might arise as a result of using alcoholic beverages.

The hard road of experience teaches one these things. We had a dissertation on this from the hon. member for Rockhampton South, and I respect him for the things he had to say. He said that when he was 15 and 16 he used to drink in, I think, the Rocklea Hotel—it was some hotel on the south side. "Hansard" will show it. To his credit, he has been able to overcome what was then an anti-social and unlawful pastime. He has helped himself, and I admire him for it. This is something he said. It is in "Hansard" and I am not breaching any confidence.

It is a fact that we do have a problem with mid-teen drinking. The problem is a social one embracing identification, immaturity and, of course, the driving of vehicles on the road.

In America and other places an absolute prohibition is placed on minors drinking or even possessing liquor. There are also certain requirements relative to identification. I will not go into lengthy detail on that, but under this Bill live music will be allowed in hotels. This will act almost as a honey-pot does for flies. One of the things that have attracted mid-teen people to hotels is the fact that "go-go" and discotheque type of music is being presented by publicans. All this leads to the question of policing—the ability of drinkers to be their own disciplinarians and the ability of the police to enforce the law.

I believe that policing of the law has been inadequate, and in some instances almost non-existent. I should like to know how many under-age drinkers have been charged over the last few years, the number of men

in the Police Force involved in this type of work and the time they spend on it. I am not suggesting that, because a charge is not laid, worth-while advice and help have not been given to mid-teen persons found on licensed premises. Even if they are not actually partaking of liquor they are not supposed to be there. However, this does not excuse the section of the Police Force that, in my view, has not properly carried out the law. Sufficient evidence of this can be seen.

There will now be heavier penalties and the onus will be where it belongs—on those who sell and serve, and particularly on those who partake. This method of asking for an identification by the signing of a form amounts almost to a statutory declaration. The Minister might be able to advise the House on this, but the form that is to be signed, at the request of the server of the liquor, by a person whom he suspects of being under 21 appears to me to be almost a statutory declaration.

If the customer is not prepared to sign or show some other means of identification, that is tantamount to his admitting guilt and saying that he is under 21. But if he signs the name "Peter Delamothe", has he made a statutory declaration or does he come within the Oaths Act? Let us face it; that sort of thing will happen. In addition, some people might sign documents and keep them as spares.

Hon. members will remember when some people, to get a drink on Sundays, signed names like "Bob Menzies", "Frank Nicklin" and so on, so a similar sort of thing will occur with under-age drinkers. To what extent can the gap be plugged and penalties made to fit the deception that is perpetrated on the person behind the bar?

If one thing has been clearly demonstrated, it is that the police are either unwilling or unable to enforce the Act. The problems that arise will be accentuated, so I believe that the Licensing Commission should be clothed with authority by regulation. Under section 14A (vi) the Commission should be enabled to exercise such powers and authorities as may be prescribed. Regulations should prescribe that, in addition to the inspectors employed by the Licensing Commission for the purpose of ensuring that health and hygiene regulations are observed and others associated with requisitions imposed upon hotels for painting, and so on, extra inspectors should be appointed to police the provisions of the Liquor Act. I do not suggest that this responsibility be removed from the Police Force, but that teeth be put into the Act so that its provisions can be carried out.

By adding to the number of inspectors employed by the Commission it will be able to report to Parliament, "We have done this. These are the anomalies, and these are the prosecutions." I know that in remote country areas of the State the Act cannot always

be enforced, and for that reason the Police Force must retain power to do so. As police officers ensure that the provisions of other Acts are carried out, they could be called upon to enforce the provisions of this Act, and their numbers would be supplemented by additional licensing inspectors clothed with the necessary powers to enforce the Act.

Until the present Government came into power the Act had not been amended for 25 years. Society and its needs changed, and although we are not our brother's keeper, we must provide facilities to meet the needs of the majority of people in the community. A good deal has been said about needs.

At the introductory stage I referred to the interpretation of the Premier's policy speech. I believe that many people feel that the Government has either committed a breach of faith or repudiated its policy by introducing these amendments to the Act, particularly those relative to drinking within 40 miles of the Brisbane G.P.O.

I reiterate my opposition to sectional legislation and my support for the amendments. I believe that there should not be one law for some people and another law for others. I am also cognisant of the desires and wishes of the people. We are here to legislate for the common good at the will of the majority of the people. It is very likely, if a referendum was held, that people of the city—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member knows my ruling about discussing a referendum. There is no provision in the Bill for a referendum.

Mr. HUGHES: I can probably deal with that matter later. I have foreshadowed that I will be moving an amendment relative to holding a referendum when we are dealing with clause 37. I will discuss that matter further with the Clerk. If it is out of order, I can only lodge a protest. I accept your ruling on it, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier is placed in an invidious personal position as leader of the Government. He has his views which he has expressed, and which I respect. He believes that there should not be Sunday trading but, although he is the leader of the Government he is only one person. Because this is a democratic Government in its workings, and in the parties that constitute it, votes have been taken on these matters. If the Premier is out-voted, he can do as his conscience dictates. No-one abrogates the right of members on this side to do that. At this stage he has said, "These are my views. However, I am leader of the Government and I am bound to introduce what the Government wishes." The Government comprises members of the Liberal and Country Parties.

If the wishes of the majority of the people were a deciding factor on this question, I believe that the Gallup polls that have already been taken would give a fair indication to the Government because 10 per cent. of the people in various areas have been approached on a house-to-house basis. That is a fair sampling of public opinion, and up to 76 per cent. have said that they would not have Sunday trading.

If the Government could be charged with anything, it is with being dilatory in introducing these amendments. We have witnessed a political seesaw—sometimes yes and sometimes no—in bringing it forward. I believe that a Government is elected to govern. We should have been precise, positive, and purposeful. We should have said 2½ years ago, "We will deal with the liquor legislation. This is what we think should be the amendments." We could then have called for suggestions and opinions and given them the necessary consideration. We could have publicised our views and said, "It is the Government's intention at such-and-such a time to introduce amendments on these lines." What we are doing today we should have done 2½ years ago. I have been a proponent of that step. One of our problems is that, as the Government, we have manoeuvred ourselves into an invidious situation where many people hold opinions at variance with those of the Government as to intention.

While many of the amendments are overdue, they will provide worth-while facilities for those who desire them. Option polls are now to be taken within three miles of a selected site. We will now know where the site is and polls will not be held in the dark as was the case with the Sunnybank Hotel, where people who resided on the same side of the street as the proposed hotel could not vote on the issue because no-one really knew where the hotel was to be built. There have been many instances of polls being taken in which, unfortunately, many people who have been affected—

Mr. O'Donnell: Nobody minds your using the expression "option poll".

Mr. HUGHES: It is in the Bill. I can use that term because it is included in the measure we are discussing. Surely the hon. member does not want me to go right through the Bill to show it to him. I am not outside the ambit of the measure in discussing it.

This matter is now defined so that it will be workable and worth while. It will be helpful to all those associated with an application to establish a hotel on a certain site. The specific site is to be decided by the Licensing Commission and a poll taken within a 3-mile radius of it. That being the case, I believe we now have something worth while.

Many aspects of the proposed measure improve the principal Act, although some of them are debatable in the minds of people

both inside and outside the House. I support the Bill and, in the Committee stage, hope to present my views on the need for a referendum.

Mr. R. E. MOORE (Windsor) (5.55 p.m.): I commend the Minister on the introduction of this Bill. He is the buffer against those who are offended by this type of legislation; he is the chopping block. Irrespective of his personal views, he must advance the arguments of the Government. I am critical of some of my colleagues for not sticking to the party line and accepting the majority decision on this matter. If we are to govern we must be a team, and I sometimes have fears in that regard.

Mr. Hughes: Surely you do not advocate that we should not speak as our consciences dictate

Mr. R. E. MOORE: Your conscience and frame of mind will be the same in three or six months' time.

Is it conscience, or is it a matter of opinion? If it can be lived with, then it is opinion; if not, and it is really conscience, then one has to be prepared to go all the way. I wonder how much conscience really comes into this. However, I would prefer the interjections to come from the Opposition, not from my colleagues.

The Bill contains many good proposals, such as the consumption of liquor with food. It is well known that, without food, more alcohol is absorbed into the system. Food acts like blotting paper and slows down the absorption of alcohol by the bloodstream and its effects on the brain. A drinker does not get as intoxicated if he eats while drinking. Any person who has gone without breakfast and lunch knows the effect that three or four beers have on him, whereas if he had his meals they would have little or no effect.

Mr. O'Donnell: We will take your word for that.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: It is very true. I have been caught in that situation.

Previously, the Act had its shortcomings. It paid no regard to the quality of restaurants and restricted the number of restaurant licences. Under the Bill, there is no restriction on the number of restaurant licences.

The Bill also allows an extra hour for the consumption of liquor in restaurants in a more civilised way so that people will not have to throw their liquor down and not enjoy it. Again, the absorption rate will be lowered in this way. That is another proposal on the credit side; it is one of the pluses.

From information that I have received there are in Australia no motels of the international standard we hope to see in Brisbane.

Mr. O'Donnell: I don't believe that.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: That is what I have been told.

Mr. R. Jones: Lennons was good enough for the President of the United States.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: It might have been.

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

Mr. R. E. MOORE: Before the dinner recess, I was referring to international-type hotels. My understanding is that no hotel of the international type envisaged for Queensland has yet been built in Australia. In such a hotel, people of all nationalities are able to obtain the type of food to which they are accustomed. There is no public bar open to the street, and no doubt prices are high. In fact, there may be criticism of the fact that the prices charged in such a hotel will keep the lower-paid workers out. Whether that will be regarded as a matter of regret, I do not know, but that is the type of hotel envisaged.

Mr. Hanlon: It does not say so in the Bill.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I have had some discussion with other people on this subject, and I am giving the hon. member some information.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: Are you making this speech or am I?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will please address the Chair.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: I am speaking about the good features of the legislation.

The next thing to which I wish to refer is the provision for theatre licences. I can see no applicants for such licences, but provision will be made for granting them to suitable theatres. I think I heard someone suggest the SGIO Theatre. I do not know whether it is the intention to apply for such a licence at that theatre. However, provision is being made for theatre licences, and the Minister is to be commended for that.

I refer next to cabaret licences, and the sale of liquor from 7 p.m. to 3 a.m. There are people who go to bed at 8 or 9 o'clock, and to them 3 a.m. seems to be out of all reason because they do not keep such hours. They think that the only people out of bed then are milkmen. However, people on holidays, especially in our climate, can sleep in the morning and the heat of the day, and, when the sun has gone down and it gets cooler, they begin to wake up and they may decide to go to a cabaret. There they sit, quietly enjoying themselves. Liquor is available, and they sip a few drinks and enjoy the show without getting intoxicated. At about 3 a.m., they go home. It is provided that they must have a meal after midnight. This provision, which combines drinking with eating, is a sensible one.

The legislation also refers to playing billiards. There was a time when ability as a billiards player was a sign of a mispent youth. Billiards is, however, an innocent game, and a game of great skill.

Mr. Baldwin: Do you play it?

Mr. R. E. MOORE: If I could only learn which end of the cue to hold, I might be able to play billiards. It is a good game, and it is not a gambling game. (Opposition laughter.) It is not a gambling game. Of course, a person who wishes to gamble will gamble on two flies crawling up the wall, if he is that type of person. I am sure that there are no persons of that type on this side of the House. The present restriction is quite unnecessary, and it is being lifted.

Turning to permits for the various national days of foreign people, I point out to hon. members that such a national day could fall on a Sunday. Up till now, there has been no chance of their getting a liquor permit and any celebrations have had to be dry. Some people may say that is all right. But if one person is allowed to have a drink on his national day, there should not be any discrimination against other migrants who come to this country and who still have a strong feeling for their own country. They may be Australian citizens, but nationality dies hard. They do not like to sever completely their ties with the country of their birth and they like to celebrate its national day.

Mr. Davies: They are still Australian citizens, I take it?

Mr. R. E. MOORE: Of course.

Mr. Davies: You implied that they were not.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: The hon. member can put his own interpretation on it. He can read "Hansard" and see what I did say.

The granting of booth licences for five hours could be particularly useful when rodeos are held in country towns. People living out of town come to the centre in which the rodeo is held. If drink can be purchased at the hotel but not at the showgrounds in which the rodeo is held, people will leave the showgrounds and head for the hotel. The provision in the Bill will enable them to obtain liquor at the rodeo and help to make it a paying proposition. Their wives will know where they are, they will be with their families, and they will be able to have a quiet drink without leaving the showgrounds.

I do not intend to deal with the Bill in depth, but I wish to state that I believe that the extension of trading hours at clubs and hotels will be of great advantage. I know of many clubs and hotels that were breaking the law, and it would have taken an army of police to supervise all of them. The breaches were more or less innocent, but the law was still being broken. When one finds that many decent people are breaking

the law, it indicates that there is need for change. The need for change has been recognised by the Minister and other Government members who have their ears to the ground, and the hours have been increased. A similar state of affairs existed before the introduction of the T.A.B. The Government could not control S.P. book-makers because their operations were of the hole-in-the-cupboard-door type, and the T.A.B. was set up to counteract them.

Let me turn now to the attitude of the Liberal Party to Sunday trading. Several decisions relative to liquor have been made at Liberal Party conventions, and motions have been passed recommending that amendments be made to the liquor legislation. Dr. Wylie Gibbs and Mrs. Margaret Gordon submitted a report on liquor at one convention, and, at the Liberal Party convention held in 1969, I think the vote was about 180 to six in favour of abolishing the sectional legislation providing for the 40-mile limit. That indicates clearly the attitude of the Liberal Party.

I received quite a few telegrams and letters relative to Sunday trading. These people are opposed to drinking on the Sabbath and I respect them for giving me their point of view, which I presented to the party, as every other member did. We knew the situation. We knew that some were for it and some against.

Hoteliers who wanted change have approached me, not so much on Sunday trading. Cafe proprietors have made requests on the matter. Reception lounges have made representations for dual licences to run cabarets in conjunction with the lounges. People from clubs have come to me wanting changes. With that kind of pressure, no matter what I do about this legislation I will please only half the people.

Some of the letters I received about Sunday trading were from country people who did not know that the hotels in their areas had Sunday trading.

Mr. Jensen: That is because they go to church.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: That is so—they do go to church—but the effect of Sunday trading was so minimal that they did not even know it existed. I have great sympathy for people opposing this measure, but I really believe that their fears are unfounded. Some of them feel that it will be an "open slather" for hotels and drinking. When Sunday sport was introduced, some churches protested against it. They protested against the opening of picture theatres on Sundays, but not every picture theatre opened because it was not economical to do so. Not all the hotels will open either; it will only be an odd one here and there. It will not be economical for some of them to pay staff double time for four hours for only a small clientele.

One constituent who represents quite a number of people in my electorate asked me three questions about the economic effect, the social effect and the personal effect of Sunday trading.

The economic effect as I see it is that, for a start, the liquor industry would affect the hop-growers in Tasmania who would be making a living from it, the barley-growers on the Downs, and the freight that accrues from the transport of those commodities. There are sophisticated types of machines used in breweries, the brewery staffs, such as chemists, maintenance staff, and so on. All these classes are affected, leaving no doubt that the liquor industry is a large industry. The sugar industry is involved because of liquor's sugar content. The alcohol content results from the enzymes eating the sugar. That briefly covers the economic side.

On the social side, I suppose it could be said that for individuals partaking of liquor is a means of getting together. It is well known that many men in employment in difficult jobs, under tension all day, call into a hotel or club on their way home and have a couple of drinks. In effect, this is a means of letting off steam; they do not take their work home with them. It is a form of tranquilliser. It is well known that alcohol in moderation is one of the best tranquillisers known to medical science. It has fewer side effects than any other tranquilliser.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members on my left will give the hon. member for Windsor an opportunity to make his speech without further interruption. I know that we have heard a good deal of tedious repetition today, but at least the hon. member for Windsor is introducing something new into the debate.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: Alcohol has three effects. When taken in moderation it is a tranquilliser; taken in excess it becomes a stimulant; and, finally, taken in very great quantities it becomes a depressant. In moderation it is a tranquilliser and does no harm. Australia has become a nation of pill-takers, and there would be very few females in Brisbane who do not take some form of sedative at some time or other.

An Opposition Member: You are stretching the long bow.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: If I am, I will be judged on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Windsor is certainly introducing something new now, but it is not relevant to the debate.

Mr. R. E. MOORE: It is relevant to alcohol that if people were not taking alcohol they would be taking some other form of sedative. However, I have made my point.

Finally, if there was no alcohol, I would not care; as there is alcohol, on occasions I have had a couple of beers and I may not have any more for a couple of years. I can take it or leave it.

Mr. WHARTON (Burnett) (7.33 p.m.): I appreciate the remarks of my colleague the hon. member for Windsor. I will not be able to make a contribution like his; he introduced a good deal of hilarity, and that is needed in this House where we hear so much tedious and dismal repetition. Perhaps I engage in it, too.

The Bill contains many improvements that will reduce the effects of alcohol. I have received a great number of telegrams from personal friends, acquaintances and organisations, and most of the points they have raised relate to Sunday drinking. I respect their views, and also those of the churches. No matter where we go in the community we see the great influence that the church has on the moral well-being of the community. I feel sure that the churches consider the good of the community, and that is why they have taken such an active part in this matter. I commend the churches for the action they have taken, because no organisation or group of people would know more than the churches about the social problems caused by excessive drinking.

The Government has not overlooked the views put forward by the churches; it has always tried to respect the wishes of the people. I know that Mr. Speaker will not let me speak about a referendum, and no point would be served by raising the matter in this Chamber as the majority of members are opposed to a referendum.

Under this measure we are eliminating the 40-mile limit as it affects Brisbane. Sunday drinking was introduced to the other parts of the State in 1961, and surely that is when a referendum or a poll should have been held.

Mr. Davies: Why didn't you have one?

Mr. WHARTON: A referendum was not sought at that time, as the hon. member knows.

Mr. Houston interjected.

Mr. WHARTON: There was no question of it at that time.

Sunday drinking seems to have worked quite well in the country areas over the years during which it has been in operation.

I well appreciate the churches' problems and their concern. They are close to the people, but the majority of people consume liquor. In some way we can make them less susceptible to the effects, problems, and curse of alcohol, we should do so. I believe that this legislation, which provides for liquor to be consumed with meals, alleviates the problems confronting the churches.

Many of the letters I have received have expressed opposition to and concern about drinking generally. The problem of Sunday drinking has not concerned people vitally. I respect the views expressed to me but, on the other hand, I believe that by this legislation we have extended facilities that will alleviate the problem.

I point out that the great majority of drinkers conduct themselves quite well whether they have a few drinks or drink somewhat heavily. Very rarely has there been a great deal of drunkenness in Queensland during the last few years. I am sure everyone agrees that people generally have learnt to live with alcohol and to consume it without getting into trouble. There will always be some people who go off the rails, but this legislation will not increase that number. Rather it will reduce it.

An Opposition Member: We will all go to bed early.

Mr. WHARTON: The hon. member could go to bed early for once.

Clubs are to get extended permits so that they may cater for wedding parties and so on. This provision has been sought by quite a few people. This is our way of living, and I am sure most hon. members will agree that people do not get into trouble in this way.

Generally speaking, I respect those who drink in that we do not see as much drunkenness now as we did in the past when perhaps a licentious section of the community drank heavily. In a way, drink has become part and parcel of life, but it does not seem to be causing problems as it did in the past. I hope that this legislation, which provides for meals to be taken with drink, will in some way lessen the effects of alcohol and reduce the road toll, which concerns us all. I believe that rather than aggravate the problem, it will alleviate it.

I must refer to the matter of women drinking in hotel bars. In doing so, I reiterate the opinion of many people when I say that this will be the last straw. While I respect the right of women to have a drink in a public bar, surely I echo the sentiments of many people when I say that this is not a popular provision of the Bill. I well appreciate that women will be able to buy liquor a little cheaper in a public bar, but not many women will want to enter public bars. Surely they will frequent the bars provided for them, with special amenities. We have already provided these facilities and I do think it is unnecessary to make provision for women to enter public bars.

Since 1961, people in the country have been able to drink on Sunday between certain hours. The removal of the 40-mile limit will give the same right to people in Brisbane. Hotels are not compelled to open on Sundays, and I do not think many hotels in the city will open.

If it is good enough to open the bars, surely it is good enough to allow people to buy bottled beer to take home. Many country people go to church first and then take a bottle of beer or two home for the family. This is civilised drinking, and we should encourage rather than discourage it. If people want to drink at home, they should have the right to do so.

I respect the strong views of those who oppose this legislation. However, I feel that we have tried to give expression to their opinions and that, in the long run, these proposals will encourage more civilised drinking. If there is to be drinking, it should be civilised. If it does not work out that way, we should again amend the legislation.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (7.42 p.m.), in reply: I almost said that the debate ranged far and wide, but in fact it was restricted to a very narrow field. As you pointed out, Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of tedious repetition, particularly of what was said during the introductory debate in an attempt to continually "rubbish" the Premier, to attack his credibility, to assassinate his character and to smear him in every possible way. I think we all admired the way in which he stood up to this and answered his accusers adequately. It does not need me to add to his very capable handling of this situation.

I should like to reply to some of the comments of the hon. member for Baroona, who was the major speaker for the Opposition. He suggested the necessity for a complete review of the Act. He made some sort of complaint that this Bill, comprehensive and all as it is, did not make such a review. I agree with him entirely that the Act needs reprinting to dovetail all matters. However, the review that it has been given and the further review that it will get during the Committee stage preclude the necessity for urgent consideration in that regard.

The hon. member referred to price control. This is a hardy annual. The Government does not believe in price control, and the Opposition does. We have discussed it and debated it so many times that I do not think anything is to be gained by again going over all the old ground.

Mr. Hanlon: It is covered in the Liquor Act to a limited degree but it has never been extended to the breweries, who are a factor in pricing.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The Licensing Commission, on complaint, has the right to investigate charges in public bars. I do not think that the Government would ever go beyond that, because the people who are affluent enough to visit other bars can be considered quite able to look after their own affairs.

The hon. member referred to the closing of bar doors and windows on Sundays and the sale of liquor in bottles. I thought I

might have inadvertently included that in the Bill. However, I have since had a look at the Bill and can find no sign of it.

He also chided me for my statement that the extension of Sunday drinking to Brisbane was a rectification of a social injustice. He pointed out that this Government had inflicted that social injustice. Of course, my reply is that the Opposition, when it was in government, inflicted that injustice not on Brisbane alone but on the whole of the State. The Government is at last completely rectifying the situation.

The Leader of the Opposition admitted the accuracy of the report of the Labour-in-Politics Convention at Southport, and in doing so admitted that the liquor policy of the Opposition is really nationalisation of the liquor trade.

Mr. Houston: That's rubbish, and you know it.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: He also spoke about the gerrymandering of electorates. One of these days some amendments to the Electoral Act will be brought down, and I shall then take the opportunity of showing in detail the gerrymandering perpetrated by the last Labour Government.

I have the Leader of the Opposition reported as saying that no-one is barred from the A.L.P.; anyone who wants to join can do so. Yet the other night the hon. member for Salisbury said that only socialists can join the A.L.P.

Mr. Houston: Rubbish!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I think those statements tie together.

The hon. member for Toowong expressed his continuing opposition to Sunday bar trading—he has never varied from that stand—but he gave general approval to the rest of the Bill. He also raised the question of the churches' attitude. I do not think that anyone can say that any member of the Government has in the slightest way criticised the churches' attitude. They have a right to their opinion, just as I have a right to mine, and they also have a right to express it.

Mr. Houston: And move amendments if they want to?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: They have a right to express their opinion, just as I have a right to express mine; but that does not necessarily mean that their point of view is right or capable of adoption.

The hon. member for Kedron rightly said that through the years it was pressure groups that had kept the liquor laws in an archaic condition, and I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who admitted that there were bad conditions in the liquor trade between 1957 and 1961.

I was rather appalled that one or two members were highly critical of the breaking of the law that they allege has been taking place, and, they say, the failure of the police to enforce the liquor laws. I remind all hon. members on both sides that they took an oath of office, very much the same as the oath of office taken by police officers, to uphold the law, and if any member knows of his own knowledge that breaches of the law are taking place, he should take some action and not come here whingeing and shedding crocodile tears about the police. Hon. members should do something about it themselves.

Mr. Marginson: The hon. member for Kurilpa was one of those.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I referred to members on both sides of the House.

The hon. members for Kedron and Barooka both raised the question of remote-area retail spirits merchants' licences. They are to be provided for those small, remote places 30, 40, 60 or even 90 miles from the nearest town with any form of licence. They are for little settlements, with say, half a dozen fettlers, perhaps 10 to a dozen farmers, and a store.

The hon. member for Barcoo would know of quite a few places along the central railway line in his electorate that will benefit by this provision; the hon. member for Flinders would know of a number of others in his electorate. The provision is included specifically and solely for the benefit of people living in remote areas. The Government believes that they are as much entitled to obtain liquid refreshment, if they wish to, as are people in Brisbane.

The hon. member for Roma was very pleased with the Bill generally because it contains many provisions that will be of benefit to the remote bush areas in his electorate. Many other similar areas in Queensland will benefit from them, too.

The hon. member for Chatsworth mentioned a point that no other hon. member mentioned. He drew the attention of the House to the fact that Sunday opening of hotels in Brisbane is permissive, not compulsory. Licensees have the option of opening or not opening as they see fit. He said that he, in common with other hon. members, had treated with respect all communications he had received and had conceded to all the people with divergent views who had written to him at least the right to hold those views.

The hon. member for South Brisbane was called to order several times, I think, for tedious repetition. The only point that he made related to snide drinking taking place for years in the city on Sundays. I wish he would present evidence when he makes accusations such as that, because during my term as Minister I have not had any complaints or made any observations of snide drinking on Sundays, and I am

around the city a good deal at week-ends. I do not know that other hon. members have seen it, either.

The hon. member for South Coast was one of two members who really spoke to the Bill. He dealt with various provisions in it, as also, at least for some time, did the hon. member for Windsor. These two hon. members stood out. In spite of all the complaints about insufficient information being given at the introductory stage, hon. members have had the Bill for a week and, apart from the hon. member for Baroona and the two Government members I mentioned, for all that the debate has covered points in the Bill, hon. members might just as well have not had it.

One point raised by the hon. member for Kurilpa is worth mentioning. He said that changing liquor laws are a matter of evolution. The provisions that are in the Bill could never have been introduced 40 years ago because hotels and society generally had not evolved to the stage where they could fit neatly into the new social environment.

I think that covers all the important points that were raised. I commend the Bill to House.

Motion (Dr. Delamothe) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Ramsden, Merthyr, in the chair)

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

Clause 5—Amendment of s. 7; Functions, etc., of Licensing Commission—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (7.56 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 2, line 30, after the word 'informed' insert the words—
'in writing'."

This is a fairly simple, machinery amendment. The purport of this clause is that a person inquiring of the Licensing Commission the date and time of any hearing to be held by the Commission in connection with the grant or removal of a licence shall be informed of such date and time, and the amendment basically seeks to ensure that the person in favour of the removal of a licence shall be heard.

We think that the amendment will tie the clause up if the information is given in writing. The hon. member for South Brisbane, during an examination of the Bill, pointed out that the normal procedure where notification has to be given is to have it sent by registered post so that there can be no argument about it. We do not think that would be acceptable here because it seems to exclude the situation when somebody comes to the counter and inquires, and is merely informed verbally.

Putting the information in writing would provide some evidence that the information was given and would possibly obviate a re-hearing on some technical point.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (7.57 p.m.): I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Hanlon) agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—New s. 8B; Power to order costs against unsuccessful applicants—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (7.58 p.m.): We are not opposed to this clause, which gives power to the Commission to order costs against an unsuccessful applicant where there are grounds for the Commission to believe that the application was frivolous or vexatious or an abuse of the processes of the Commission, or alternatively, against the objector if it takes the same view of the objection.

We had a look at this clause to ascertain whether it might tend to frighten off genuine objectors, who would be fearful that costs might be granted against them. We examined this, again with the advice of the hon. member for South Brisbane, who has practical experience of the legalities before the Licensing Commission, and he pointed out that when persons have a valid application before the Commission, invariably where a brewery or a spirit merchant is concerned an objection will be automatically entered in an endeavour to dissuade such a person from trying to secure a licence that he thinks he is entitled to under the Act. Very often these matters involve considerable hearings and procedures before the Commission. They are drawn out, perhaps unreasonably, by persons who have a vested interest in doing this but no real grounds for the action they are taking.

Whilst we would not like to think that the fear of costs being awarded against a genuine objector or applicant to the Commission would deter him, we feel that, on balance, this does prevent some misuse of the Act and we are satisfied to leave it to the discretion of the Commission, feeling sure that they would award costs only in appropriate cases.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 11, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—Amendments to s. 18; Annual fees—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (8 p.m.): Clause 12 relates to the licence fee to be paid for a tavern licence. This matter was referred to at the second-reading stage, and I do not need to go over it again. The Bill lays down a standard licence assessment of 6 per cent. per annum on the gross purchases under the various licences except the tavern licence, which has been left open. It is desirable that the Licensing Commission should be given some flexibility in assessing a tavern licence fee because it is possible, indeed it is probable, that in certain cases it considers that a licence fee higher than 6 per cent. should be charged on a tavern licence because a tavern would provide no

accommodation and would not have the responsibility of providing accommodation, and, therefore, would obtain a better return on its licence, so to speak, than a licensed victualler, who is required to provide accommodation to meet the public's need. However, we do not consider that the assessment should be left entirely to the discretion of the Licensing Commission, which could strike a fee of from .1 per cent. to 100 per cent. We think that a minimum should be prescribed. For that reason, I move—

"On page 6, line 42, after the word 'percentage' insert the words—

'not less than 6 per centum'."

If 6 per cent. is to be assessed as the rate on licences that have a comparatively small turnover, it does not seem proper that the rate should be less than 6 per cent. for a tavern licence. Unless the Minister can tell us that it will not go below 6 per cent. we do not feel justified in supporting the clause.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.3 p.m.): I am prepared to accept the amendment, as it clarifies the clause. A tavern licence is simply another form of licensed victualler's licence, and the rate would be assessed at 6 per cent. However, I am prepared, as a matter of clarity, to provide that it should not be less than 6 per cent. because I would imagine that it might be even higher.

Amendment (Mr. Hanlon) agreed to.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.4 p.m.): I move the following further amendment:—

"On page 7, after line 4, insert the following words:—

'(ii) inserting after the words "every registered brewer" where they secondly appear the words "or licensed spirit merchant";'

In the Liquor Act this appears at page 24, five lines from the bottom. As hon. members are aware, the supply of alcoholic beverages to places with Commonwealth Government licences, such as airports, Army camps, Air Force camps, and so on, is free of a licence fee. Does the hon. member follow that?

Mr. Hanlon: Is this the one where you are inserting, "or licensed spirit merchants"?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Yes, after "registered brewer". It is simply to give them the same advantages of freedom from licence.

Mr. Houston: I cannot find the words "every registered brewer."

Dr. DELAMOTHE: They are in the principal Act.

Mr. Houston: We are amending the Bill, not the principal Act.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: That is right. We are inserting the words after line 4. It refers back to the principal Act.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (8.6 p.m.): As I understand the Minister's amendment it inserts the words "or licensed spirit merchant" into subsection 4 of section 18 of the original Act to make clear that on the assessment of fees on a percentage basis the licensed spirit merchant is brought in.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.7 p.m.): That is the idea. The amendment permits a spirit merchant to supply liquor to persons licensed to sell liquor under any law of the Commonwealth and not to pay a fee on such sale. As hon. members know, fees are collectable by the Commission only on sales to licensees with licenses issued by the State, not by the Commonwealth.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (8.8 p.m.): I know that this clause relates particularly to the Brisbane Airport and the franchise area of those persons who have concessions or licences within the Brisbane Airport, on Commonwealth territory, for the sale of liquor, and thus a fee will not be payable by them. That is presuming, of course, that it is on Commonwealth territory.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is very difficult to hear the hon. member.

Mr. HUGHES: It is because it is what is termed "Commonwealth territory". Can the Minister say to what extent this will affect areas other than the Brisbane Airport? Does it affect every aerodrome area in the State at which commercial planes touch down? Does it relate to the Coolangatta Airport?

An Opposition Member: And military establishments?

Mr. HUGHES: Military establishments could well be involved. How far does it go? I think the Minister could enlighten the Committee. Will it relate to military establishments or any other place controlled by the Commonwealth? Does it affect canteens or bars? Does it apply to Cannon Hill and Enoggera? Does it relate to all airports or only to the Brisbane Airport? If it affects the whole of Queensland, these people will be in a rather privileged position because they will not be paying the 6 per cent. State licence fee as they have Commonwealth protection by virtue of Commonwealth ownership of the land. In those cases they will have a competitive advantage, and the State is losing fees that other people have to pay.

Has the Minister made any representations to the Commonwealth authorities to obtain this rightful State due, as I see it, so that these people will be on a parity with all others who dispense liquor in Queensland? If he has not, will he consider doing so to obtain the fee for Queensland.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.9 p.m.): I have argued this matter with the last three successive Ministers for Civil Aviation. The Commonwealth law, which leaves these people free of

paying any licence fee, precludes the State from collecting any fees. As I mentioned—perhaps I did not speak loudly enough for the hon. member to hear—I said it applied to Army camps, Air Force stations, Commonwealth aerodromes and anywhere else that has a Commonwealth licence. They get their liquor free of the licence fee of 6 per cent.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (8.11 p.m.): I think we may be at cross purposes. The words "The Commonwealth or of" are in the clause itself. I have been speaking to the Minister's amendment for the addition of the words, "or licensed spirit merchant." I understand it comes into the assessment of fees on a percentage basis and was inadvertently left out, and that the words "licensed spirit merchant" will now be inserted in subsection 4 of section 18 dealing with the assessment of fees on a percentage basis.

Dr. Delamothe: That is so.

Amendment (Dr. Delamothe) agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—Amendments to s. 22; Persons and premises disqualified—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (8.12 p.m.): I have a query on this clause. Previously section 22, which relates to a restriction on a licensee within the meaning of the Auctioneers, Real Estate Agents, Debt Collectors and Motor Dealers Acts, 1922 to 1961, or a partner or spouse of such a licensee, used to disqualify an auctioneer, etc., other than a spirit merchant, with premises and so on. Frankly, I cannot establish in my mind why it was in the Act in the first place. I would be grateful if the Minister would state why it was in the Act and why it will now be taken out of the Act.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.13 p.m.): This is one of the anachronistic things which dates back to the horse-and-buggy days when horse sales, cattle sales and sheep sales were held, and auctioneers held licences at the local bush pubs, and it was considered that, acting as both auctioneer and mine host, he was able to inveigle the sellers of stock at the sale to go to his pub and spend all their money. It has long since lost any application in modern-day conditions.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—New s. 27A; Spirit merchant's (retail) licence—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (8.14 p.m.): I think the Minister has answered our query. This relates to a spirit merchant's retail licence, which is a new type of licence. We did seek an assurance from the Minister in the second-reading debate that the meaning of "a remote area of the State" and "of sufficiently sparse population" would be restricted to areas that are genuinely remote

and genuinely of sparse population so that people there would have no opportunity of getting to an ordinary licensed victualler for their supplies. We are not opposed to it as long as it is used in that way and is not used willy-nilly to issue a spate of these licences, here, there and everywhere. The Minister has given us that assurance and we accept it.

There is, however, the possibility of an anomaly the way the clause is worded. The clause provides that the provisions of section 18 of the Act, among other sections, should apply to a spirit merchant's retail licence in the same way as they apply to an ordinary spirit merchant's licence as we know it in the Act. This means that the licence fee would be not only 6 per cent. of his gross purchases per annum but also \$400. That is my interpretation of it. It should be possible for the Commission to remit all or part of the \$400 in certain cases because more than 6 per cent. is paid on only a spirit merchant's licence.

No other licence involves a lump sum in addition to the 6 per cent. It would seem to be an anomaly if a small store in a remote area, with a comparatively small turnover, was expected to pay \$400 per annum in addition to the 6 per cent. licence fee, the same as spirit merchants with large businesses. For that reason, I move the following amendment:—

"On page 8, line 31, after the word 'merchant' add the following proviso—

'Provided that in any case where the Commission is satisfied that the extent of the business carried on pursuant to the spirit merchant's (retail) licence is such that the licensee should not be required to pay the whole of the fee prescribed by paragraph (ii) of subsection (1) of section 18 of this Act the Commission may by notice in writing to the licensee reduce the fee otherwise payable for the license under that paragraph by such amount, not exceeding four hundred dollars, as the Commission thinks fit and payment of the reduced fee shall be deemed to be payment of the fee for the license prescribed by this Act.'

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.16 p.m.): I am prepared to accept the amendment. I think it clarifies the position.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (8.17 p.m.): In actual fact, this situation may never occur. Subsection (3) (b) of the proposed new section refers to "a remote area of the State sufficiently removed from the nearest licensed premises and of sufficiently sparse population as to warrant the existence of a retail spirit merchant's business in the locality." I do not know if there will be any places to which this provision would in fact apply. What is a remote area, and what areas are sufficiently sparsely populated, would have to be decided.

I should like to think that this was the forerunner of legislation that would provide a greater number of such liquor outlets in places where a demand for bottled liquor exists. I think it would be preferable to have such establishments providing a greater variety of wines and spirits than are presently available from many wine and spirit merchants. This would tend to bring about a greater home consumption of liquor, and the spending of less time in hotels.

To a great extent, the trend in the liquor trade is to bottle sales. I was recently informed that there has been an increase of about 80 per cent. in the sales of bottled liquor, which suggests that those who wish to have alcoholic drinks are buying them in bottles and taking them home to drink with their wives and friends.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member for South Brisbane should know that under this clause bottles cannot be opened where they are purchased, and the contents cannot be drunk there.

A provision relating to sparsely populated remote areas may be almost without application, and we should therefore watch the position with a view in the future to bringing about a greater number of sellers of wines and spirits in single bottles so as to encourage drinking at home rather than in hotels.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.20 p.m.): As hon. members know, there is no provision for bottle shops, as they are popularly called, under this Act, but the Commission has power—it always has had it; it will exercise it more frequently now—to order that licensed victuallers provide a special type of retail bottle shop opening onto the public footpath.

Amendment (Mr. Hanlon) agreed to.

Clause 16, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 19, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 20—Amendment to s. 47; Borrowing powers—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (8.21 p.m.): I have an amendment to move to this clause, and I must say that I think my good run with the Minister is about to come to an abrupt end.

Dr. Delamothe: You will be all right with this one, too.

Mr. HANLON: Are you going to accept it?

Dr. Delamothe: Yes.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. HANLON: I have been waiting for Clancy to lower the boom, so to speak, Mr. Hooper. I move the following amendment:—

“On page 10, line 5, after the word ‘sums’ insert the words—

‘not less than \$100,000.’”

The section that this clause amends originally provided for a maximum expenditure of \$60,000 from the Liquor Trust Fund for the purposes of an educational programme to discourage intemperance and a health programme in relation to the problem of alcoholism. The clause removes the maximum of \$60,000 and provides an additional purpose for which the money will be used, that is, maintaining a publicity programme to emphasise to users of the road the dangers of the consumption of liquor. The Opposition believes that a minimum amount should be specified. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber know that Governments say they like to make up their own minds, that they do not like to be bound. But if a useful purpose is to be served by diverting funds from the Liquor Trust Fund for the three purposes I mentioned, the Opposition believes that at least \$100,000 should be provided.

I stress that that is a minimum figure, because the Government has been subjected, possibly quite rightly, to some criticism in the past on this matter. When the provision was first instituted the Opposition sought to insert a minimum, but its amendment was not accepted. I am pleased that the Minister has now indicated that he will accept this amendment.

The Opposition does not believe that this should be a matter of running hot and cold, passing a large sum one year and then letting it go. Figures expended by the Government seem to indicate that a minimum of \$100,000 would not be unreasonable. I am not suggesting that the Government will do this, but the Opposition believes that the allocation of money from the Liquor Trust Fund to a publicity programme to emphasise to users of the road the dangers of the consumption of liquor should not be taken as an excuse for merely making a paper entry from that trust fund to the Queensland Road Safety Council, or some similar organisation, and replacing normal expenditure on road safety advertising. It should be an injection of new money, according to the spirit of the clause, and the Opposition hopes it will be.

When one looks at the information given to the hon. member for Kedron and the Leader of the Opposition relative to details of expenditure on the programme to discourage intemperance and the health programme in relation to the problem of alcoholism, it will be seen that when staff are paid and travelling expenses met, it is not difficult to spend \$50,000. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (8.25 p.m.): A remarkable feature of this clause, which was inserted in 1961 when trading hours over virtually the whole of Queensland were extended to Sunday, was the power of persuasion achieved by the then Premier and the Treasurer by offering a portion of the licence fees received by the Government for use on health education. As a result, the opposition that was expected to the Bill seemed to collapse almost overnight.

However, the amount of money spent by the Government since 1961 has been far too inadequate for the task set for it. In those years \$30,000 has gone to the Education Department to provide three inspectors to travel through the schools of Queensland teaching temperance to students and purchasing for display films and documents of benefit in this form of education. In the vicinity of \$22,000 of that \$30,000 has been spent on salaries and administration expenses and very little on the actual work to which the money was supposed to be devoted. It indicates a lack of sincerity on the part of the Government.

Similar remarks could be made about the money spent by the Department of Health. Most of this has been absorbed in administrative expenses and very little has been used for films and the educational programme for which it was intended in the first place.

Hon. members will recall that when Parliament resumed some weeks ago I asked a question of the Minister seeking information as to whether it was intended to increase the amount of this money and expand the programme for which it was intended. At that time the Minister said that this was not the intention. Since then, he has apparently had second thoughts because the amount is now to be increased and extended also to the Transport Department.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona would mean that the minimum \$100,000 per annum would be taken from the funds of the Licensing Commission and that \$30,000 per annum would be diverted to the Transport Department. This, of course, will be spent on propaganda. It could be much better if some of the temperance organisations were given this money to expand their own programmes. They could possibly put it to better use than the departments that have been given these rather miserly amounts for this purpose since 1961.

The amendment at least provides for a minimum amount which the Government will divert for the purpose of educating people in temperance, and, in the health programme, in combating alcoholism. I think the combating of alcoholism in the State would be a most worthy subject on which to spend this money. In this way some benefit would accrue from the expenditure.

I am sure the minimum \$100,000 provided in the amendment will appeal to the Minister and also to the many opponents of his present legislation, although he did not attempt, as his predecessors did, to quieten the clamour of protest by offering to extend the programme as the Government did in 1961.

Maybe it is a bit cynical to say that, but it did quieten some of the opposition at that time. It may be that the Minister may not have been as persuasive as Sir Thomas Hiley or the then Premier. At the risk of being cynical, I say that it appeared as if the Government was offering something in an attempt to quieten the protests against the legislation. I think that the money has been used for a good purpose, particularly from the health point of view, and this could be expanded even more than it has in the past when only a small amount of money was diverted for that purpose.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (8.31 p.m.): I sincerely hope that the Minister and the Government have got the message that the hon. member for Baroona has tried to convey this evening by moving that the amount be increased to a minimum of \$100,000. There is no doubt that the expenditure of even \$400,000 on the State's educational programme in this matter would not have a marked effect.

I hope that in future the Government will show more sincerity in educating young people in the dangers involved in drinking. The Minister will recall that the education programme started in a forthright manner and on a firm foundation. It was gaining ground because qualified teachers from the Queensland Temperance Union and church organisations visited the schools and warned the children of the pitfalls associated with becoming teenagers. But subsequently those teachers were forbidden to enter the schools to impart their knowledge and advice to the students.

Mr. Bennett: Did the Government double-cross them?

Mr. DEAN: I do not know whether the Government's action could be called a double-cross, but certainly it disappointed many people in the community, particularly parents.

As the hon. member for Baroona has pointed out, the suggested amount is the minimum amount, so I hope that before long it will be increased. Every day reference is made in the Press by people who carry out analyses into the effects of alcohol in the community to the fact that liquor has been proved to be the No. 1 killer on the roads. In July, 1969, "The Courier-Mail" stated that the drunken driver was the top road killer in Australia.

I sincerely hope that the Government will show a little more sincerity and try to bring back those qualified teachers into the schools, particularly the secondary schools,

to pick up where they were forced to leave off and to continue educating the children. The mere insertion of the clause into the Bill will not satisfy those who face the problem. People in the community who take an interest in those who suffer from the effects of alcohol face the problem of picking up the broken pieces of young people.

A great danger faces our young people, and I felt impelled to add further emphasis to that laid by the hon. member for Baroona on his message. I sincerely hope that it has crossed the Chamber. We do not wish the amount to stay at \$100,000. We want it to increase, and we believe it should not be long before it is increased to a much bigger amount.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.36 p.m.): I am very happy to accept the amendment. Strange as it may seem, the hon. member for Baroona must have been reading my mind because that is the exact sum—(Opposition laughter).

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Would hon. members opposite like it to go to a vote and be knocked out?

This is the exact sum that was sought for the coming year by the Minister for Health, the Minister for Education, and the Minister for Transport. I am quite happy to include this amount as the minimum as it represents an increase of \$40,000 on the \$60,000 made available last year. I hope that from year to year the amount increases.

As to the point raised by the hon. member for Sandgate about who should spend the money or who should be the teacher, I advise him to take that matter up with the Minister for Education. I have enough problems of my own without buying into that one.

Amendment (Mr. Hanlon) agreed to.

Clause 20, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 21—Amendments to s.47A; Forfeiture of licenses for cause—

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (8.37 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

“On page 10, line 44, omit the word—
‘liquor’

and insert in lieu thereof the words—
‘wines and spirits.’”

The object of this amendment is to remove the tie that has existed for so long on the stocking of wines and spirits by all hotels. On looking at the proposed amendment I considered that it was a very clumsy way of setting out what we intended to do. Having used the word “liquor”, which covers all types of liquor, we then had to carry on with subclause 3 and make certain exclusions

so that it did not apply to beer. By changing the word “liquor” to “wines and spirits” it will deal with the particular types of liquor that are to be stocked compulsorily in all hotels—I repeat the word “all”—throughout Queensland.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (8.39 p.m.): We had a close look at this clause because it is obviously of extreme importance relative to the tied-house concept if it were to be breached in a major way. When we examined the clause we considered it contained a milk-and-water approach, if I may so describe it when discussing the Liquor Act.

As I said earlier in the debate, if the Act had been consolidated the Opposition would have had an opportunity to put forward amendments and ideas on a wider scale. However, we are restricted to the amendments that the Minister is dealing with. In this case he has presented a clause about which, from reports in the Press and elsewhere, it is fairly common knowledge that he has received representations from merchants who felt they were affected in some way by it.

The clause is now being further amended by the Minister. This indicates that there have been second thoughts. The word “liquor” is to be taken out. I agree with the Minister that the way it now appears it does not seem to make much difference—I am not certain that it does not make some difference—but there might possibly have been some concern about the use of that word.

The Opposition's attitude, in the context of this clause, is that this is not really a full-blooded attempt to face up to the question of tied-house problems. It does present many problems and I do not intend to go into them at this stage, because I am restricted to this clause. However, we do not think it is more than a pious aspiration on a limited basis. We feel that its operation will be open to some practical difficulties, even as it stands. While we are not opposed to the clause, we are not really very taken with it, either as it was or as it is to be amended. Therefore we are content to damn it with faint praise and leave it at that, unless there is further comment on it.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (8.42 p.m.): This amendment is long overdue because for too long what should be stocked on the shelves of hotels has to a great extent been dictated by brewery interests. This is not only my personal observation; it is what has been said to me by hotel licensees. They have frequently had a call for certain brands of wines and spirits but, because they were either a Castlemaine or a Bulimba hotel—tied or merchant-financed—the brands of wines or spirits that they were required to stock were those for which the breweries were agents.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: That has been almost an accepted fact.

Mr. HUGHES: It was a fact.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: No qualification is needed.

Mr. HUGHES: I am being quite charitable in this. Many licensees have complained about this because they felt they were not giving the public the service they demanded. Over the years the demand for wines has increased and tastes have become more discerning. Today, a great number of Australians desire a particular brand of wine or whisky with their meals at home or at another place, even a hotel.

In 1961, when a large number of amendments were made to this Act, the guidelines were set and a note of warning was sounded in regard to such things as this. With the passage of this Bill, hotels will be required to have bottle shops fronting streets and to "stock and supply in reasonable quantities all classes, kinds, brands and descriptions of liquor usually sought by the general public." If the general public wants a particular brand, the publican is required to stock it. I should like to know to what extent this is more than a pious hope for the provision of a selection of prices, brand names and quality to the public. To me, this is another business like that of a grocer, although it is not quite the same regarding choice and Government control. If they are in this business, they must meet the demands of the public.

To what extent will the Licensing Commission be able to police this? Will the Licensing Commission make reports on it to the Minister or to Parliament? I certainly hope that, if certain publicans are not abiding by this provision, action will be taken against them.

If so, what action will be taken against them? What teeth are there in the legislation? Or is it merely a pious hope?

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (8.45 p.m.): For many years wine and spirit merchants have been requesting the right to serve licensees with their brands of wines and spirits. At the same time, for many years members of the public have been demanding the right to go to hotels and buy not only the wines and spirits they prefer, but also the bottled beer of their choice. It seems that the Government is at present agreeing to the demands of the wine and spirit merchants and ignoring the wishes of the consuming public.

As a non-drinker myself for some months, I realise that I am not able to speak with authority on behalf of the consumer. I do feel, however, that the important and timely point is that members of the consuming public are being ignored. I should have thought that the Government would give greater consideration to public requirements.

Since the practice started of breweries and wine and spirit merchants purchasing hotels, there have been numerous instances in Queensland of limited supplies of many brands in popular demand. In many towns

in Queensland there is only one hotel, and many of such hotels have been bought by breweries or wine and spirit merchants. There is a case in point on the North Coast close to Brisbane, where one licensee, who is under mortgage to a brewery, owns the only two hotels holding licences in the area. As a result, the public is unable to secure supplies of the other brand of bottled beer.

Whilst a distinction is being made between liquor and wines and spirits, I believe that there should be included in the Bill a proper definition of wines and spirits, and supplies of bottled beer. They are commodities quite different from the beer sold across the bar in a hotel or on licensed premises. Bottled beer is there for home supply, just as, in the majority of cases, wines and spirits are sold for home consumption. People get accustomed to one brand of beer. They like it, and they are entitled to be able to obtain supplies of it. At the Mooloolaba and Maroochydore hotels it is impossible to buy Castlemaine beer, because those hotels are mortgaged to the Queensland brewery. That means that people who want to drink the other brand of beer must bring it from Brisbane, or from the nearest hotel supplying that brand. That is a ridiculous situation, but it in fact occurs in parts of Queensland where there is only one hotel and it is owned by a wine and spirit merchant who supplies only one brand of bottled beer, or a brewery that supplies only its own brand. The home supply is therefore satisfied by only the one brand.

I should think that in this regard there would be little difference between supplying wines and spirits and supplying bottled beer. It is the people who in the final analysis pay the piper; they are the ones who pay the licence fees and provide the breweries and merchants with their profits. They are entitled to be catered for, and I believe that the supplying of bottled beer should be included in the provisions that the Minister is introducing.

Mr. Hanlon: In some parts of the State the breweries will not supply direct to licensees; supplies must go through the merchants.

Mr. LLOYD: That is quite correct. That has occurred in many towns and cities in Queensland. The brewery supplies only to the wine and spirit merchant and, in turn, all the supplies delivered to the hotels must flow through the back door—in other words, everyone gets a cut out of it before the consumer pays for it.

In my opinion, these are important matters that should have been considered. If the Act had contained a provision that would have prevented occurrences similar to the ones at Maroochydore and Mooloolaba, I should have said that the amendment is satisfactory; but there is nothing in the Act that gives the Licensing Commission power to discipline a licensee for restricting supplies of bottled beer in popular demand, nor is

there any provision that gives it any power over the licensee. One might expect that, under the amendments, the powers would not be as strictly implemented as those relating to forfeiture of licences. However, the Licensing Commission should at least have power to insist, when there is public demand and public protest relative to matters such as this, that the licensee must supply a commodity in popular demand in the area and to impose a monetary penalty, or perhaps some other form of penalty, if he fails to do so. Whether or not it will be possible to do that in the final analysis, I do not know.

For many years while the Australian Labour Party was in Government, a section of the party endeavoured to insist on the licensing of breweries in Queensland, and I still believe that there is a need for an Act to provide for the licensing of breweries. The provisions of the Bill relating to forfeiture of licence will cover a licensee who may be powerless to act because the hotel is owned by a powerful monopoly, such as a brewery, or a powerful agent, such as a wine and spirit merchant. The licensee is the one who is penalised, and I think that the breweries should also be brought under the control of the Licensing Commission. The Commission could then penalise the breweries or the owners of the hotels. Why should a licensee be requisitioned on building construction work when he is not the owner? Why should he be penalised for the failure of the owner of the hotel to carry out alterations or other construction work? Despite the law of the State, the licensee will, in one way or another, do as he is told by the owner.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. LLOYD: To summarise, the point I have made is that I believe that the Government should have included in the Bill some power to control, through the Licensing Commission, the unrestricted sale of supplies of beer in addition to wine and spirits.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (8.54 p.m.): It is perfectly obvious to me that this clause has been dictated to the Government by the big wine companies, in particular Penfolds and McWilliams.

Government Members: Oh!

Mr. BENNETT: It is not funny. I am making a truthful assertion.

I endorse the remarks of my colleague the hon. member for Baroona. Members of the Australian Labour Party are very sceptical about the inclusion of paragraph (j) in section 47A. It is obvious that it will give the big companies a waddy with which to whack the little applicant who comes before the Commission. It will give them power also to report the little man for stocking liquor that is not, in their opinion,

in great demand. The operative words are "all classes, kinds, brands and descriptions of liquor that are usually sought by the general public in the locality". We had the sorry spectacle over a long number of years—

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: It means that you would not drink champagne at the Exchange Hotel.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member would drink metho.

I was about to say that over a long period of years we have witnessed the sorry spectacle of the Licensing Commission's time being taken up by frivolous objections and applications by brewery and big-company interests. As I mentioned in an earlier debate, they have paid counsel and barristers sitting almost permanently in the Commission to object to applications made by, and on behalf of, little men.

The section says that it relates to wines and spirits that are usually sought by the general public in the locality. Surely that is giving a vested and monopolistic interest to the big companies. They will follow the same procedure as that followed under section 27 of the Liquor Act. When an application is made for the grant or transfer of a spirit merchant's licence, the Commission has to be satisfied, according to the legislation, that there is a demand in the locality in which it is proposed that the business be carried on. Every time an application is made for the grant or transfer of a licence the big brewery interests and wine and spirit merchants do a canvass of the area asking people, "Have you ever heard of Blogg's wine?" Of course they have never heard of it. It has never been introduced into Queensland, although evidence can be produced to show that it is a first-class wine and sometimes a wine of international repute and renown.

Very often it is manufactured in the vineyards of South Australia and is regarded by the South Australian Government and other authorities as a very excellent wine, but because a franchise has not been granted to vested interests and companies in Queensland, they do their best to keep it out of this State.

I have been associated with applications to the Licensing Commission when this has happened. It is scandalous and vicious, and I am pleased to see that a provision is being inserted at least to charge these vested interests for their frivolous and vicious objections.

If some wine is being sold in Brisbane or other localities, these people will canvass the publicans under their control—they have a tied-house system—and say to them, "We require you to appear before the Licensing Commission and give evidence to the effect that certain wines and spirits on so-and-so's shelves are not sought by the general public in the locality." This is happening regularly, and I gather from the remarks made by

Mr. Kelly, Chairman of the Licensing Commission, that he is well aware of these vicious campaigns being conducted to maintain monopolistic interests.

Applications that could be dealt with by the Licensing Commission within a matter of two hours sometimes take a day, or even two days, and the little man is saddled with rather exorbitant legal costs to maintain his application and endeavour to put it through successfully. He has to sit there while witness after witness is brought in by the breweries and other big interests to say that the liquor is not in great demand or usually sought.

Various hoteliers only have a lease of the licence of a hotel and their tenure depends on the good will of the head lessee or the owner—the brewery. They must obey their dictates. Consequently, they say, "We only sell McWilliam's wines" or "certain brands of Penfold's wines, and, although the South Australian wines are of excellent quality, there is no demand for them."

Obviously there cannot be any demand until the public has a chance of tasting them. I think it is a scandalous situation that, in order to secure the sale of an article of good quality, one has to prove there is a public demand for it. It is a vicious circle; it is like a dog chasing its tail. A public demand for any article cannot be proved unless the public are given the opportunity of testing it and tasting it. At present there is not only the tied-house system but also the closed-door system. If the big brewery interests do not want to introduce certain products in which they have no franchise and from which they obtain no commission, they close the door.

I am glad that the hon. member for Baroona has expressed a great deal of scepticism on behalf of the Opposition about the clause because, as I have said, it is a weapon with which the vested liquor interests in this State can maintain on the shelves of hotels and motels and in the new arteries of liquor sales only products that they desire to be sold, and to boycott products in which they have no interest and from which they cannot make a profit.

Amendment (Dr. Delamothe) agreed to.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (9.3 p.m.): I move the following further amendment:—

"On page 11, omit all words comprising lines 1 to 30, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following words:—

'(c) adding the following subsection:—

"(3) A provision of an agreement between a licensed victualler and a brewer or a licensed spirit merchant or of any other document made by a licensed victualler for the benefit of a brewer or a licensed spirit merchant which purports to restrict the freedom of the licensee to stock or supply wines or spirits of all classes, kinds, brands and

descriptions or which in its practical effect restricts or is calculated to restrict such freedom shall be deemed to be a nullity to the extent that it so purports or operates in relation to the stocking or supplying of wines or spirits but no further."."

This amendment deletes subclause (c) and subsections (3) and (4). Subsection (3) is no longer necessary now that the word "liquor" has been changed to "wines and spirits". Subsection (4) is replaced by a new subsection (3), which is much the same, except that after the word "brewer" wherever it occurs, the words "licensed spirit merchant" are included. This subclause will ensure that any agreement or instrument entered into outside the original subclause (j) between a licensed victualler and brewer or between a licensed victualler and spirit merchant shall be void and a nullity.

Amendment (Dr. Delamothe) agreed to.

Clause 21, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 22—Repeal of ss. 48, 48A and 49 and enactment of new sections in their stead—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (9.5 p.m.): This is an important and extensive clause repealing sections 48, 48A and 49 and enacting new sections in their stead. Section 48 refers to the removal of cancelled, surrendered or forfeited licences to another locality, and the procedures that are to be followed by the Commission and others in the circumstances. We realise that the number of licences in Queensland is restricted to the number that existed under the Act in November, 1935, but that might not be generally appreciated. Usually, when a new site for a hotel is selected an application is made for one of the cancelled, surrendered or forfeited licences to be moved to that locality rather than to move for a new licence as such.

As I pointed out at the second-reading stage, we said a few years ago relative to the Inala Hotel that it was a very silly procedure to have a local option poll and the other procedures under the Act when the public could be voting in the dark. The people in the area had no knowledge where the hotel was to be, what sort of hotel it was to be, or even whether it would be near their residences. We suggested that the procedure now included by the Minister in this clause would be a much better one. Firstly, the Licensing Commission will consider the various tenders and select one. If a local option poll is taken, it will be held within a radius of about three miles of the site. The people will know the site and all about it when voting. We approve of that wholeheartedly; we are pleased that the Government has taken steps to implement what we suggested.

We are using this clause to try to deal with trafficking in licences for new sites. In the debate in December last the hon. member for South Brisbane and I expressed

concern about the manner in which licences passed comparatively quickly, particularly to breweries, and in one case to an insurance company. We referred to the current rumour about the Homestead Hotel becoming a Gold Top hotel. We felt that this practice should be discouraged positively by the legislation.

If the Act was being consolidated we would probably do this in a way different from what we now propose. However, one provision of this clause enables the Commission to take a security bond from the successful tenderer to ensure that he will carry out the project and continue with it once he is selected. That is an obvious provision. It would be ridiculous to select a tenderer and to hold a local option poll if the applicant bailed out at the last minute when he was supposed to proceed with the erection of the hotel. We think the security bond provision relative to the tender is a good idea, but we propose to tie in with it a provision to ensure the continuance of the licence by the applicant or his nominee, or any person claiming through either of them, for a period of at least five years, subject to the usual exemptions contained in the clause relative to ill-health, hardship and so on. In those circumstances I move the following amendment:—

"On page 13, line 51, after the word 'made' insert the words—

'and against the sale of the license by the tenderer or his nominee or any person claiming through either of them for a period of five years after the license is endorsed under subsection (2) of section 48C of this Act.'"

I do not pretend that this is an ideal way of doing it, but when we read the later provisions of this clause about what happens when recompense is sought under the security bond, or some part of it is to be retained by the Commission, it becomes a little awkward in application. We feel we should take the opportunity presented by this clause to include a provision restricting trafficking in new licences. I do not want to personalise in any way and name any particular hotel. I did mention the Homestead Hotel, which is the latest rumour around.

If the Commission grants licences to people and those licences become available to a brewery almost immediately, whether at a profit or not and in a manner which suggests trafficking, in our mind the position is accentuated. We might as well face up to the fact that the Government determines policy on whether it wants the breweries to have licences exclusively or not. We believe that the insertion of this provision will be something in the nature of a warning from this Parliament that, in this sort of situation, we do not regard the rapid transfer of licences as desirable.

The only restriction in the Act at present applies to any licence. It says that any sort of licence, whether it is an existing licence or not, must be held for a minimum

of three months before transfer can be sought, except in the case of ill health or the other normal provisions. This amendment does not relate to the transfer of an ordinary, existing licence. It relates exclusively to an application made for the removal of a licence to a new locality—a new hotel on that site, so to speak. We think the amendment has considerable merit.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (9.12 p.m.): I support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona. I feel that the section could be even stronger because in the past we have presented to this Parliament irrefutable evidence that racketeering and trafficking are rife in the transfer of licences under the Liquor Act.

So that a state of confusion will not be caused by any misconception or misrepresentation by Government speakers, if they are game to speak on it, let me assure the Committee that the submissions made by the hon. member for Baroona and those that I propose to make, and have made in the past, in no way cast aspersions on the Licensing Commission. I make it quite clear that I do not suspect or claim that there is one scintilla of evidence that it is involved in any questionable conduct.

So let us not have any red herrings drawn across the trail by Government members claiming that I am attacking the Licensing Commission, because I am not. (Government laughter.) Government members may laugh. They will have to send out for three boxes of matches if they think they will burn us off in this debate. We are not even bought off by all the matches from the Department of Industrial Development.

I am personally friendly with the members of the Licensing Commission. In the dim and distant days of antiquity, when I was a legal officer in the Commonwealth Crown Law Office, the chairman of the Licensing Commission was my search clerk, so I know that his integrity is 100 per cent. I also know that the Commission operates with great difficulty at times and certainly with a good deal of embarrassment, because the provisions of the Act have enabled certain coteries of businessmen to take advantage of the Commission and it is powerless to do anything about it.

I have no doubt that the Commission knows that certain dishonest practices are attached to applications, but it must accept the evidence that is given without any advance information on what is likely to transpire when the golden gift is given in the form of a licence that can be sold for an exorbitant price or a fabulous fortune, which has happened. We have seen what happened in the case of the Sunnybank Hotel, the Homestead Hotel, and the Colmslie Hotel.

Mr. HINZE: Are you suggesting some crooked transactions in connection with the Colmslie, Homestead and Sunnybank Hotels?

Mr. BENNETT: I told the hon. member this afternoon that he did not have the knowledge that I have of certain malpractices that occur from time to time, and I can only conclude that he is well known to many people with whom I mix. When the hon. member asks me if I am accusing some businessmen of malpractices, all I can say is that in my opinion they are acting according to the tenets of certain big businessmen in this State.

Mr. Campbell: Is that the attitude of the Labour Party?

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister has been singularly silent. He had a lot to say in the Press about the faction-fighting in the Liberal Party, but he does not seem to have the "guts" to get up and say anything about the Liquor Act in Parliament. Quite frankly, if businessmen followed the example of the Minister, I would certainly say that they were dishonest and engaging in malpractices. I was here when the Minister made his weak, anaemic attempt to justify his position in the Liberal Party, but he was not game enough to take on the "ginger group", who have him severely worried.

To return to the responsible contribution that I was making before I was interrupted by the irresponsible Minister, I have mentioned the questionable aspects of the sale and transfer of the Colmslie Hotel licence. I think it is shocking that any man can traffic in any licence created, granted or given by a Government or a local authority. I have been of the belief in the past that there has been a certain amount of excessive and unsatisfactory profit-making in the trading of, for instance, taxi-cab licences. However, most taxi-drivers operate their taxis for quite a period of time and build up goodwill with them, and thus have something to sell. That is unlike the scandalous sale of the Brook Hotel licence which, although not a stick was inserted in the soil or a sod turned, was sold for well over \$100,000.

Why should a Government create the avenue for such malpractices? I know from my appearances before the Licensing Commission that when a lawyer brings a client before the Commission and he gives evidence of his intention, the Licensing Commissioner firmly believes that he is sincere in those intentions and wants to enter the hotel industry. The Commission does not think that he is merely making the application for the purpose of retailing the licence he obtains because he has the wherewithal to brief a barrister and has the ear of some businessman or member of a Government instrumentality who knows what is going on and knows the appropriate time to make an application. The Licensing Commission accepts applicants on their face value as bona fide and sincere, and I am absolutely certain that if the Commission was told by an applicant that he was making his

application merely to resell it at a vast profit, the application would be refused on the spot.

The hon. member for Kurilpa said that more teeth should be written into the Act. Why not write teeth into the Act to give the Licensing Commission power and control over this racket? The amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona is designed for that purpose. The Homestead Hotel licence has already been sold for a fabulous fortune. Every lawyer at the Inns of Court knows that the agreement has been signed and the contract finalised. The application has not yet been made to the Licensing Commission, so far as I know. That is the only formality that has not been completed, because, as I understand it, certain assurances have been given that, in order not to embarrass the Government, the application will not be made till this Bill is bludgeoned through Parliament. The true test of the Government's sincerity is whether or not it will accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona.

It has been said that applicants to the Licensing Commission must be sincere and bona fide. I do not need to repeat the qualifications necessary and the conditions that have to be satisfied in order to obtain a permit or licence, but in effect an applicant has to satisfy the Commission that he wants to enter the hotel industry; that he wants to be a retailer; that he wants to deal in liquor; that he wants to build premises that will be advantageous to the public generally and provide them with ornate facilities. Applicants have very grandiose plans prepared by architects and tender them to the Commission, and they satisfy the Commission that it is a bona fide, sincere application that they wish to follow up and in which they want to take an interest for a certain time. I say that they are dishonest when they swear on oath that they propose to do these things, because in fact all that they propose to do is obtain the licence and resell it. In my opinion, that is not honesty. Having satisfied the Commission that they are genuine and bona fide applicants for a licence, they obtain a licence and then retail it. It is improper and absolutely unfair.

Mr. R. Jones: They might believe it "at this point of time".

Mr. BENNETT: I suppose many of them will give evidence that "at this point of time" they propose to comply with the conditions applicable to the granting of a licence.

I hope that the Minister will accept the amendment. It would not be possible to set up a big business in less than five years, and the amendment merely makes provision for the applicant to satisfy, by way of bond, his bona fides to the Commission or else pay up. To use a colloquialism—it is not necessary to use legal phraseology—they would have to "pay up or shut up" under

the proposed amendment and not take up the time of the Commission in obtaining a licence that they can retail.

As a matter of fact, if I had my way, instead of using the phraseology "the Commission . . . may, as it sees fit, take security", I would say "shall take security". I would not muck about. There is too much looseness about the wording as it stands. It leaves it open to friends and pets of the Government to get licences without any conditions being imposed or any security demanded, while others who are not persona grata with certain people in influential positions will have to put up security. If it is good for the goose, it is good for the gander. If it is good for Joe Blow from West End to have to put up security, why should not Bill Bloggs from the north side also have to put up security? I cannot see that the Government is being consistent in saying that the Commission may accept security as it sees fit. I think that it should be mandatory for the Commission to accept it.

The fact is that certain confidential information is handed out prior to public pronouncements being made. I recall the time when the Minister for Lands—naturally, this did not have anything to do with his portfolio, but apparently he decided to trespass on the portfolio of the Minister for Justice—made an announcement concerning the extensions to the Gold Top brewery. He was not chairman of directors of the company, but apparently he was their ministerial spokesman.

Mr. Sullivan: It does not surprise me that you are all mixed up. You have been mixed up the whole evening.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister knows only too well the interest that he has. His public pronouncement reminded me, also, of the "plug" and sponsorship that the Premier gave the Carlton Brewery when he signed—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Rae: How much do your clients pay you a minute?

Mr. BENNETT: Much more than the Minister would even earn in a lifetime if they paid me according to the value of my time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: At the risk of offending the supersensitivity of the Ministers sitting in Committee tonight, I content myself with the concluding observation—

Mr. Rae interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course, the Minister himself might even be chemically fit tonight. I was trying to be indulgent with him when I was about to conclude, but if he

likes to provoke me into some further submissions I have plenty I could make. It might reach the stage where they would all like me to remain in silence.

I feel sure that the Minister for Local Government would be an ideal teacher of temperance to send throughout the schools. I do not see why we should have to pay anybody when we could use him to do the job for us.

I feel that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona is a test of the bona fides of the Government. It will give the Licensing Commission a weapon with which it can enforce the integrity of the Act and prevent the spurious, specious applications made regularly by the monopolistic interests that employ professional brains for the purpose of exploiting the provisions of the Act.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (9.27 p.m.): We have listened to one of the usual tirades of envy that come from the hon. member for South Brisbane. He said nothing, and there is nothing in the contents of the amendment that leads me to the desire to accept it.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted in clause 22 (Mr. Hanlon's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 30

Baldwin
Bennett
Blake
Bousen
Bromley
Casey
Davies
Davis
Dean
Hanlon
Hanson
Harris
Houston
Inch
Jensen
Jones, R.
Jordan

Lloyd
Marginson
Mellor
Moore, F. P.
Newton
O'Donnell
Sherrington
Thackeray
Tucker
Wallis-Smith
Wright

Tellers:

Wood, B.
Wood, P.

NOES, 39

Ahern
Armstrong
Bird
Campbell
Chalk
Chinchen
Cory
Delamothé
Fletcher
Heatley
Herbert
Hewitt, N. T. E.
Hewitt, W. D.
Hinze
Houghton
Hughes
Hungerford
Jones, V. E.
Kaus
Knox
Lee

Lickiss
Lonergan
Low
McKechnie
Moore, R. E.
Murray
Newbery
Porter
Rae
Ramsden
Richter
Row
Sullivan
Tomkins
Tooth
Wharton

Tellers:

Miller
Muller

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (9.35 p.m.): The amendment on page 14 of the Bill was consequential to the first amendment to the clause. It is no longer applicable as the first one was not accepted by the Committee.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (9.36 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 16, lines 22 and 23, omit the words—

'paragraph (a) of subsection (2) of section 48B of this Act and of'."

This amendment is needed because, inadvertently, it removed from the Bill the necessity to call for objections against the removal of a licence to a tourist area. This amendment will return the position to what it was.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (9.37 p.m.): We made a notation against this clause to question the Minister about it. As the Minister has moved the amendment, there is no point in the Opposition continuing the difference of opinion that we had about tourist areas, local options and so on on a previous occasion. The matter was determined at that time. In the circumstances, we do not propose to offer any opposition.

Amendment (Dr. Delamothe) agreed to.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 23—New s. 49; Licensed victualler's license for international class premises—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (9.38 p.m.): This clause introduces a completely new principle and a completely new licence virtually by statute, in that it sets out the circumstances under which a licensed victualler's licence for international-class premises may be granted by the Commission. We make it clear from the outset that we are not opposed, from a tourist point of view, in the light of modern developments and air travel by jumbo jets, to the concept of an international hotel. But we are extremely concerned about this clause and for reasons that will be outlined we intend to oppose it. We are concerned about the rather vague and somewhat clumsy way in which the provision is to be inserted in the Act. Virtually by statute a licence will be provided which gets a clear-cut run on the rails in a manner different from all the normal type of provisions that apply to everyone else, and every other type of licence.

We approach this clause in several ways. We do not argue that this is not an appropriate time for international-class premises, but we should be very careful about giving anyone a run on the rails under the Liquor Act because avalanches could follow the insertion of such a provision rather carelessly in the Act. We approach this matter on the basis that existing hoteliers or licensed victuallers in this State comply with the requirements of the Commission and provide standards of accommodation and so on that vary according to the requirements of the locality. This has been so over the years.

Although we may have had some complaints, I think it can be said that hotels that normally cater for the type of clientele

envisaged in clause 23 have progressively improved their premises, taking into account the situation during the war and the immediate post-war period, to provide what could be regarded as top-class hotel accommodation.

In more recent years, parallel with the raising of the standard of our hotels, we have seen the advent of motels, to which the Bill gives a limited form of licence. It would be extremely unfair to create by statute a situation in which somebody, either from this State or outside it, could simply breeze in and establish an international hotel. It could be done for profit. We do not argue that this could be desirable and profitable for the State.

The Act does not indicate what is meant by "premises of an international standard". There might be some general trade acceptance of this. I imagine it could be expected to have several hundred bedrooms and certain facilities. The Minister for Tourism is nodding his head in agreement. However, we are not interested in what is generally accepted, because this gives a clear-cut run on the rails and we do not want it to be restricted to what is generally accepted. The Bill does not indicate what is meant.

Mr. Hughes: What restrictions would you impose?

Mr. HANLON: I am coming to that. We consider that existing licensees should have an opportunity of saying that they are prepared to do something on their own sites. What the hon. member for South Brisbane pointed out applies here.

Let us go back to the establishment of oil refineries in this State. The Amoco company established itself here, and good luck to it. Sir Thomas Hiley pointed out on that occasion that there was no possibility of any Australian concern doing what that company did. He thereupon gave Amoco an advantage for a long period in the way of Government contracts and in many other ways. The former member for Rockhampton South, Mr. Pilbeam, claimed that Ampol was in a position to do this. He was "rubbished", and so were we when we said consideration should be given to that company. I do not want to be "rubbished" on this occasion.

An existing licensee, if he is given this advantage, might be in a position to do something about it. I do not claim that there are many or any who would want to do it. But they should be given the opportunity. Tenders should be called, public hearings should be held and some opportunity should be given to people other than the selected person to enjoy this run relative to an international licence.

The consensus of the Government interjections is that nobody locally would be interested.

Mr. Hughes: They may be interested.

Mr. HANLON: All right, but saying that any person may be granted a licence by the Commission does not mean that local people will be given an opportunity. We have already had some propositions canvassed in this State. One was canvassed by Mr. Waterhouse. I do not say that his proposition should not be closely examined on its merits and on what it can do for tourism. He associates a casino with his proposition.

At the present time, casinos—if I may use the Premier's words—"at this point of time" are as big a question mark as Sunday trading in the Brisbane area was during the Albert by-election, during which the Premier said "No". The Premier says "No" today, and he might say "Yes" tomorrow. It is a case of, "He doesn't say 'Yes' and he doesn't say 'No'; he doesn't say 'Stop' and he doesn't say 'Go'." But he has gone from the Chamber now, before the debate is completed.

What is the position? Is this some sort of a kite-flying operation for a future casino? One of the proposals advanced for an international-type hotel is the one that has been put forward by Mr. Waterhouse, and it includes a casino. Is it the one that has been mentioned for Brisbane? I cannot see that a hotel of this magnitude would be a very profitable proposition, at least for some time.

Again I return to the right of the people who have already done the job in this city, or on the South Coast, to be given some consideration. What if an international-type hotel with several hundred bedrooms was built and it turned out to be a white elephant? If it was built next to a hotel not of an international standard but of a standard that provided reasonable accommodation and it became a white elephant, it would have an adverse effect on the operation of the other hotel.

Mr. Hinze: We will guarantee that it will be kept full.

Mr. HANLON: I do not see anything in the Bill about guaranteeing to keep it fully occupied. When the Broadbeach Hotel was built, it was going to be a tourist Mecca that would be kept fully occupied, but it became the biggest white elephant on the South Coast. It passed from one set of hands to another. The Lennons group came into it and then got out of it, and it has been a dicey proposition right from its establishment.

People make all sorts of predictions about what will happen with the building of a major hotel complex. What happened in the case of the Chevron Hotel in Sydney? As I see it, it is operating successfully because the new owner was able to obtain it at virtually 50 per cent. of its cost. As I am reminded by the hon. member for Port Curtis, the influx of American servicemen on leave from Vietnam has helped, too. But basically the hotel was acquired at a price that had a

reasonable relationship to its profitability because many people got into extreme difficulties.

We want to develop tourism in this State. I realise that some hon. members opposite, not necessarily the Minister, may say that we do not want an international-style hotel and we do not want to accommodate tourists. We do not want to be accused of that.

Mr. Sullivan: You are trying to stop it.

Mr. HANLON: We are not trying to do that at all, but we are trying to stop it in the form that it is in the Bill. The Government should have done a better job on the Bill if it wants it to be accepted by those who act with a sense of responsibility and some knowledge of what can happen if a clause of this nature is provided. We do not know whether for example, some of the motels might want to make some proposals.

We gave consideration to providing for objections, but felt that that would not be satisfactory. From the way the clause has been drawn up, we have no alternative but to oppose it as it stands. We intend to do so, and other members will support my remarks.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (9.49 p.m.): It is extremely hard to understand the attitude of the Opposition to this question. It is nothing new in this State. This city needs and demands a hotel of international standard.

Mr. Bennett: It is new in the Act.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and why? Because of the demand and need for such a hotel, and one way to get it is to write a provision into the legislation to enable it to be built in Brisbane. The hon. member for Baroona suggests that only people from overseas would be able to obtain the licence.

Mr. Hanlon: It is open to them.

Mr. HUGHES: It is open to anyone. There are no exclusions, not even present licensees.

The exact wording of the clause is—

"Any person who is not disqualified by this Act . . ."

Further on it says—

"Every such application shall contain or be accompanied by such particulars as are prescribed or as the Commission requires."

The premises must come up to international standard.

The hon. member could apply, if he so desired, for a licensed victualler's licence for international-class premises, provided he could establish to the Commission his ability, financially and otherwise, to carry out the project.

Mr. Hanlon: Very few licences will be granted. There will not be scope for many of them before most people know about them, and some person will get an inside run at the application.

Mr. HUGHES: There is no such thing as an inside run. There has been a need for a long time for an international hotel. Has not the hon. member heard of the Bligh plan for the redevelopment of the Roma Street area? What happened when that was taken to England and other places?

This State is no longer the Cinderella State that it was under Labour administrations. It has grown up. It is no longer a Siberia for branch managers from the South. It stands on its own feet industrially and otherwise. Many more people are coming here by air from overseas, and jumbo jets will bring them here in larger numbers. Exploitation of the State's mineral wealth and many other things will create an even greater need for accommodation of international standard. Surely the hon. member does not wish this city and this State to be lacking in such amenities. Does he want Queensland to languish as it did? Everyone—I do not exclude any person, party or organisation—

Mr. Bennett: Why not fix up the terminal at the airport?

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member is quite adept at drawing red herrings across the path of the argument. He is being true to colour. His interjection has nothing to do with the clause before the Committee. In my opinion, it could well be advertised that the city and the State are in need of hotels of an international standard. The hon. member for South Brisbane suggested that such hotels would be established here for profit. I wonder whether people would come here and establish them merely to be philanthropic. They would come here because they know this is a free-enterprise society. As my colleague from Mt. Coot-tha says, "Good luck to them!"

If the A.L.P. cannot run such hotels under its plan of socialism, it does not want anyone else to run them. It is open to anyone to endeavour to satisfy the Commission that he has the financial ability and experience to develop such a project, and a hotel of international standard is long overdue in this city.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (9.53 p.m.): I do not think I have heard the hon. member for Kurilpa make such a complete verbal somersault as he has made on this occasion. At the introductory stage he was crying out, "We demand a referendum to find out whether or not people want Sunday trading."

Mr. Hughes: We have not come to any clause dealing with Sunday trading.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes we have. This clause is a blank cheque. There is no definition of "international-class premises".

Mr. Chinchin: It changes every year, and you know it.

Mr. HOUSTON: It could be 50 beds; it could be 100 beds. There is nothing in the Bill to say what size the hotel shall be.

Mr. Hughes: It must be economic.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Committee is discussing the Bill that is now before it. The Opposition objects to the clause for the simple reason that it removes the right of any other hotel in the area to object to an international-class hotel being erected on its doorstep, and also removes the right to conduct a local option poll. A person from the Bulimba area, or any other residential area, could go to the Licensing Commission and say, "We have bought some ground and we are going to build an international-class hotel", whatever that means. They would then have the right to build the hotel in the middle of a residential area, right next door to the existing hotel. If it was a motel, that would be all right because one could say, "You cannot have bar trade." But this is a hotel, which means that there will be in the area, without any right of objection from anybody, virtually another bar.

Mr. Lickiss: It is not a public bar.

Mr. HOUSTON: It does not say that. I do not know who has got at this so-called "ginger group", but they are certainly selling out everyone they argued for a few days ago. Apparently they have been bought off on this either by words or some other means. They are selling out their own conscience.

Mr. Lickiss: It does not have a public bar.

Mr. HOUSTON: It does not say that.

Mr. Hanlon: It could have a number of bars, not necessarily public bars as we know them.

Mr. HOUSTON: It may not be a public bar, but it can still have bar facilities. The public can still go in. They might pay a bit more for their drinks.

Mr. Lee interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: Has the hon. member seen an international-type hotel?

Mr. Lee: Of course I have.

Mr. HOUSTON: Where?

Mr. Lee: Overseas.

Mr. HOUSTON: They have international hotels overseas, but some I would not be seen in, they are so filthy and dirty.

Mr. Lee: How would you know?

Mr. HOUSTON: I have seen them. In some towns in the Far East people will tell you, "Don't stay at that place; you will get your throat cut", but they are still regarded as international hotels.

The hon. member said earlier that there were no international hotels in Australia.

Mr. Hinze: There are not.

Mr. HOUSTON: What does he think Lennons is? Here we are de-rating the only hotel in this city that is able to supply accommodation for a large number of people. Would the hon. member regard the Tower Mill as an international-standard motel?

Mr. Hinze: Why is Lennons being sold?

Mr. HOUSTON: Does the hon. member claim that the Parkroyal Motel is of international standard?

What is international standard? That is not set out in the Bill. What about the Southern Cross Hotel in Melbourne? Is that of international standard? These are all international hotels. I wonder what the Minister for Tourism, who is in the Chamber now, thinks of this? I will guarantee that he has been overseas telling people to come to Brisbane, because we have good facilities. Or does he say that we have not one hotel in Brisbane worthy of an international tourist? What nonsense and tripe!

This is a confidence trick of the worst order. In this legislation the Government can grant a hotel licence to any of its friends. It does not have to call tenders; it is not even going to tell the local people about it. There is no protection at all for the hotelier already in the area.

The Government can go to the people. Hon. members opposite who previously declared themselves in favour of a referendum are now supporting this provision. This is their chance to prove their sincerity. If they think that the people of this city or State are entitled to a say as to whether a hotel is to be opened in their area, with drinking facilities—

Mr. Lee: An international hotel.

Mr. HOUSTON: Never mind the word "international". Perhaps the hon. member is trying to put his own conscience at rest with the word "international". Some hotels are called "The International Hotel", but that does not mean a thing. This is a deliberate attempt to remove the right of the citizens of this city and State to object to a hotel being built right in their backyards, with all that is associated with it.

Mr. Campbell: Is the Lord Mayor of Brisbane opposed to this concept?

Mr. HOUSTON: I did not ask him.

Mr. Hanlon: We are not opposed to the concept.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Government should say, "We will have an international hotel but the public will have the right to express their opposition." If the Government believes that Brisbane needs an international-type hotel, let it pick a site for it and allow anyone in the vicinity to express his views. Then, when the views are listened to and judged in the proper manner, if it still decides

to go ahead with it, let it call tenders. Then I would say, "We will give it serious consideration."

We will not endorse what amounts to the blank cheque that the Government is giving here. When in a few months' time the Bill becomes law and we object, Government members will say, "It is in the Bill." The Labour Party believes that we should not lay down a law like this, which takes away the rights that other sections of the Act give to other licensees and to the general public. I believe that the principle is wrong, and those hon. members who believe that the public should have a say in whether people can drink publicly in their localities must support our opposition to the clause. If the Government wants to introduce another clause it can do so tomorrow, but we have tried to put forward an amendment to give effect to the proposal. However, under the present set-up it is impossible to move an amendment that might defeat the Government's desire to look after its friends.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (10.1 p.m.): I would be the first to agree that the suburb of Bulimba is one of the most delightful in Brisbane. On a hot afternoon the breezes waft gently up from the river and cool the fortunate residents who live there. Be that as it may, the possibility of the residents of Bulimba having to judge upon an international hotel being founded within the limits of their suburb is so remote that it is not worth consideration.

One of the first essentials for an international hotel is accessibility to the facilities offered by the capital city. Therefore, anyone who is interested in establishing an international hotel will not be remotely interested in any of the suburbs or any other place in which the bulk of the population resides.

What is the possible site in Brisbane for an international hotel? It is the site presently occupied by the Windsor Hotel, practically in the heart of the city. In fact, parking facilities will be provided in the new complex that is being built by the Labour Lord Mayor. The whole essence of an international hotel is accessibility and availability. Who are the people who predominantly make use of an international hotel? They are international travellers, who arrive at an airport, require accommodation for a short space of time, and in that short space of time want to have facilities available to them. They are picked up en masse at an airport, brought to the central international hotel, for a short space of time they use the facilities offered by the city, and then fly out. They are not remotely interested in suburbs, so for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that suburbia will have an opportunity of gaining an international hotel is evidence of his misunderstanding of the position.

We must look at the matter of local option polls. If it is recognised that the first essential is that an international hotel must

be erected in the heart of the city, thought must be given to which local residents will be given the opportunity to vote at a local option poll. In the heart of the city there are no local residents at all to turn to; they go home at night. So what must be looked at are local authorities, with ordinances, by-laws and town-planning provisions. Certainly, someone who wants to create an international hotel complex would be required, firstly, to satisfy the local authority. And there is the safeguard. No-one can tell me that with present town planning an international hotel will be approved unless it complies with all the rigid requirements that are laid down. While in theory the hon. gentleman has a solid point—and I concede to him that I looked at this clause closely—on deep probing it does not stand up to argument. The first essential is that an international hotel must be situated within the centre of the metropolis.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (10.4 p.m.): I cannot relate the utterances of the Leader of the Opposition with any real degree of logic. Once again they demonstrate that members of the Opposition have declared themselves publicly as "knockers" of progress in this city and State. Out of their mouths they condemn themselves. Does the Leader of the Opposition believe that people who will expend millions of dollars on an asset that will need to repay them over a fairly long time will be interested in establishing such a venture in an area out of the city for any reason other than that it is economically and feasibly possible? Occupancy, the power of spending of the occupants, and location, are first and foremost in their minds. It is not envisaged as the type of hotel that the general public would frequent. The public would not be excluded, but it is not envisaged that there will be bars and bottle departments leading onto the footpaths.

Mr. Houston: Why not?

Mr. HUGHES: Does the hon. gentleman not know what an international hotel is? It is about time he graduated from the horse-and-buggy days. He wants pubs with pool-rooms and parlours, and wire mattresses on old-style beds. We have graduated from those days. Even some of our city hotels can do better than that, but the standard of city hotels over the years has been responsible for motels becoming such a notable success. Yet even the motels do not provide necessary facilities such as large convention rooms and ballrooms, and catering, bar and lounge facilities that will be provided by an international hotel. There will certainly not be a local option poll in relation to this matter.

As my colleague states, such a hotel will not be in the suburbs, affecting the residential life and enjoyment of the community generally. Because of the necessity to make it accessible, feasible and economically possible, it will be near the heart of the city. That

is the trend in every other city of the world I have visited, and I fail to see why Brisbane should be different.

A big demand will arise for such a hotel. The Minister for Tourism could tell hon. members about the increase in tourist numbers from Asia and America. When jumbo jets operate, many people will come here. If 300 or 400 people were to arrive here at once, I suggest that even now our hotels could not cater for them, and they certainly will not be able to do so in the days to come.

We definitely need an international-class hotel and this provision is designed to provide an incentive to those who are prepared to risk their capital in such a venture. In this way we will get worth-while progress in Queensland. Labour members can only "knock" such proposals, but the city council is prepared to knock down hotels that Opposition members tend to class as international hotels, such as Lennons Hotel. Let us do some building for a change.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (10.8 p.m.): I have always called this Government a Queen Street Government, and tonight that has been clearly demonstrated by the attitude of the hon. member for Kurilpa and others who can envisage an international hotel only in Brisbane. When they refer to progress, they do not talk about any part of the State other than Brisbane. If there is to be progress in Queensland, surely to goodness those members are small-minded people when they cannot envisage anything taking place other than in Brisbane. I say to each of them that at this moment there are people in Townsville who are looking into the possibility of erecting an international hotel in that area.

I support the argument put so ably by the hon. member for Barooka. Garbutt will one day be an international airport served by jumbo jets. We hope to bring tourists to Townsville and make it the gateway to the Barrier Reef.

Mr. Bennett: That is if it is still there.

Mr. TUCKER: That is so—if the Premier and others do not destroy it. In the near future we could have a hotel of international standard established in Townsville because of the tourist industry. I hope to see it.

What about those who have invested in North Queensland? Surely they deserve consideration.

An Opposition Member: And protection.

Mr. TUCKER: And complete protection.

In the past few years many firms have built first-class premises in Townsville and other areas of North Queensland. Do not those firms deserve protection? The Australian Labour Party says that these companies should not be wiped out overnight. Those who build international hotels should

be subject to the same laws and regulations as those who build other hotels in any area. Local option polls should be held and objections heard whenever a new hotel is mooted.

It is mooted that an international hotel will be established on Magnetic Island, where two hotels already exist. What happens to those who have invested money there during the past few years? Would not those people have a right to object to something being "plonked" at their front doors that might wipe them out overnight?

Is it not just and right that we should look after North Queensland companies and firms who, over the years, have provided services of which we in North Queensland are proud? They provide employment in North Queensland, so it is not only the firms but also their employees who depend on them for their livelihoods who would be affected. As the hon. member for Baroona said, there should be as much protection for these genuine North Queenslanders who have invested in North Queensland as there is for those who have invested in Brisbane. Surely there can be no argument against that. It is only just and proper that those who have invested in an area receive some protection by being given the right to object and the right to have local option polls conducted.

Mr. Hughes: They will become taverns and be better off.

Mr. TUCKER: We are talking about orderly development. If, as the Leader of the Opposition said, the Government is given a blank cheque, orderly development will be wiped out overnight. It is not only in Brisbane that development is going on. I hope to see development take place all over Queensland, not only in Queen Street, which this Government seeks to protect. I reinforce the arguments that have been put forward this evening.

It is necessary to have this protection. It is wrong that the Government should be handed a blank cheque. Once this is written into the Act, it will be there for ever, and during the next 10 years or so we will see a good deal of this sort of development.

Mr. Hughes: By saying that, you are saying that we will remain the Government for ever and ever.

Mr. TUCKER: That will be decided in a year or so.

I believe that we need this protection if we are to have orderly development, and I am not prepared to give the Government a blank cheque. I welcome an international hotel for the tourist industry, but let it be built where it will not hurt others. Let it be provided where it will help development of the area, but let there also be protection of the interests of those who have had an investment in the area for a long time and who have helped it to progress.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (10.15 p.m.): I agree with the hon. member for Baroona on the manner in which the provision dealing with international hotels has been brought down. It can be construed as providing something that would react violently against existing licensees. At the same time, there is a necessity for the construction of hotels in areas other than those in which licences are presently in operation. If such hotels of a high standard are necessary, why not approach the matter in the correct manner? Who can better decide the location of an international hotel than the Government or the people of this State? In an area in close proximity to an aerodrome, such as Clayfield or Hamilton, where there could be a demand for a hotel of a standard suitable for the international travelling public, which authority is better than the Government or the Licensing Commission to declare it a licensed area and advertise the licence for public tender?

Directing this argument to the situation at Townsville, of which the hon. member for Townsville North has spoken, there may be a requirement in that city for an international hotel. If such a hotel were to be constructed as a result of negotiation with an international company or a national company from Sydney, for example, there could be conflict with the interests of present licensees who have a considerable amount of money invested in the area. If there is a need for a licence of the international type to be granted in Townsville, why should it not be the prerogative of the Licensing Commission or the Government to advertise the licence for public tender? Those in the hotel business in the city would then be in a position to tender for that licence, and they would not in effect be frozen out of the industry by the construction by some other company of a hotel that would damage existing licences.

If there is the need for a hotel to be built above Central Station in Brisbane, on a site owned by the State Government, why should the Government refuse to call public tenders for its construction? If there is a need for the Brisbane City Council to have a hotel constructed in the area where the Windsor Hotel now is, why should it not be necessary for the Brisbane City Council to call public tenders? It would then be for the Licensing Commission to decide which was the most suitable tender.

I am not concerned whether there would be local option polls on the building of such hotels; that does not concern me at all. But if there is a requirement for a hotel in a certain part of Queensland, I believe that the Government is the correct agency to say in what location it should be constructed. Those in Government are the ones who should know most about the State, although there have been cases in recent months in which they have shown a glorious ignorance of their State. Nevertheless, they are the

ones who should know, and who should be able to call public tenders either in Australia or overseas. I do not care where they are called, as long as those in the industry in the locality have the right to tender for the licence.

As the hon. member for Baroona and the Leader of the Opposition have said, why should the Opposition vote for something as loose as this? For instance, there may already be an Australian company or a local individual spending money to cater for the tourist industry. A company from overseas or some other Australian State may come along and secure a licence, without any right of objection from the person already in the area, and without his having the advantage of being able to tender publicly for the licence in competition with the company that is damaging his industry. I believe that the clause could react unfairly against people already engaged in the industry who have contributed a great deal to it.

Mr. Houston: Particularly the modern motels.

Mr. LLOYD: Yes. I refer particularly to southern companies that own strings of hotels, and to companies engaged in the hotel business in the United States of America. The democracy of the Country-Liberal Government in Queensland is such that, as a writer in "Sunday Truth" said some time ago, if Murder Incorporated wanted to come to Queensland, it would receive a licence from the Government to do so.

Do hon. members opposite believe that people from overseas are the only ones who are capable of building such premises? I do not believe that they are. In my opinion, people experienced in the industry in this State would be equally capable of building them if the Government called public tenders for that purpose.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (10.22 p.m.): I never cease to be amazed by the political hypocrisy of many hon. members opposite. Those who cause me the greatest concern in this debate are the members of the so-called "ginger group". I shall call them the tame cats from now on. They obviously are political gymnasts and can do wonders with their consciences—that is, if they have consciences.

The hon. member for Kurilpa said that members of the Opposition are "knockers" of progress. There is evidence to show that big things are done and great progress is made when Labour Governments are in office. One has only to look round the city at present to see what an A.L.P. council has done administratively.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Kurilpa accused me of introducing red herrings into the debate. I might say in regard to him that this is the first time I have had to shear a black sheep.

The hon. member spoke about "knockers" of progress. What has the Government done, with its hill-billy attitude, relative to the international terminal at the airport? Nothing has been done about building an international air terminal. It is not even a national terminal at present.

Mr. Hughes: I agree with you.

Mr. BENNETT: It would be a disgrace to Boulia. I am sure that the Minister for Local Government and Electricity would not want it transferred to his electorate.

The Opposition has been accused of "knocking" progress. Talking of accommodation, I ask how long have Country-Liberal Governments talked about building suitable accommodation for country members of this Parliament? It does not measure up to its responsibilities.

Clause 23, which will become section 49 of the Act, is the loosest piece of legislation that I have ever had the misfortune to study, and it certainly needs some study if one wishes to make sense out of it. What minimum standards are prescribed in the clause? What conditions will be imposed on the successful operator? I call him an operator because one cannot call him a tenderer, and I shall have more to say about that later. Where is the accommodation to be built? The hon. member for Chatsworth obviously let the cat out of the bag. The Government has advance information.

Hon. members know that these international-class premises could, in theory, be constructed anywhere, depending upon certain conditions such as where the airport is now or might be in the future. According to the hon. member for South Coast and many others who spoke in the Albert by-election, the airport was going to be shifted almost down to Southport. That is what they told the electors then. Why would we want an international hotel right in the heart of Brisbane if the international airport is going to be on the Gold Coast?

Mr. Ramsden: What about the Mandarin Hotel in Hong Kong, in the middle of the airstrip? Why don't you wake up to yourself?

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member for Merthyr at least might have some progressive ideas but he cannot galvanise his lazy Government into the implementation of one of them. He has been talking about tunnels for years, to such an extent that the only time he gets a tunnel is when he burrows his head into the dirt to get away from his sham showing and the hypocrisy he exhibited when he spoke about a referendum on this legislation. He went to water very quickly and

crawled not into a decent tunnel but into a political tunnel to get out of the limelight and to get out of his political embarrassment.

I am caused some anxiety by the fact that quite obviously, according to the tenets of the section, the prerequisite to the successful tender is the ability to engage in skulduggery, craft and cunning with Government members. We harken back to the questionable days when refinery licences were being handed out and remember with consternation and a great deal of embarrassment the admissions made by the then Deputy Premier and Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Ken Morris. As Deputy Leader of the Government and Leader of the Liberal Party, he journeyed down the river in the dark of night to negotiate with the Ampol and Amoco interests on the possibility of their being successful tenderers. What went on in the dark of night down on the river, only Ken Morris knows, because he only took us as far as his point of disembarkation; he did not take us any further with him or tell us what went on.

Licences, as I mentioned earlier, involve big money considerations. We have already seen it publicly announced in the columns of the Press by a reverend gentleman that if a certain Mr. Waterhouse gets a casino licence he will get \$250,000 to construct a boys' town. That is not pin money. That is not a bagatelle. There is big money involved. Obviously \$250,000 profit is not going to be made in a few months or in 12 months unless the licence is retailed. That is what has been going on and no doubt negotiations are proceeding in that direction again.

The hon. member for Kurilpa, having made a hasty trip overseas at the taxpayers' expense, now poses as a great authority on international standards and talks about what is going to happen when the jumbo jets arrive.

Mr. Hughes: The Grand Hotel in Gladstone would be a pretty good international hotel.

Mr. BENNETT: I have no doubt that the Grand Hotel in Gladstone would measure up to international standards in cleanliness, moral standards and hygiene. I have no doubt about it. I am no prude and I would not want to stay at a better hotel. And I am sure the hon. member would not, unless the taxpayers were again paying for it as they were recently, when he would whoopee it up at the taxpayers' expense.

Not everyone who travels on jumbo jets wants to waste money; many people travel on them not for any artificial snobbery or to gain a false sense of values or place in life, to which they are not entitled, but purely for utility purposes to travel quickly from one place to another. When they arrive at their destination they do not automatically seek artificial accommodation at exorbitant prices. Those people who can afford to travel round the world on their

own money look for appropriate, adequate and moderately priced accommodation. It is only the playboy type, the international spiv or the fellow who is travelling at somebody else's expense—and certainly the one who travels at the taxpayers' expense—who wants to live it up in places of artificial standards.

I am not speaking for my party when I say that I do not worry about any particular places of alleged international standards. I would hope that all our places of accommodation, whether they accommodate shearers from the West who come to Brisbane to enjoy a few days' relaxation, train drivers from Sydney who want to spend a few days in Brisbane, or decent international tourists, provide decent and healthy accommodation. We do not need to provide artificial standards for them. If we do not have one of these "joints", as I would call them, but have several high-standard places at which people can stay at reasonable cost, I, as a public man, am satisfied.

Too much importance is placed on those people who can afford to spend big money independent of their own personal qualities and character. Affluent men of character and solidarity do not require tremendously expensive accommodation, unless they are trying to impress somebody in order to make a deal. In any case, the clause does not specify the meaning of "international standard". That is what we want to know.

Mr. Ramsden: We thought you would know from your educational standard.

Mr. BENNETT: I know that from a mental point of view the hon. member could well be regarded as substandard.

At present, it would be more appropriate if the premises referred to in the clause were described as cosmopolitan.

The clause says that the commission may negotiate with certain people who are financially capable of erecting the premises. What does that mean? As well, it says that it may negotiate with people who are capable of maintaining the premises and the amenities and services to be offered therein at an international standard.

As my Leader has said, the international hotel does not necessarily have to be built in the city. He and I know that in many big cities in other countries these so-called international class premises are built not in the inner-city areas but on the outskirts. The clause does not say that the hotel must be built in the inner-city area. But surely our scepticism has been aroused and our curiosity stimulated by the hon. member for Chatsworth, who said that it will be erected on the site of the Windsor Hotel. Obviously already some skulduggery has been cooked up and negotiations have taken place. I have no doubt that Mr. Waterhouse has the ear of some members of the Cabinet and the "ginger group" as well. Call it protection money; I have no doubt that the coffers of

the Liberal and Country Parties for the next election campaign will be considerably swelled from the allocation of this particular permit.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much audible conversation on my right.

Mr. BENNETT: In two vital aspects there has been a departure from the fundamental principles of the liquor legislation as we have known them over the years. It will no longer be necessary for a person, a company or a coterie of privileged and well-informed businessmen to tender for international premises. The commission will negotiate with the applicant. In other words tenders will not be called, and specific provision is made for keeping the negotiations secret and concealed. It will be like the old Star Chamber; negotiations will be conducted behind closed doors. It is typical of this Government and the attitude of the coalition parties to deliberately deny the right to call public tenders for the construction of these premises. After getting the Commission to negotiate privately with the applicant (who no doubt has a position of privilege with the Government), after the agreement is made secretly behind closed doors, and consideration has been exchanged with tags attached, whatever they might be—that could not be attached to a written agreement—the contract so negotiated shall be deemed to be the successful tender. Although tenders are not to be called, after this chicanery, graft, cunning and skulduggery have been indulged in it is to be deemed that tenders were called. What an absolute farce; what a complete inversion of the standards of integrity and the principles previously contained in the Bill.

Mr. Lee: Are you tying this up with Clem Jones's negotiations with Lennons?

Mr. BENNETT: I was thinking of the member's association with the Sunnybank Hotel interests and the pool where the koalas were kept when Mr. Alec Dewar was Minister and used his influence—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I was thinking, but I did not wish to mention it.

We have the sickening farce of legislation providing that tenders must not be called and that after these questionable, secret and dishonest negotiations, compared with high business principles and standards, it shall be deemed to be the successful tender. What rot; what hypocrisy! The Government's whole attitude to standards of integrity and honesty is hypocritical. The commission is able to take a security under a provision, that we have dealt with, but it is weak and anaemic because the Government did not accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona. Security now means nothing; it can be for three months, three days, or it may not be for any time at all.

Let us face reality. Waterhouse, who has been carrying on negotiations with certain members of the Government, approached the New Zealand Government and it gave him short shrift. To use a colloquialism of the people I represent, the New Zealand Government gave him the "Khyber". But this second or third-rate Government did not do that. It is prepared to entertain him and deal with him. I wonder why. Under this provision the successful tenderer who does not have to tender, will be given statutory protection, statutory blessing and statutory authority to carry on, as I pointed out, like the Union Trustees and Queensland Trustees. Finally, this clause of the Bill, in contrast with every other clause, is denuded of an important principle. This is a matter on which the hypocrites in the "ginger group" should be saying something instead of sitting there singularly silent. The section specifically denies citizens the right to call for a local option poll.

Mr. Houston: Or even to present a case.

Mr. BENNETT: That is so.

So keen and so avaricious is the Government to engage in this skulduggery with Mr. Waterhouse, or somebody else—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think I have been fairly tolerant with the hon. member, but he is imputing improper motives, and has been for some time during his speech, and I ask him to withdraw them.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well, I withdraw them.

I merely say that the legislation specifically disallows citizens and taxpayers the right to call for and demand a local option poll, as they can if a local citizen applies for an ordinary permit to run a decent hotel. The only difference in principle is that this international business will be a big business and big money will be involved.

As I asked this afternoon, will there be gambling dens in these joints, as I prefer to call them, because many so-called international hotels are joints? If those who have travelled overseas are "fair dinkum" and genuine, they will admit that, while some international hotels are of a good standard, others are just glorified brothels. What will these be here? We do not know. What will be the calibre of the successful tenderers? Will they retail them to overseas interests as has happened so often?

There are many questionable aspects of the Government's conduct in the introduction of this legislation, and this matter calls for the greatest security. This will be an outlet for graft and corruption. I cannot see why, under the existing legislation, businessmen presently in operation cannot lift the standard of their establishments to international standard, if they have not already done so.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: They have the opportunity.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course they have, and they do not need this provision to do so. This does not give the ordinary businessman in Queensland, who has been conducting his business successfully and satisfactorily for years, an opportunity of being statutorily regarded as having premises of international standard, whereas it does give some interloper the right to be regarded as a person who is constructing premises of international standard. Independent of the admissions made by the hon. member for Chatsworth, my information is that negotiations on this section were conducted some considerable time ago.

I deplore the claim made by way of interjection during my leader's speech that there is no accommodation suitable for international visitors. I should like to hear the Minister for Tourism on this, because that is in sharp contrast with what he has been saying all along. He has claimed that under the guidance of this Government the facilities provided in this State are attractive to international tourists.

Mr. Ahern: Have you been overseas?

Mr. BENNETT: I have not been overseas at the taxpayers' expense, if that is what the hon. member wants to know.

Mr. Lee: You sound as if you have not been out of Brisbane.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for South Brisbane.

Mr. BENNETT: I feel that we can be proud of many of our leading premises. I should like to hear the hon. member for South Coast on the slur that has been cast on Gold Coast accommodation. He has been saying for years that it is first class and that the Gold Coast only needs extra facilities, like liberalised liquor laws, to make it of international importance. Now, by way of interjection, Government members are saying that its places of accommodation are all hick joints and not of international standard. I do not know that we can raise their standard by statute. That can be done only with public demand.

Because we name a place as being of international standard, I do not see that it will be any better than existing premises unless the owner, by his own efforts, makes it better. Any person who wants a licence can set the standard that he desires, and the public demand will be shown by the result that he achieves.

I deprecate the inclusion of this provision in view of the fact that the Government has not been prepared to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Baroona requiring a five-year bond, because I am perfectly satisfied that this licence will be granted to someone who will retail it before the

end of the year at a tremendous profit, as has been done with every other big licence granted in Brisbane in the last decade.

Mr. Hughes: "Knocker."

Mr. BENNETT: It is all very well to say that. I like some honesty. Because there are people who send their contributions to party funds—and I object to legislation being enacted for that purpose—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think I should be classed as a "knocker".

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Again I remind the hon. member that he is imputing improper motives, and I ask him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. BENNETT: I suppose—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I withdraw the remark.

Mr. Murray: You think everyone else runs a slush fund.

Mr. BENNETT: If I claimed that the "ginger group" slush fund had been considerably enhanced by their actions, I would be asked to withdraw.

(Time expired.)

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (10.47 p.m.): I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition would have made a much more constructive contribution to this debate, because he, with me, has had the opportunity of knowing hotels of international standard. He would know all about them, and how difficult it is to put their standards into words. The clause has therefore deliberately been widely written to give the Commission the opportunity to examine the accepted standards of international hotels, wherever they are overseas, and write requirements to cover them.

But enough of that. We have had to listen tonight to one of the most foul-mouthed, scurrilous attacks ever by the hon. member for South Brisbane, who is well known for that sort of thing.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. The Minister is imputing improper motives to me. The remark "foul-mouthed" is particularly offensive, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has taken objection to the remark "foul-mouthed", and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I will withdraw the expression "foul-mouthed" if it offends the hon. member, and say that his breath is as if he had pyorrhoea.

Mr. BENNETT: If the Minister wants to enter into a slanging match, I will start, too. I ask that his remark be withdrawn without qualification.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw his remark.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: If the hon. member for South Brisbane tells me that he does not have pyorrhoea, I will withdraw my statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I withdraw the word "pyorrhoea".

Mr. BENNETT: Withdraw without qualification.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw the remark without qualification.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Which remark?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will withdraw the remark without qualification.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I withdraw the remark.

Over the years hon. members have had the misfortune to listen in this Chamber to many scurrilous attacks on defenceless people under the protection of parliamentary privilege. Tonight the Committee has heard a most damnable attack on the Licensing Commission and its members. They were accused—

Mr. Bennett: Again that is not correct.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. I made no attack on the Licensing Commission. I specifically prefaced my remarks by saying that its members are men of integrity and that I regard them with the greatest respect.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It has been the misfortune of the Committee—

Mr. Bennett: Why don't you tell the truth?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It has been the misfortune of the Committee to listen to a damnable attack on the Licensing Commission.

Mr. Bennett: That is a lie.

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

Mr. Bennett: I will withdraw it, but I want this misinformation withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that if he takes objection to

any particular remark, the Chair will always listen to his objection. At this stage, I am not aware of what his objection is.

Mr. Bennett: The objection is that I said specifically—no doubt it will be noted in "Hansard"—that I have the greatest respect for the integrity of the Licensing Commission.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not believe that a withdrawal is necessary, but I ask the Minister to accept the statement of the hon. member for South Brisbane.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: We heard the Commission accused of secret deals, of accepting hand-outs with tags attached to them—

Mr. Bennett: That is not true.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Tomorrow morning, when the hon. member reads the "Hansard" pulls, he will be ashamed. And so he ought to be! Tomorrow I will bring the contents of "Hansard"—

Mr. Bennett: Bring it into the Chamber.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I will bring it to the notice of the members of the Commission. They are the people who cannot come here and defend themselves.

The hon. member spoke about international standards. The greatest trip that you have ever made, judging by the language you used in reference to innocent people, is a walk to your back-yard lavatory.

Mr. Bennett: I won't tell you about the type of operations you carried out. I will produce the letter—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister to address his remarks to the Chair.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Having said that, I shall study "Hansard" tomorrow with a great deal of diligence.

I have explained the reason why the clause has been written loosely, and I refuse to alter it. As I have told hon. members, the Commission will draw up the regulations covering these matters.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (10.53 p.m.): The Minister has drawn me back into the debate by his reference to visits overseas. I have been overseas and, because of that, I recognise that, in the Tower Mill Motel and the Parkroyal Motel, Brisbane has two places that have suites of rooms every bit as good as those in which I stayed overseas.

Mr. Hughes: They are motels.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is correct; they are motels. The only difference today between a motel and a hotel is that no bar facilities for the public are available at a motel.

Mr. Hughes: There is much more difference than that.

Mr. HOUSTON: No, there is not. That is the only practical difference.

There is no reason why motels—there may be others, but I have been in the two that I mentioned—should not apply to the Commission to be classed as an international hotel.

The Minister stated that it would be impossible to put the standard into words, but he admitted that the regulations will contain the words. If the regulations will contain the words, they should be in the Bill. At least it should be stated in the Bill how many rooms will be required before a hotel can be declared to be of international standard.

Mr. Lee: Do you want plans and specifications, too?

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member should not be facetious. There is talk already of the coming of jumbo jets.

It should be laid down that such a hotel should have 200, or 300, or at least some specified number of rooms. If the Government refuses to designate that an international hotel shall have a certain number of rooms or a certain capacity, it is deliberately leaving it open. Let us look at who are the “knockers”. The “knockers” are those in the Liberal Party and the Country Party who have been saying all night that there is not one hotel of international standard in Queensland today. What a shocking thing to say!

Mr. Rae: There is not one.

Mr. HOUSTON: I suggest to the Minister that he have a look at our Tourist Bureau brochures. They tell people to come to Queensland, where there is first-class accommodation. Hon. members opposite are the “knockers”. We have been accused of being “knockers”.

Government Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! When the Committee comes to order, I will call on the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Bromley: Throw the Ministers out.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Norman to restrain himself while I am on my feet.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Minister said that the hon. member for South Brisbane criticised the Licensing Commission. I say that his colleagues have been criticising the Licensing Commission because for years the Commission has had the responsibility in this State of setting down a standard for hotels. If it has not set down a standard acceptable to international tourists or anyone else who wants to come here, that is its responsibility and it has fallen down on its job.

Mr. Rae: It has upgraded them since the days of Labour.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not denying that. I admit there is an improvement and I welcome it. The whole point is that we

can still get these hotels. Call them “international” or what you like, but let us do it under the same system and rules as apply to every other person who wants to build a hotel in our State. Otherwise the Government is leaving it wide open. This one clause negates every other clause of the Bill. I believe it is deliberate so that, at Government direction, certain things can be done. After all, the negotiations will not be going on with the Licensing Commission when the Government wants these so-called international hotels.

Mr. Hughes: It is obvious that you have no conception of the money required for these undertakings.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is obvious that the hon. member has not, either. Let us consider some of the hotels overseas at which I have stayed. I stayed at the New Otani in Tokyo, a very lovely place, but it is not in the centre of Tokyo; it is miles outside. In fact, it is further from the centre of Tokyo—the most important area where people go—than my electorate is from the centre of Brisbane.

If the hon. member goes to Taipei and has a look at the Grand Hotel, the one all the international tourists like to go to—

Mr. Chalk: Not in Gladstone.

Mr. HOUSTON: I tell the Treasurer this: the food and the rooms provided by the hotel in which the hon. member for Port Curtis was interested provided better food than we had overseas. The room we had our breakfast in—the Minister was with us—was a little poky room similar to a broom cupboard. We wanted an early breakfast. Anyway, I should not care to walk from that hotel to the centre of Taipei.

Who are hon. members opposite trying to kid? Anyone who believes them would believe anything. I am not prepared to believe them on behalf of the electors I represent, nor is any other member of the Opposition. The top-class hotels in Kuala Lumpur and Singapore are all outside what we normally consider the business centre of a city.

A Government Member: What about the Mandarin Hotel in Hong Kong?

Mr. HOUSTON: That is an international hotel. It is worth telling a story about that hotel—and I know the Chairman will allow me to do so. A few other people and I were having some drinks, and one or two of us had “shouted”. The cost was a certain number of dollars. As time passed we were still sitting there, and it was the turn of a certain other hon. member to “shout”, so he bought a round of drinks. They were only small ones, but he was charged double the previous price. Someone asked, “Why the double price?” The reply had arrived, so the prices were doubled.

If that is what will occur at an international hotel to fleece the tourists, I am sure they will not return. I know that the hon. member interjected in good faith, so I told the story.

A Government Member: Who was the other hon. member?

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not saying who he was. The point is that we should have the best possible standard. Let us have big hotels if there is a demand for them, but first let us carry out our own laws and not provide for the exclusion of one section that allows certain things for the people of Queensland. The people want local option polls. They have been held on other matters, so why should not one be held on this matter?

Question—That clause 23, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 40

Ahern	Low
Armstrong	McKechnie
Campbell	Miller
Chalk	Moore, R. E.
Chinchen	Muller
Cory	Murray
Crawford	Newbery
Delamothé	Porter
Fletcher	Rae
Herbert	Ramsden
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Richter
Hewitt, W. D.	Row
Hinze	Sullivan
Houghton	Tomkins
Hughes	Tooth
Hungerford	Wharton
Jones, V. E.	
Kaus	
Knox	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lee	Bird
Lickiss	Heatley
Loneragan	

NOES, 31

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 24 and 25, as read, agreed to.

Clause 26—Amendments to s. 51A; Machines, etc., capable for use for gaming, etc., not to be brought or kept on licensed premises—

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (11.10 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“On page 19, line 50, after the figures ‘1965’ insert the words—

‘or a billiard table within the meaning of those Acts’.”

This is a simple amendment. I believe it was the intention of the Government to allow for this and, on a perusal of the

clause, it is obvious that the amendment is necessary. I have spoken previously today on the desirability of having this type of entertainment machine in public bars because other entertainment machines are presently allowed. This will allow a coin-operated billiard table to be placed in public bars.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.11 p.m.): I accept the amendment. It makes good a deficiency in the framing of the clause and will provide for something that was intended.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.11 p.m.): The Opposition has no objection to the amendment. Some time ago we were made aware of the position of the manufacturer in this area. Not that that is the sole purpose of it, but I do not consider that a person who is manufacturing something in this State should be disadvantaged by the Act. We therefore do not have any objection to the provision of these tables.

Amendment (Mr. Hinze) agreed to.

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (11.12 p.m.): I move the following further amendment:—

“On page 20, line 6, after the word ‘machine’ insert the words—
‘or billiard table’.”

This amendment is consequential on the previous one.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.13 p.m.): I accept this as a consequential amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Hinze) agreed to.

Mr. HINZE (South Coast) (11.14 p.m.): I move the following further amendment:—

“On page 20, line 14, after the word ‘machine’ insert the words—
‘or billiard table’.”

This is another consequential amendment.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.14 p.m.): I accept this as a consequential amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Hinze) agreed to.

Clause 26, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 27—Amendment to s. 51B; Billiard, bagatelle and mini-pool tables excluded from licensed premises—

Mr. HINZE: (South Coast) (11.15 p.m.): For reasons outlined previously, I move the following amendment—

“On page 20, omit all words comprising lines 29 to 33, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following words—

‘27. Repeal of s. 51B. The Principal Act is amended by repealing section 51B.’.”

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.16 p.m.): The amendment introduced by the Minister appears to exempt licensed clubs from the provision that they must not have their premises open at any time, and that billiards

must not be played at any time, other than the time in which it is legal for liquor to be served. If that amendment is replaced by the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Coast, does that mean that the game of billiards can be played only during licensed hours? Many clubs conduct snooker tournaments which continue for perhaps an hour after 10 p.m. The amendment introduced previously by the Minister appeared to allow the playing of billiards in licensed clubs after the hours of closing of the licensed premises to enable tournaments to be completed.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.17 p.m.): There is some slight confusion in the mind of the hon. member for Kedron. Section 51B concerns the placement of billiard tables, and it refers mainly to mini-pool tables in the bar. Naturally when the bar closes tables in the bar will be out of operation, but there is nothing to stop playing on tables in the other rooms in which they are now.

Amendment (Mr. Hinze) agreed to.

Clause 27, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 28 and 29, as read, agreed to.

Clause 30—Repeal of s. 59A; When sale, supply to and consumption by female of liquor at bar permitted—

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (11.18 p.m.): This clause repeals the principal provision of the Act relating to females in bars. Although there have been demands by some women—the suffragette type who chain themselves to bars—for the right to be served in bars, I have some doubt about the wisdom of this provision. I might perhaps be a little old-fashioned. There are no doubt those who are feminine but not ladies, and they may now exercise their right to drink in public bars.

This provision raises the question of age, and other aspects which will make it even more difficult for the police to see that the extended sections of the liquor law are enforced. Whether it could be said to make it easier or more difficult depends on one's own interpretation. I think it will make it infinitely more difficult, because there will be many more places in the licensed premises in which people can congregate.

At the moment, a female cannot go into the public bar of a hotel and partake of intoxicating beverages. The extent to which this will apply is purely a matter of guesswork. I do not know whether the provisions of the United Nations charter relative to the equality of rights for women come into the argument, but I think that—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have constantly appealed for quiet in the Chamber. I appeal once more for quiet.

Mr. HUGHES: I think that womenfolk, in pursuing equality, may lose more than they gain. For example, they may lose some of the old-world courtesies that males have extended to females. One sees today that men are not giving up their seats to women in buses, trains and other forms of public transport as they did in years gone by. I wonder whether this clause may further break down the courtesy that men have shown to women.

I hope that the clause will be policed, particularly as it applies to under-age drinking.

Mr. JENSEN (Bundaberg) (11.22 p.m.): I have nothing against women in public bars—being a member of a golf club, I know that women can take their place in bars beside men—but to ask a lady to walk into a public bar in a hotel today would be like asking one to walk into a hotel lounge 30 years ago. At that time it was considered to be beneath the dignity of a lady to do that, and it was thought that there was something wrong with any woman who did. Thirty years from now women will walk into public bars in hotels just as they walk into a bar at a golf club today and sit and drink beside men.

However, that is not the point. The point is that the Minister has amended the section, as he said, for one purpose: so that women can purchase liquor at a lower price than they do now. Today, women have to go into the lounge or the beer garden of a hotel, and sometimes they have to take a tray and get their own drinks. They are still charged two or three cents more for each drink. If the Minister had amended the Act to provide that a lady in any part of the hotel would be served with liquor at the prices charged in the public bar, she would not have had to lower herself by walking into a public bar.

Mr. Ahern: She does not have to.

Mr. JENSEN: This is something that one has to become used to. The hon. member would not take his wife into a public bar, but he would take her into a bar at a golf club. It will be accepted in time, but I think that today a part partition could be erected in the public bar, not to segregate the sexes, but so that ladies could drink in a certain section of the bar if they did not wish to mix with a lot of drunks. As I said, this will come about gradually. The only women who will go into a public bar today are those who are a little bit drunk, or those who are loose and want to sit on someone's knee and drink with him. I know that Ministers may not mind that, but I mind because my wife will hear about it.

I am old enough to know what happened 30 years ago, and, as I said, in those days no lady would walk into a hotel lounge on her own. Today, no lady, young or old, minds walking into a hotel lounge or beer garden.

They are caught hand over fist. The publican charges them two or three cents more because they are in that section of the hotel even though he does not provide service. I see that every day of my life. The ladies take the tray out and get their own drinks, but they pay two or three cents more for them.

Mr. Sullivan: Do you spend every day of your life in a hotel?

Mr. JENSEN: No, I see this as I pass the hotels. I do not go into them, as the Minister does. The important point is that ladies who want a drink are caught all along the line because they have to drink in the lounge or beer garden. The Minister knows that if the hoteliers were forced to charge ladies in that section the same as is charged in the public bar they would not want to enter the public bar. That is a fact. If the Minister cares to visit any hotel and speak with the ordinary labouring man he will be told that they do not understand why this should be done.

Yesterday I was at a hotel at Mt. Gravatt and was talking to a couple of chaps there. I was not having a drink; I was just talking to them. They said, "How could you have ladies coming in here and drinking with us?"

Mr. Sullivan: What time of the day was this?

Mr. JENSEN: This was yesterday afternoon, between half past 4 and 6 o'clock. I spoke to them for an hour and a half in order to get their opinions. Unlike the Minister and others with him, I like to get the people's opinions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. JENSEN: I am sorry, Mr. Hooper. The Minister wanted my opinion and I gave it to him. What I have said is a fact. The Minister could find it out in hotels in his own district. That may not be quite right, because in the West the gins go into the bar and drink with the Minister. That does not happen in this city.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. JENSEN: The Minister is trying to get me off the track. Yesterday afternoon I discussed this matter with quite a few people at the Mt. Gravatt hotel. It is a hotel that will probably open on Sunday. The suburban hotels will open, but the city hotels will not. I usually go to Nundah but the Minister for Transport has taken over there. I went to Mt. Gravatt and I asked these men what they thought of this idea and they said bluntly, "How could you have ladies coming into this bar?" I said, "You are not with the times. Thirty years ago a lady would not enter a lounge. If you were in my golf club in Bundaberg—that is in Bargarra—one of the nicest clubs in Queensland, and probably in Australia, overlooking the sea, you would sit in the bar and the ladies would sit with you and have a drink.

There is nothing improper about that; it is a fact of life." Today this is not a fact of life in a hotel. It might take 20 years before it becomes a fact of life.

If the Minister would stop the racketeering that goes on with ladies going in for a drink, they would not go into the bar. The Minister has done this for a purpose and it is a good one. I admire him for getting up and saying that it has been done so that ladies may obtain a drink at the same price as men, but it will not be effective next year, or probably for the next 10 years.

Clause 30, as read, agreed to.

Clause 31—Amendments to s. 60; Minor not allowed in bars—

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (11.30 p.m.): This clause relates to increased penalties imposed upon under-age drinkers, and must receive the approbation of the Committee. The penalty has been raised from £20 and not less than £10 to \$100 and not less than \$60. That amendment typifies the Government's attitude to the policing of the Act in that it has imposed a minimum penalty of a fairly substantial amount instead of a token amount. In our affluent society the earning capacity of people, particularly young people, is such that a few dollars does not amount to a lot. They could laugh at the law. They pay as much as \$5 to hear a pop singer at the Festival Hall. A minimum of \$60 and a maximum of \$100 should have a telling effect on people who blatantly and flagrantly breach this provision of the Act.

Clause 31, as read, agreed to.

Clause 32—Amendments to s. 60A; Beer gardens on licensed premises—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.32 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 21, lines 19 and 20, omit the words—

'nor less than sixty dollars'."

Section 60A relates to beer gardens and repeats and reinforces the penalties imposed upon minors in order to discourage them from visiting beer gardens and from consuming liquor or being found with it in their possession. By moving the amendment, I do not suggest that the Opposition is against a minimum penalty of \$60 for under-age drinkers who consume liquor or have it in their possession. However, under section 60, which has been amended—and the Opposition endorses the increased penalty as a deterrent—a minimum penalty of \$60 is provided. An under-age person found in a beer garden can be fined a minimum of \$60, and there is a distinction between section 60, as now amended, and section 60A. There is no minimum penalty if a person is found on the premises in a bar but a minimum of \$60 is imposed upon a person who is found consuming liquor or with it in his possession.

We believe that the same provisions should apply to beer gardens. Possibly it might not be desirable for a person to be in a beer

garden, but there might be more reason for a youngster being in a beer garden than in a hotel bar. Certain beer gardens provide entertainment, and a young person might go in to listen to the entertainment and not to drink. Of course, he is forbidden to go into the beer garden; but we believe that the penalties should be consistent. If he is consuming liquor or found with it in his possession, indicating that he intends to consume it, he should be fined a minimum of \$60, and if he is found in a beer garden he should pay the same penalty as if he were found in the bar. We cannot see how his presence in the beer garden is more serious than his presence in the bar, whether he is drinking liquor or has it in his possession.

I move the amendment, not to delete the minimum penalty but to make it conform to the provisions relative to the bar.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.35 p.m.): I will accept the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Hanlon) agreed to.

Clause 32, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 33, as read, agreed to.

Clause 34—New s. 61A; Certificate as to age—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.36 p.m.): This clause introduces a new provision enabling the licensee or his servant to seek a certificate of age from someone suspected of being under age. It will be an offence to refuse to furnish a certificate. It is probably true to say that the deterrent raised by requesting a certificate will prove effective in some cases, but in others it will be like the old visitors' book for Sunday drinking; young fellows will sign any name at all. However, it will be an offence for them to do so and they will be aware, from the prescribed form, that it is a serious offence.

This provision gives more protection than is provided in the Act, as the licensee or his servant can seek such a certificate. The clause states that a person is not guilty of the offence of supplying liquor to an under-age person if he shows that at the time of supplying the liquor he obtained from that person a certificate, as prescribed by the provision, which indicated that the person had attained the age of 21.

The Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union approached us because it is very concerned about the difficulty confronting bar attendants in judging a person's age. It believes the onus should not be placed on the bar attendant, and that his duties should not encompass determining whether people are under age or not. The union pointed out to us that if something is not done about this, industrial unrest will arise because the members are becoming more resentful as the problem is now more difficult.

As I said earlier today, young people now have long hair and so on. It is hard enough to judge a male's age today, and sometimes it is hard to judge whether a person is in fact a male. It is extremely difficult to determine a female's age, and there is a possibility that females of 21 years of age will enter bars. It is fair for the union to say on behalf of its members, "We have had enough of being made the 'bunny' to an increasing extent." The union claims that it incurs considerable expense at times in defending its members. The current practice, I understand, is that if an admission is not made by the bar attendant he is not proceeded against because the Act says that the person must be apparently under the age of 21.

We tried to remove the onus from the bar attendant or servant of the licensee, but it is not possible to do so under this legislation, or any other Bill, because the section under which the bar attendant is breached is the one under which anyone could be breached for a pure act of supplying liquor. It is an offence even to "shout" liquor to a teenager. It is therefore virtually impossible to remove the onus from the bar attendant. If it were removed it would be an "open slather" for anyone to give liquor to teenagers. It could be argued that the onus should be on the teenager entirely as he is the only one who knows his age.

We think that the certificate gives the licensee and his servant a little assistance as they can secure a certificate from anyone whom they suspect to be under age. When completing the certificate he is aware that he is committing an offence if he completes it falsely. We should meet the union's difficulties by inserting an amendment that will not make it necessary for bar attendants to have to seek certificates.

If a young fellow is obstreperous, a female bar attendant might not want to ask him to furnish this certificate. An awkward situation could arise, even for a male attendant. He could get a "bunch of fives" very quickly if he asked some young fellows for a certificate. If they were over 21 years of age they could take grave exception to the suggestion that they were under-age. These are the problems confronting bar attendants in this regard.

We acknowledge that it is not possible to overcome this situation fully. However, to the extent that we and the union wish to endeavour to be fair to these bar attendants, I move the following amendment.—

"On page 21, line 45, after the word 'age' add the words—

'or, being an employee in the licensed premises concerned and not being in charge of the part of those premises wherein the minor concerned was supplied with, given or treated liquor, he requested the licensee or other person in charge of that part of the

licensed premises to obtain from the minor concerned such a certificate before he supplied, permitted to be supplied, gave or treated the liquor to the minor."

I presume that "he", as usual, means "he or she."

This means that the licensee, his servant, or bar attendant may ask for the certificate of age, but if the employee does not want to do it, and assuming that he is not the person in charge of the premises or the bar in question, he can approach the bar manager or the licensee, or whoever is in charge of the premises or that part of them in which he is working, and say, "I think that lad, or lass, is under 21 years of age", and can call on the bar manager or licensee to ask for the certificate. This relieves him of that obligation.

We believe that this amendment goes a little of the way to overcoming the problem confronting union members. I move it in that spirit without suggesting that it is the complete answer.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.43 p.m.): I consider that this is a reasonable addition to the clause, and I am happy to accept it.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (11.44 p.m.): This is, at last, some semblance of a provision that is capable of being administered properly. There has always been a question about the age of a person. The Act provides that the persons should not serve any person apparently under the age of 21 years. The question was: was it apparent that he was under 21 years of age? This became a matter for discourse and debate and one of interpretation and qualification.

In doing this the Government is setting guide-lines which will protect those in the industry. It can be expected, and rightly so, having provided this protection, that if there is a doubt in the mind of the server of alcohol or the licensee, he can demand that the person requesting service sign a certificate. If the person refuses to sign, the server is then obligated to say, "Out", or accept the risk of being caught serving an under-age drinker, if that is the case.

The person desiring to be served could sign—no doubt this will happen, as I said earlier—"Peter Delamothé" or "Pat Hanlon", or the name of some other widely known person. Then it is a question of how far the bar attendant will be able to check.

To what extent would these people be subject to a penalty if they accepted such statements in good faith? The clause states—

"If a person, on being requested to furnish a certificate under this section—

(a) fails to furnish such a certificate; or

(b) furnishes such a certificate that is false or misleading in any material particular,

that person is guilty of an offence against this Act."

I should like to know the extent of the penalty, and against whom it would be imposed. Is this a statutory declaration that has to be given? Does it come under the Oaths Act? Is a minimum penalty prescribed?

I think the Committee should be made aware of these things. Where are the penalties prescribed? To whom do they apply? Do they apply only to the person giving the certificate, or also to the person receiving it? If somebody signed "Louis XIV" or "Bob Menzies", it would be fairly obvious to anyone with any degree of common sense that he was merely laughing at the law. On the other hand, if the person receiving the certificate said, "I am too busy. That will do me", and proceeded to serve the person giving it, to what extent would he be subject to a penalty?

There is also the question of the policing of motels. Does this provision apply to licensees of motels, restaurants, and function rooms? Does it encompass all aspects of the amendments as they relate to all types of licences? There is also the question of serving liquor in bottles on licensed premises. We are now asking hotels to provide bottle departments opening onto a street. That is worth while, but it increases the opportunities for under-age persons to obtain liquor. Where do we go from here?

Earlier I referred to some States of America, particularly Hawaii, in which this problem was experienced, as is shown by the report of the Liquor Commission on this question. When young civilians presented themselves on licensed premises, the licensees were at a disadvantage because it was difficult for them to ascertain whether the identification cards presented belonged to the persons presenting them, and one mistake could possibly cost a licensee his means of livelihood. They then called for drivers' licences, and the commission even recommended that an automobile driver's licence contain a photograph of the person to whom it was issued, in addition to fingerprints and other information already contained in it. The case of non-drivers was also considered. However, I shall not go into all the details of that report.

What will be the penalty on a licensee of licensed premises if he has more than one conviction? To what extent will the Licensing Commission act if there are many offences by a licensee under this section of the Act?

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (11.50 p.m.): I do not know whether I should reply to the hon. member for Kurilpa. The

solution is a very simple one but the Minister, being a mere medico, may not be able to supply the answer.

The section, of course, creates an offence, that is, to give a false certificate. If it is proven that the teenager concerned gave a false certificate, he obviously is liable. Equally, if the bar attendant or the bar manager accepts a certificate in good faith and believes it to be a true and valid certificate, he commits no offence. Many defences would be open to him, including a defence under section 24 of the Criminal Code. He would be liable only if he knowingly accepted a false certificate and acted on it as a means of contravening the Act.

The general penalty clause is contained in section 155 of the principal Act, which says—

"Any person who is guilty of any contravention of this Act for which no penalty is herein otherwise provided shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding \$200.

Any person who contravenes or fails to comply with any provision of this Act shall be guilty of an offence against the Act."

One has only to study the Act. It is a very simple answer.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.51 p.m.): The hon. member for South Brisbane left unanswered one part of the question asked by the hon. member for Kurilpa, who asked what would happen in a motel. The provision of a certificate applies to all licensed premises.

Amendment (Mr. Hanlon) agreed to.

Clause 34, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 35 and 36, as read, agreed to.

Clause 37—Repeal of and new s. 69; Licensed victualler's hours of trading—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (11.52 p.m.): I have circulated an amendment which I think comes before the one circulated by the hon. member for Kurilpa. Others were circulated by the hon. member for Toowong and, I think, by the hon. member for Ithaca. I do not know whether or not they will be proceeding with them, but I think my amendment is the one to be moved first.

I have put it forward because of the doubt that I expressed as to the conditions of trading on a Sunday now that the 40-mile limit has been removed. I put two questions directly to the Minister during the second-reading debate: firstly, a question as to the Government's intention of keeping the doors and windows of bars closed; secondly, as to whether sales would be allowed through the bottle department. All I could gather from the Minister's reply was that he has not directly provided for those things in the Bill.

That is the Opposition's interpretation of the clause, too. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber cannot find anything in it

requiring doors and windows of bars to be closed or anything that would prevent bottle departments from opening. However, it is suggested—I think the hon. member for Ithaca has envisaged this in opposition in one of his proposed amendments—that it could be held that if the hotel did open, the licensed victualler should open all sections of his premises, including the bottle department. The Opposition believes that the bottle department should be open for people who wish to call at the premises and buy bottled beer to take home.

The clause provides—

"The Commission may from time to time by order impose conditions and limitations in respect of the sale, supply, drinking and consumption of liquor during the permitted hours generally or in relation to a particular district or to particular premises and may at any time revoke an order so made."

Roughly, that is what is in the section that is being repealed. It could be suggested that this may be a condition imposed by the Commission. The Minister may say that the proposed amendment is not necessary, and the Opposition is loath to take away from the clause the general supervisory power of the Commission in that regard.

We are also aware that the Commission has general powers under other sections of the Act that could probably be applied in a similar way, but we want to make it quite clear that we do not wish to see Sunday trading, which will be operative if this clause is passed—I do not want to "jump the gun" in that respect—conducted under terms of hypocrisy or subterfuge, with closed doors and windows and customers being forced to enter by a back entrance to the hotel. We also want to make it clear that we think bottle departments should be able to operate on Sundays.

I take this opportunity of thanking the Minister for the way in which he has received a number of our amendments. We sometimes complain about the treatment we receive in these matters, although sometimes we put forward amendments that are strictly clashes of opinion between the Opposition and the Government and it is obvious that the Government will not accept them. We put them forward to stress a principle of policy. Tonight the Minister has accepted several amendments that have been moved by the Opposition, and I thank him for the manner in which he has done so when he thought they may be beneficial to the Act.

I suggest that this amendment may be of a different character. We are moving it to put on record, in case the commission, for some reason that we do not know, makes a general order to stop bottle department sales in a district or something of that sort, or brings in some weird regulation to close bar doors

and windows, that we did not envisage anything of that nature. I accordingly move the following amendment:—

"On page 23, after line 38, insert the following proviso:

'Provided that no such order shall vary during the permitted hours the conditions of entry to, or exit from, or the ventilation of, or the sale or supply of liquor in all parts of the licensed premises, whether generally or in relation to a particular district or to particular premises from such conditions as apply during any day or time during which the sale of liquor is authorised by this section.'

If we had more time to secure the advice of the Parliamentary Draftsman in this matter we might have a more extensive amendment or one better drawn than that, but I move it in order to put our contentions on paper to show that we think that conditions as we outline them should operate if Sunday trading becomes general throughout the State. Indeed, it has been our opinion that bars should have been able to operate anyway, although they were not allowed to do so in the area outside the 40-mile limit.

We know that the Commission previously had the discretion to allow the use of bars in some areas because of conditions of heat or because lounges may not be suitable, but applications were made in some western towns and were refused by the Commission for reasons of which we are not aware. It is not something new to suggest that we think ordinary, normal trading should apply during that period.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (11.58 p.m.): I am unable to accept this amendment. I want the Commission to retain the widest possible freedom to meet any possible circumstances that arise.

Mr. Hanlon: You believe it is unlikely that they will introduce any restriction of that nature?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It is up to them.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (11.59 p.m.): I regret very much that the Minister has not come out definitely and told the people of Queensland whether or not the doors and windows of hotel bars will be open. It would have been very simple for him to say one way or the other and make it very clear to the Commission what the Government wants.

The Commission is set up to conduct affairs connected with drinking of alcoholic liquors in this State. Surely it is required to carry out Government policy—that is why an Act is in force—but apparently it is Government policy to hold the crazy belief that it will make Sunday drinking moral merely by closing the doors and windows. Some time ago in Roma an application was

lodged with the Licensing Commission to permit Sunday drinking in bars. The Commission rejected the application by a majority decision. One member believed that the application was reasonable, and the other two thought it was not.

Surely we should not tolerate a situation in which a statutory body's decision is based on an individual's belief that doors and windows should or should not be open. That is the Government's responsibility. Perhaps it is natural to provide that windows in air-conditioned hotels in country areas should be closed. They will be closed anyway to ensure that the air-conditioning works properly. But the closed windows do not stop people from looking out or others from looking in. And if the doors are to be closed, how will people get in? Will they be required to knock on the door and then wait on the footpath until they are let in? If they are permitted legally to go in, what is the sense in providing that the doors should be closed?

What about hotels that do not have air-conditioning? In a number of the hotels in western towns that I have visited—I begin to wonder whether the Minister knows his own State—people in the bars could not stand the heat if the windows and doors were closed. It would be so hot that they would drink more than usual—and perhaps that is what the Government wants. It is not common sense to provide facilities and then, without giving a reason, say to those people who wish to use them that they cannot.

The Minister has not given any reason for his belief that hotel doors and windows should be closed, particularly in the bars. He said that he will leave the matter to the Commission; but, as I have said, already the Commission has made rulings on policy matters and its members have not always reached unanimous decisions.

I could cite many hotels that have air-conditioning and many others that have not. If the provision is designed to prevent noise from coming out of the bar, it will not do so; if it is to keep the drinkers out of sight, it is putting drinking at a very low level in our society. In effect the Government would be saying, "You can have drink on Sunday, but do not let anyone else see you drink." That is not an enlightened drinking law. If the Press reports are correct, the Minister said that Queensland will have the most advanced laws in Australia for the next 100 years. If the provision designed to keep the doors and windows closed is an advanced law, I would hate to see laws that are not advanced.

As for bottle departments, although the Government has done everything possible to encourage people to drink on Sundays at hotels, apparently it does not want to enable them to buy bottles of liquor and take them home to drink. It could be argued that it is more desirable to make people go home and drink than to require them to stay at hotels.

The ordinary person does not keep a refrigerator full of "grog". The claim that people can buy enough liquor on Friday to last over the week-end is without foundation. Normally, people do not worry about having their refrigerators stocked with beer over the week-end. On occasions some friends drop in unexpectedly, and, owing to the fact that hotels have not been open on Sundays in Brisbane, the custom has been for the host to take his friends to the local bowling club or golf club, where, as visitors, they are able to drink and talk.

What will happen now if a couple of friends arrive? The men will go to the hotel and the women will stay at home with the children, but the men cannot bring back a bottle to them. It is all right for the men to drink, but not the women. We are saying, "Good on you; drink as much as you want on Sunday at the hotel but don't dare to take a bottle away to drink at home."

One of the arguments in favour of opening bars on Sundays is that women go into hotel lounges during the week to drink in comfort, without having men around. On Sundays they will go to the lounge to drink, but they will be unable to drink in private with only females present. The men are being forced out of the bars into the lounges, and complaints have been received about stuffiness and general conditions associated with over-crowding. By doing this the Government is appearing to be more modern and up-to-date, but we are going further ahead with the old idea of, out of sight out of mind.

I am disappointed that the Minister and the Government have refused to accept the reasonable amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona to ensure that no doubt remains in anyone's mind that the Government wants the doors and windows opened on Sunday, just as on any other day of the week. In addition, the bottle department should also be opened for the major purpose of encouraging people who wish to have a drink on Sunday to take home a bottle of beer or wine. It should not be thought that the only drink taken home is bottled beer. Many people like to drink wine with friends whom they have not seen for a long time. If people wish to do that, it is their own affair as long as they do not interfere with others.

By this legislation we are creating a situation that has no advantages for anyone. I hope that the Minister tells us in reply how he believes the Commission can justify having closed doors and windows in hotels on Sundays. To my knowledge, that has not been made public.

[Friday, 20 March, 1970]

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (12.8 a.m.): The Minister's demeanour in this matter and his answer to the member for Baroona indicated clearly that the remarks

published in the Press purporting to report his attitude to these amendments were correct. It is clear that the Minister is admitting the Press statement that he proposed to close the doors and windows of hotels on Sundays. That has not been denied by the Minister, who gave the Press a wealth of information about the legislation—more than he has given to Parliament. When this matter was raised by the Leader of the Opposition earlier in the debate, the Minister did not deny that that was his intention. It was laid on the line by the hon. member for Baroona when he moved the amendment, and again the Minister is not prepared to declare where he stands.

At the risk of being personally abused by the Minister again, I can only say that the Government's attitude to this legislation is typical of its behind-closed-doors tactics. I am satisfied that it is proposed—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that the hon. member is once again imputing improper motives. I do not know whether I misunderstood him or not, but I should like him to withdraw the remark. From the chair, I took it that he was imputing improper motives.

Mr. BENNETT: I withdraw it again, Mr. Hooper. I must say that, as a responsible parliamentarian trying to do my duty, it is my firm belief, having listened intently to the debate and the Minister, and having read the Press and the Minister's publication in it and observed the reaction to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona, that the doors and windows of hotels will be closed on Sundays and that drinkers will be sealed off.

A Government Member: That is not definite.

Mr. BENNETT: If the Minister assures me that I am wrong, I will accept the assurance. Why cannot somebody assure me on this? I am entitled to be logical and honest in the matter.

The Minister dealt with one aspect of the situation. He said that he does not want to interfere with the discretion of the Commission in this regard. Incidentally, when I say this, I hope that nobody will be puerile enough to suggest that I am attacking the Commission. I suppose it is commendable not to want to interfere with the Commission's discretion. However, we are the top court in the land; we are much more important than the Licensing Commission, and we are responsible for the conduct of this legislation and its implementation and administration.

I do not suggest that the Minister personally should give any directions, but I do suggest quite clearly that Parliament should direct the Commission that it does not want bar doors and windows closed on Sundays in an unhygienic fashion. I am not

suggesting any impropriety on the part of the Commission when I say that it is our duty to direct it.

Mr. Hinz: Can you read that in the Bill?

Mr. Houston: The Minister will not give us an undertaking.

Mr. Hanlon: It is possible the Commission will order it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If hon. members desire to speak to this clause, they have the opportunity to do so. The hon. member for South Brisbane has the call, and I ask hon. members to observe decorum and give him the hearing he deserves.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not argue that it is in the clause. I say that the Commission has power to impose this condition both under the existing legislation and under the proposed legislation. I feel that the Minister, either consciously or unconsciously, has given a strong indication to the Commission that the Government wishes bar doors and windows to be closed, and I am asking the Minister to clarify the position.

Leaving out of it the discretionary provisions, and what the Commission might impose, I should like an assurance that the Minister will not promulgate regulations under the Act to ensure that bar doors and windows are closed. He has the power to do that under section 19 (2), which deals with the "screening, partitioning, seclusion, or segregation of persons consuming liquor." If it is argued that he has not the power under that section, then, under section 168, which is the general section dealing with regulations, the Minister has wide powers to introduce regulations covering any provision of the Act. After naming several specific provisions, that section says that the Governor in Council may from time to time make regulations generally to give effect to the objects and purposes of this Act.

Mr. Hanlon: Regulations promulgated by the Minister would come before Parliament, whereas an order by the Commission under this clause would not and we could not do anything about it.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. And as so often happens, a regulation can be promulgated while Parliament is in recess, and by the time Parliament reconvenes it is a fait accompli. Therefore, it is not unreasonable for us to expect, require and demand of the Minister that he indicate his attitude to this matter. If he cannot indicate the Government's attitude, he certainly is in a position to indicate his own attitude on what the Commission should do.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (12.15 a.m.): I do not think the Opposition is unreasonable in this request, and I should like to hear a little more from the Minister on it. As I understand it, the Licensing Commission

is given a discretion in the matter. We should probe that for a few moments. There could be a hotel with a frontage upon a street, possibly in close proximity to a church or a footpath used by pedestrians on their way to church. Under those circumstances, there may be a case for closing the doors and windows of that hotel.

But I draw to the Minister's attention the great number of drive-in hotels that are far removed from street frontages, with large areas of parking space between the street frontages and the hotels. Under those circumstances, the doors and windows of the hotel could be opened, and they would be nowhere near the passing pedestrian traffic.

I therefore do not look for a blanket coverage. I grant that there may be cases where doors and windows should be shut, but I establish with equal validity that there are cases where they could be opened without offering any offence to anybody. All I want from the Minister is an assurance that reasonable discretion will be exercised, and that there will not be a blanket coverage on this matter. I think we are entitled to hear a little more from him.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (12.17 a.m.): To my way of thinking, Sunday trading is either legitimate or illegitimate, and the amendment now before the Committee will make it legitimate. If it is right that one should be able to drink on Sunday, I think that the doors and windows of hotels should be opened so that those who wish to take advantage of the opening of hotels will be able to drink in proper conditions.

I deplore any attempt to cast a veil of "sly-grogging" over legitimate Sunday trading, as is being done at the moment by the Minister's refusal to give the assurance sought. It is easy to say, "This will be done" or, "This will not be done", but I will not agree with any attempt to leave the matter up in the air.

On the one hand, certain actions are now apparently to be legitimate, and, on the other hand, certain other actions are to be illegitimate. I do not think that that is right. If doors and windows of bars are going to be kept shut, we are virtually branding as criminals those who drink in bars on Sundays. We are saying, "We will hide these people who are in there having a drink, even though they are having a drink legitimately." We are opening the bars, yet we are keeping the doors shut so that drinkers will not be seen. What will people read into that ridiculous idea? The impression will be given that some sort of subversive meeting is being held. The doors and windows will be closed so that people outside will not be able to see what is going on inside. Surely that is not in the interests of the general public.

If I may again be a little parochial, I repeat that this has been going on in my area for eight years. People are forced to drink behind closed doors or out in the back of

hotels. As an indication of the popularity of Sunday drinking, I mention that hoteliers have told me that they do more business on Sundays than on Mondays. Yet for eight years people have been forced to have their drinks in this snide fashion. Surely to goodness it is time we faced up to our obligations and said, "If Sunday drinking is legitimate, let us open it to the general public." People should not go past and hear noises and say, "There is drinking going on behind closed doors."

What about the climatic conditions in North Queensland? The Minister's remarks amazed me. He should know that many of the bars in North Queensland are not air-conditioned. What will happen when scores of men are together in those bars? The bar in summer will be like a sauna bath in less than an hour with the windows and doors shut. The Minister knows that what I am saying is true.

Mr. Murray: Scores of men and women now.

Mr. TUCKER: Yes. For goodness sake open the windows and doors and let the people in the bars drink in a civilised fashion.

The hon. member for Baroona and other members of the Opposition committee and I sat down and went through this clause line by line. As we went through it, we decided that there may not be anything objectionable in it. I am still of that opinion, up to a point. That is why the Opposition has asked the Minister this evening to make a statement that its interpretation of the clause is correct, that there is nothing to prevent the opening of windows and doors and nothing to prevent the bottle sales. The hon. member for Baroona has already canvassed that point.

The peculiar situation has been created that one can now legitimately drink in a hotel for four hours on Sunday. A person who drinks quickly will be able to leave the hotel in the evening as blind as a bat. A person will be able to drink as much as he likes and as quickly as he likes, as long as he can pay for it. However, under the regulations, apparently, a person will not be able to buy a bottle of beer and take it home and have it at lunch time on Sunday with his wife and family. What sort of crazy, screwy thinking is that?

Some people say, "You can buy bottles of beer on Saturday and take them home." That is true to some extent, but there are always times—I know this from personal experience—when people drop in on Sunday afternoon. I say, "By jove, it's nice to see you", and then I look in the refrigerator and see that I have one or two bottles of beer, but not enough for all those who have called. I should like to be able to slip down to the hotel, buy a couple of bottles, and come home and have them quietly in my own home. Under the clause, it appears that I will not be able to do that.

As I read the Bill, a person in a motel on a Sunday will be able to have a drink at any time. He can ring room service and drink quite legitimately, and I do not see anything wrong with that.

I come from an area in which it is very hot indeed for many months of the year. In my opinion, it is absolutely stupid to talk about leaving doors and windows closed when a bar is full of men and women, and something should be done about that now.

Mr. Low: Don't you think that the Commission will use common sense?

Mr. TUCKER: I do not know. One hopes that it will. However, one always seems to run into the unexpected. Having in mind the questions that are asked and the discussions on liquor that take place in this Chamber, I think it is preferable to spell it out in the clause and say, "You may do this. You may not do that."

I believe that it is rather sad that the Government, when it decided to bring down a Bill providing for a large number of amendments to the Liquor Act, did not consolidate the Act as has been done in South Australia.

The consolidated legislation could then provide what can be done and what cannot be done. Surely that is desirable from the viewpoint of policing these laws. It would then not be necessary to place a whole set of amendments alongside provisions in the principal Act.

The difficulty of policing some of these provisions is exemplified by the fact that a number of Opposition members studied this Bill and came to the conclusion that, as it stands, windows and doors could be opened and bottles sold. When we asked the Minister to say whether or not we were right, we could not get a reply. The hon. member for Baroona asked the question. I ask it on behalf of North Queenslanders and point out that if the Bill is passed in its present form those things must follow automatically.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (12.26 a.m.): I did not want to enter this debate but I feel, in view of what has been said on this particular clause, that one ought to outline the history of Government members' thinking on this aspect. It has been said that this whole idea is sinister; it has been described also as ridiculous. As one who has been closely linked with these amendments over two years now, I want to say—

Mr. Houston: So you did have it in mind to do something two years ago?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Yes. If the Leader of the Opposition has not read the newspapers for the last two years, I excuse his ignorance.

Mr. Houston: Why did you campaign as you did during the election?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I won't go into digressions from this clause.

The **CHAIRMAN**: Order! Is the hon. member aware that we are debating an amendment at the moment?

Mr. RAMSDEN: From my understanding of the debate we are discussing the problem of closed doors and windows, and it is on this subject that I wish to speak because the thing that activated Government members in their stand on liquor reform was the self-evident words we have heard so often, namely, sectional legislation. It is true that in the 1961 amendment of the Act the then Government, which was the same politically as it is today, brought in certain provisions which permitted Sunday hotel trading in country areas and, indeed, in areas outside a 40-mile radius of Brisbane.

Mr. Davies: Why didn't you give us the referendum in the country at that time?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Because the hon. member did not ask for one. Over the years, it has been abundantly apparent that clubs such as bowling clubs, golf clubs and the like, have had certain rights in regard to Sunday trading.

Mr. Bennett: Under the Act?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Yes, under the Act. Surely the hon. member for South Brisbane who is a brilliant lawyer should know these things.

Mr. Bennett: You are on the right track now.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Perhaps the only mistake I made was in the use of the word "brilliant".

Let me say that one of the matters that has concerned members of the Government parties, and should concern the Opposition if it is sincere in its arguments, is that the man who can afford to belong to a club can have his drink on Sunday during certain permitted hours while the man who cannot afford to belong to a club is denied it.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am glad to have the assurance of hon. members opposite on that. One of the purposes of our examination of Sunday trading was to try to give to the person not in a club the same rights and privileges as the man who could afford to be in a club, whether in the country or in the towns.

Mr. Hanlon: You still will not be doing that because the clubs will be open from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. now.

Mr. RAMSDEN: They may be. When we review the matter of closed doors and windows we must remember that the history of this legislation is that the hotel-trader outside the 40-mile limit was allowed to trade in lounges only. Will the Opposition concede that?

Mr. Hanlon: Except that the Licensing Commission approved otherwise in special circumstances.

Mr. RAMSDEN: Complaints then came from many country hotels that the only areas that were air-conditioned were the bars and that the lounges were too hot and stuffy to be used. It was on that basis that the celebrated Roma case, which has already been mentioned, was argued.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: Some of the small hotels could not do anything about the lounges anyway because they could not afford to.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That could well be so. I speak now as a private member. With the idea of bringing about equality between people who could drink and those who could not, it was decided that if country hotels were allowed to conduct a bar trade on Sundays, simply because they cannot afford air-conditioned lounges or have not got them, the discrimination between country and city hotels would be perpetuated.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: A hotel-keeper in Birdsville could not put in air-conditioning, could he?

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is right. Members of the Opposition should accept this argument as a historic one, not a political one. There is nothing sinister or hypocritical about the Government's decision; it was merely to meet the objections that had been raised by country hotels.

Mr. Houston: You let them trade in the bar. You want them to trade in the bar.

Mr. RAMSDEN: If they cannot afford to pay for air-conditioning. The hon. member for Townsville North said that hotels in his electorate do not have air-conditioned bars.

Mr. Houston: Plenty of Brisbane hotels do not have air-conditioned bars.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That might be so. I am only saying that we are extending to other hotels conditions that apply to country hotels.

Mr. Davies: What is your argument?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am sorry that the hon. member for Maryborough is too dull at this hour of the morning to understand my argument. I do not intend to repeat it; my time is too valuable. I suggest that he read "Hansard" tomorrow when his mind is clearer.

Mr. Houston: You have not answered the question about windows and doors. Should they be open?

Mr. Hanlon: When did this business about windows and doors first appear on the table of your caucus? Nobody would have thought of it, except that it was announced that the doors and windows would be closed.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I have already tried to explain that it was decided to allow people into bars to enjoy the air-conditioned surroundings. Surely hon. members opposite know enough about the principles of engineering to realise that the windows and doors of an air-conditioned room are kept shut.

I turn now to the rather vexed question about the sale of bottles. The whole purpose of the Government members' decision was to give to the man who could not afford to go into a club the same rights and privileges as those enjoyed by a member of a club. I ask hon. members opposite to be quite definite in their answers. Are they advocating the sale of bottled liquor at clubs? If they are, their argument about hotels is quite valid. If they are arguing that they are not prepared to permit the sale of bottled liquor by clubs—

Mr. Hanlon: The clubs can stay open for an extended period but the hotels are open for only four hours.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am referring to a principle, namely, the sale of liquor in bottles, whether the premises are open for an hour or two hours. If Opposition members are prepared to allow hotels to sell bottled beer on Sundays, they should be equally and legitimately prepared, if we are not to have sectional legislation, to let clubs do the same.

Mr. Hanlon: They have a different type of licence altogether.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I realise that.

Mr. Tucker interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member for Merthyr that he is required to address the Chair and that he is not required to answer interjections.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I fully appreciate that I should address the Chair and I also appreciate that I have no need to answer interjections. However, they have been of such a nature that I wanted to answer them. They have shown quite clearly the Opposition's attitude to these two matters.

I state without hesitation that the design of this clause is to give equality to people outside and inside clubs. If Opposition members want to argue about that, let them say so.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (12.37 a.m.): I listened intently to the hon. member as he went on and on, but I could not follow him at all. I know it is difficult to give the history of what goes on in the Government caucus, particularly on a matter like liquor, but the hon. member for Chatsworth obviously recognises what we are trying to do. We want a clear-cut assurance that bottle sales on Sundays will be permitted in the four hours during which hotels are open, and that there will not be any nonsense about doors and windows being closed.

The hon. member said that if we are to have bottle sales from hotels on Sundays we should agree to club sales of bottles. No such thing is intended. A club licence is granted for the benefit of people taking part in club activities. A hotel licence is a different licence altogether. Apparently the hon. member does not recognise that a hotel licence is a licensed victualler's licence. If it was the same as a club licence we would not have club and cabaret licences and so on. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the hon. member might as well say that people should be allowed to take beer from a restaurant.

The hon. member's proposition is ridiculous. I thought he intended to tell us how this matter relative to the doors and windows originated. A statement about it which was virtually an official hand-out, or a semi-official leakage from a reliable source on decisions reached by the Government, appeared in the Press. In fairness to the Government, I say that that could happen to us; we could all be in the same boat. Reports supposedly emanating from caucus meetings are published which are by no means accurate. But this statement appeared amongst various other decisions made by the Government parties. The names of responsible Government spokesmen were linked with what was stated as if they had been associated with a release of information after the caucus meeting at which the Government made the decisions. It stated that hotels would be open on Sundays within the 40-mile limit, but that doors and windows would be closed. No-one in his right senses would have thought of closing bar doors and windows. Once that report appeared in the context of an official or semi-official release some credence was given to it, and the Licensing Commission might be expected to give some credence to it.

In the experience of the Opposition and of the Parliament generally there have been cases, like that mentioned by the hon. member and the Leader of the Opposition, in which the Commission refused an application by a hotel in Roma to use its bar rather than its lounge. The Minister for Conservation mentioned, by way of interjection, that the Act provided that an application could be made to the Commission to use a bar in certain circumstances, for instance, where certain facilities were not available in a small centre or where there was no air-conditioning. But there was this celebrated case in which the Commission refused an application that everybody else thought would be granted.

Therefore, we cannot rely on the Commission not to introduce a condition that, in some districts, doors and windows will be closed. Even though the amendment is not worded as well as perhaps it could be, it is an indication to the Commission that we are of the opinion that this should not be the case. Whether the report in the Press was false or not, I do not know, but that was the report that was published.

Mr. Ramsden: Could you quote me the part of the Act which gave the Commission a discretion to open a bar on a Sunday?

Mr. HANLON: The Minister will no doubt confirm that an application could be made to the Commission in this regard. Otherwise, how would the Roma case have occurred? That power is contained in section 69 (8G), which reads—

"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 it 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 as long as that order is operative, people can drink in the bar. That section is now being repealed. Obviously, the hon. member for Merthyr, who got up to lecture us about the Act and the different licences, did not know this. I do not suggest that anybody should know every part of the Act, but that is clearly there.

In this particular case in which everybody thought the Commission would grant the application, it refused it. However, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it was a 2-1 decision, so there was a difference of opinion among members of the Commission. Without reflecting on the Commission at all, there is no guarantee that it will not issue some sort of weird order along these lines, particularly as there has been some feeling for it somewhere. Where there is smoke there is fire, and there must have been some thought of closing doors and windows for it to have emanated from the Government meeting.

Mr. Low: I think you are crossing your bridge before you come to it.

Mr. HANLON: We do not want this position to arise. The hon. member for South Brisbane pointed out that if it was done by regulation, we could move its disallowance. As a combined body we could say, "No, that should not be." We have the power to disallow it. But if it is an order of the Commission that is the end of it. We would have to further amend the Act, unless of course the Minister says that he can twist the Commission's arm. When we suggest that, or hint that it could happen, he takes umbrage; and I do not blame him, because in his official capacity he says that the Commission is independent. However, if the Commission made such an order we would have to introduce an amendment to do something about it.

We would not mind so much if it was done by regulation. As a matter of fact, we considered moving that it be done by regulation so that it could come before Parliament. However, we thought it better

to put our suggestion on paper because obviously there is quite a deal of confusion about it.

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Lands) (12.45 a.m.): As the Minister in charge of the Bill is handling the matter so ably, I doubt whether it is necessary for me to enter the debate. However, I speak not as a Minister but as a member representing a country area.

I have had practical experience in this matter over the years. I was a back-bencher in 1961, when we legalised Sunday drinking in country areas, and I could not understand then why metropolitan members did not want to give the same facility to people in the city.

In relation to the sale of bottled beer or spirits on Sundays, although I do not think that there is in the Chamber any person who is more broadminded than I am, I am totally opposed to it.

Mr. Houston: That is it; that is what we are trying to get out of the Minister.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Although I do not agree with all the representations that have been made to us by people from the churches, we must have some respect for their feelings. I live in a country town, and have done so all my life. Before this Government legalised Sunday drinking, there was the haphazard sort of drinking that went on under Labour Governments.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Let us face facts, and these are the facts as I have seen them as one who lives in the country. People used to take bottled beer from the hotels.

Mr. Hanlon: They still do in a lot of places.

Mr. SULLIVAN: That type of thing was going on whilst people were going to church services. I am a church-goer myself; I go every Sunday. I am merely stating what actually happened, and it was pretty bad to have people coming from the hotels whilst others were going to or returning from church services. It would have been all right if all people had acted responsibly and taken their bottles home, but there were always the irresponsibles who would sit on the steps of the cafe, with two or three of their children, and drink the liquor.

Mr. Houston: What about the police?

Mr. SULLIVAN: Yes, that was a matter for the police. It was because of those things that we legislated for Sunday drinking, and I agree with it 100 per cent.

Much has been said about the closing of hotel doors and windows. The hon. member for Merthyr spoke about air-conditioning. With all due respect to him, I must say that there are many hotels in country areas without air-conditioning. I happened to walk into a hotel one Sunday morning, quite legitimately, when the publican was dis-regarding the requirement to have the doors

and windows shut. The police "chatted" him the following week and told him to do something about it. I happened to be in that country town one Sunday morning, and when I walked into the hotel to have a drink I had to step over three young children on the steps of the hotel bar. Do hon. members opposite want that sort of thing to happen?

Mr. Bennett: What about their parents?

Mr. SULLIVAN: They were inside having a drink.

Mr. Houston: You would rather have them sitting out on the footpath with the door closed?

Mr. SULLIVAN: No. If the doors were closed, they would not be there; they would be in the car or the cafe, not on the steps of the hotel and running in and out. It is, I agree, the responsibility of the parents, but surely we do not want these things going on in front of people returning from church.

Mr. Houston: You want to shut it away so that they can walk by with closed eyes and say, "It's not going on."

Mr. SULLIVAN: No, but I still believe that the doors should be shut. I have heard hon. members on the other side of the House—and on this side, too—argue that drinking should not be allowed in bars on Sunday. My view is that if it is good enough to drink in a bar on every other day of the week, it is not immoral to drink in a bar on Sundays.

Air-conditioning has been spoken about. I live in a town in which there are three hotels, and none has air-conditioning. The toilet facilities are there. Quite apart from all these things, as one who likes a drink on Sunday, or any other day of the week—

Mr. Houston: You like a drink on the way home from church.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Usually I go to church at 7 o'clock, and I am mowing the lawn at 10 or 11 o'clock.

Let us be sensible about this. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Toowong, who advocated that drinking should be in the hotel lounge or with a meal. Does he suggest that we should take Mum and the kids down to the hotel and have lunch there? I could not agree with that suggestion. I believe that there are men in Toowong, just as there are in Jandowae, who mow their lawns, trim hedges, prune roses, and so on, in a pair of shorts and with nothing on their feet, as I usually do. They will want to go down to the hotel and have a drink in a leisurely way on Sunday morning.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: As the hon. member for Mackenzie says, the worker—and I suppose we are all workers—does not want to sit in the lounge. He wants to go to the bar, dressed in a pair of shorts, a singlet, and a pair of thongs, and have four or five beers

in a leisurely way and then return home. The man who wishes to sit in the lounge with a collar and tie on and take his wife to the hotel for lunch can do that, too.

Mr. Houston: Just to round it off and make it clear in my mind, you are quite in favour of the bars being open on Sundays but not in favour of the sale of bottled liquor, and you think that the doors and windows of the bar should be closed?

Mr. SULLIVAN: That is right.

Mr. Houston: The bar is open, with the doors and windows closed, and no bottle sales?

Mr. SULLIVAN: Yes, the doors and windows opening onto the street in front of the hotel. If there are windows opening onto the beer garden at the back, they may be left open.

Mr. Houston: How do people get into the bar?

Mr. SULLIVAN: There are some very old-fashioned hotels in Jandowae. One goes off the street into the main entrance to the hotel, walks round to the back, into the bar, and has a drink there. Why not? Let us be a little bit sane about this, but also have some respect for those who are opposed to Sunday drinking.

Mr. Houston: How will we satisfy them by not letting them see it? Do you think they will be satisfied if they know it is going on but they cannot see it?

Mr. SULLIVAN: They will have to be, because we are legislating for it.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I apologise for being drawn into the debate, but I have lived all my life in the country and I know what the people want because I am one of them. I believe that the Government did a good job for people living in country areas when it introduced the 1961 legislation, apart from allowing them to drink in bars. That is what they want to do, and I commend the Minister for what he is doing in this regard. He has practical experience in this matter, and he is giving the people of Queensland the benefit of that experience.

Mr. MURRAY (Clayfield) (12.54 a.m.): I shall be very brief at this time. We have reached the hour of legislative madness. I join hon. members on both sides of the Chamber in asking the Minister to clarify the situation. It is quite ridiculous, and I am becoming completely confused. The Committee has just heard very good arguments why there should not be Sunday drinking, and guilt complexes and conflicts are coming well into the open.

I think we should have some clarification from the Minister as to what will be the position, if this clause is carried, in regard to doors and windows. It is essential that

this Committee should know that. There is public confusion and query about this, and there was long before we reached this stage tonight. I think that the Minister would serve the Parliament very well indeed if he clarified the position as quickly as possible.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (12.56 a.m.): We now have an expression of Cabinet opinion on the matter of Sunday drinking behind closed doors, not from the Minister in charge of the Bill, but from the Minister for Lands.

Mr. Sullivan: I spoke as a member of this Assembly representing a country electorate.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister obviously spoke as a member of Cabinet. He cannot shift his cloak simply to suit the time. However, I am gratified that at least one Cabinet Minister is prepared to indicate the policy of Cabinet.

I have never heard such a pathetic defence of Government legislation. The Minister for Lands based his defence of the legislation and of a policy of keeping doors and windows locked and refusing the sale of bottled beer on Sundays on two aspects. He said, "What would happen if church sympathisers were going home and saw people sitting on the steps of a cafe drinking beer?" What rubbish! What a pathetic argument!

Despite the cacophony that comes from Cabinet when I say I travel around Queensland, in my professional duties over a period of 20 years, I have probably travelled this State more than the Minister.

Mr. Sullivan: We nearly lost you in the main Street of Roma during the by-election.

Mr. BENNETT: I well remember being in the Minister's electorate as a member of a State-wide organisation. We had a dinner in Dalby on one occasion and, although the Minister was not entitled to be there, he gate-crashed. I know his electorate pretty well and I understand his activities in it.

Mr. Sullivan: I did that to keep an eye on you.

Mr. BENNETT: Maybe, and I kept a very good eye on the Minister.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister's defence was that people might be found sitting drinking beer on cafe steps on a Sunday. I have never seen that happen on a Sunday in any town throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. I have been prepared on occasions to castigate the police, but I am certainly satisfied that none of our policemen, good, bad or indifferent, would tolerate anybody sitting on cafe steps drinking beer on either a week day or a Sunday. That is a damning indictment levelled against the Police Force, and so far as I am concerned it is untrue. It does

not happen on any week day, and I am certain it would not happen on a Sunday. I must come to the defence of the Queensland Police Force when they are being attacked by the Minister for Lands in that vulgar and vicious fashion.

His second defence is that if we open hotel doors on Sundays—I cannot see the logic of this—children will sit on the steps of the hotel waiting for their parents. I do not know with whom the Minister drinks on a Sunday, but I am quite sure that none of the men I drink with would be sufficiently lacking in parental responsibility as to allow their children to sit on the hotel steps on any day in the week, let alone a Sunday. It makes a good story—the little children are sitting on the steps, and the Minister having to step over them. That is the drama that he is playing.

Mr. Sullivan: I am only telling you what I saw. I do not care whether you believe me or not.

Mr. BENNETT: If the Minister keeps on going away he will be seeing many strange things before long. His only argument in defence of the closed-door system was that children would be sitting on the front steps of the hotel waiting for their parents. I cannot see the logic in that argument. If parents take their children to a hotel and then go inside, leaving the children outside, the children will sit on the steps whether the doors are closed or open. If the parents are prepared to go that far, perhaps they will conduct themselves a little better if the doors are open, as the children can see them inside. If the argument that because the doors are closed the children will sit outside on the steps is a valid one, why does it not apply to week-days or Saturdays? The argument is illogical, and the Minister for Lands has drawn a red herring across the trail. Far from assisting the Minister for Justice in his defence of the Bill, the Minister for Lands has embarrassed him deplorably. He has not advanced one argument to support his contention and Cabinet's policy.

Mr. Sullivan: It is not Cabinet policy; it is Government policy.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, Government policy.

Mr. Sullivan: You have never been out in the bush.

Mr. O'Donnell: You are a bit naive, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the Minister for Lands and the hon. member for Barcoo desire to have a conversation, they should have it outside the Chamber.

Mr. BENNETT: It is typical of the Minister for Lands to make idle allegations. Actually, I was reared in the bush, and probably I spent more time working on the land than the Minister did prior to his attaining 21 years of age. I lived in the

bush and came to Brisbane only to practise my profession. The Minister's arguments are stupid and are typical of the rubbish that he puts forward. In my professional capacity I have had to move round the country quite consistently, and I have seen how country people work.

In spite of what the Minister for Lands has said, I hope that the Minister for Justice will enunciate Cabinet policy. I will accept what the Minister for Lands has said, but I would like it confirmed by the Minister for Justice. If the Minister for Justice has the intestinal fortitude to confirm Government and Cabinet policy as enunciated by the Minister for Lands, I hope that he can advance more substantial, satisfactory and convincing arguments in support of the policy than those advanced by the Minister for Lands.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (1.4 a.m.): I enter the debate because, like other members of the Opposition, I am concerned about the honesty and purpose of this clause. There has been too much subterfuge in regard to this State's liquor legislation, and, because of that, strong public reaction has been engendered. I believe that the Government should be honest and give a clear and concise indication to all interested parties, whether they favour or oppose Sunday drinking, about what will happen under the legislation.

When introducing this Bill the Minister was very careful to point out that it was enlightened legislation encouraging the eating of food with the consumption of alcohol. He said we would be presented with the most up-to-date liquor legislation in Australia. Although he said that we needed a hotel of international standard, which conjures up in my mind the thought that it will have every facility for civilised drinking, an ambiguous clause appears later in the Bill and the members of this Assembly and the public should have it explained to them.

I think back to this Government's attitude when it condemned the operations of S.P. bookmakers. Government spokesmen said that they did not want to have betting behind closed doors, and therefore the Government introduced legislation to establish the T.A.B. Was the Government concerned about the people who were disturbed because of the upsurge of betting in the State? Was it concerned about the feelings of those who opposed T.A.B. betting when they had to pass the open doors of T.A.B. shops?

Mr. Sullivan: You are so silly.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: At least I have been in my office writing up the minutes of our caucus meeting. I have not been going to the bar and fortifying myself with a charge of "turps" so that I could try to justify this policy.

Was the Government concerned about the person who objected to the upsurge in betting? Did it say, "We will legalise betting so that it will not go on behind closed doors"?

The Government now advances a proposition but it will not detail what is to happen. It says, "We will legalise Sunday drinking, but the people can drink only behind closed doors and windows." I am puzzled to know how people drinking on Sundays can enter a hotel that has its doors closed. Will the customer have to gain entry by the fire escape, and will the drunks be flushed down the drain to get rid of them?

I have never heard anything so ridiculous. If the Government wants sane liquor laws in Queensland, why should drinking be conducted in the atmosphere of a baccarat school, a fantan joint, or any such place? Over the years the Government has "rubbished" the Labour Party and said that it made no moves to stamp out this sort of thing. I have never heard anything as ridiculous as saying, "You can drink on Sunday—it is legal to drink, and we must have the best liquor laws in the country—but you cannot drink without locking yourself in a cupboard and drinking in a furtive and secretive way." This is what the Minister calls enlightened legislation.

The Minister has an obligation to people of all sections of the community who want to know whether they should support Sunday drinking. He has an equal obligation to those who oppose Sunday drinking to be honest about this matter. He should state publicly, "The hotel doors will be open and drinking will be conducted in a sane manner." If he is not prepared to do that, he is doing the very thing that led to the emotional upset in the community. It was promised by the Government that Sunday drinking would not be introduced, but that promise was repudiated. The people trusted the integrity of the Government but it did not honour their trust.

I believe that the Government is adopting the same tactics in this case. It is not being honest. It will not say that the doors and windows will be open. It is hoping that time will give some indication, and that it will be able to sneak a little bit more in. To me, it is ludicrous of the Government to speak of civilised conditions and drive people into the dungeon-like atmosphere of closed bars on Sundays.

Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT (Mackenzie—Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs) (1.11 a.m.): I did not intend to enter this debate, but after hearing what has been said in the last quarter of an hour or so I feel that I must say something in all seriousness.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I do not worry about the hon. member because he is only a new boy in this Chamber. I can look back to many years ago—

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I should like to know, Mr. Hooper, if the Minister is correct in referring to you as "the new boy in the Chamber".

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I was not speaking about the hon. member for Salisbury. I was referring to the hon. member for Toowoomba East.

Mr. Sherrington: You are talking about——

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: That is all right. The hon. member should go and bury his head in the sand.

I can think back to many of the things that took place under Labour. As far as I am concerned, it is time that some home truths were told. The hon. member for Salisbury made a great song and dance about what has happened. Let us look at what has happened under this Government and what happened under Labour. Let us look at the liquor problem that existed. I entered Parliament many years before the hon. member did, in 1956, when we were in Opposition. I did not have to win my seat when the Labour Party split. I won it when it was a united party.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the Minister that we are debating an amendment to clause 37 and I should like him to keep to that.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: I feel that I am entitled to answer the charges that have been laid. The hon. member for Salisbury laid many charges about what has happened under this Government as far as liquor is concerned.

Mr. Sherrington: What charges?

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: The hon. member laid charges.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I want to know what charges.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: The hon. member said that we were dishonest and not prepared——

Mr. Sherrington: I can tell you——

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: All I can say to the hon. member is that under his Government liquor was obtainable through the back door. I know about these things and I know the problem that existed and the difficulties that arose, because I lived in a country town. Since the changes were introduced in 1961 there is not the drunkenness that we saw earlier.

Then he spoke about S.P. betting. I say to him that in 1938 and 1939 it was possible to go into any betting shop in Rockhampton and other places and see the price of every horse in every State displayed on the betting boards. It is completely hypocritical of him to say tonight that we have not achieved anything. At least that sort of thing does not exist today. Punters have the opportunity to bet at the T.A.B. in a fair and decent way, and the Government of this State

derives some benefit from it. There are no hand-outs as there were in the days of the Labour Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that the Minister has made his point.

Mr. N. T. E. HEWITT: The hon. member spoke about liquor. The Act was amended in 1961, so that at least people in the country have had an opportunity, for eight years, to complain about what was done. I represent a country electorate in which there are people of many types, and all I can say is that during the last eight years I have received no complaints at all about Sunday drinking. Surely all that we are doing now is trying to apply for the benefit of Queensland generally, legislation that up to the present has been sectional.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (1.16 a.m.): The debate has reached the stage where we are now getting the real truth. I wonder what hon. members opposite have been told at their caucus meetings. It is obvious to me that they have not been told what has been going on, and the reason for this legislation. Ministers have now entered the debate, and they talk about the truth. One can go to any country area at all and buy bottled beer on Sundays, and the Ministers know it.

Mr. Sullivan: Not in my electorate. You are talking a lot of rot.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: I was in the West recently and many responsible people, knowing that this Bill was to be brought down, said to me, "Why don't you allow us to drink in the bars like they do in such-and-such a town?" I said, "That isn't going on." They said, "Would you like to bet on it?"

Let me now deal with the churches. I do not accept that hon. members on this side of the Chamber are any less Christian than those on the other side, according to our respective beliefs. Speaking of religious organisations, I might say that the Salvation Army does a wonderful job. Members of that church play outside hotels, and they are not offended. They are doing a job and trying to persuade people to give away their drinking habits. But they are not offended by them; in fact, they go into hotels collecting. It is not beneath their dignity to do that, or to pick up someone who is in the gutter and try to help him. They are real Christians.

Let us look, too, at another organisation. The Seventh Day Adventists meet on Saturdays. Has there been any cry from them, when they walk past hotels on Saturdays, that drinking is immoral? It is a lot of nonsense that hon. members opposite are talking. Surely it is not offensive to people to see someone drinking under sane conditions, whether it be on Saturdays or Sundays.

Mr. Sullivan: You are advocating 10 to 10 trading on Sundays?

Mr. HOUSTON: I did not say that. The Minister said he likes to drink in a bar, but he thinks it is wrong to have the doors and windows open.

Mr. Sullivan: People would have expected better from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am merely summing up what the Minister said. The Government may think that it is fooling people, whereas all that it is doing is perpetuating another snide practice.

If the Minister accepts the amendment, the position will be made clear. If he does not, within two years the bars will be open and there will be bottle sales on Sundays. That is the way the Government has been operating since 1961. When the Government decided to allow food to be sold in bars, it advanced all kinds of reasons why it had to be eaten in one little portion of the bar. What has been happening gradually since? The practice of eating food in bars has continued, and no-one has stopped it.

Today in country areas bottle sales are being made on Sundays. In one place I said to a responsible citizen who had a bottle with him, "Where did you get that from?" He said, "Down at the pub." I said, "Don't be silly. They won't sell it to you like that." He said, "Oh, I said to the fellow, 'Can I buy a bottle?' and he said, 'Not legally, but we don't mind bending the law a little.'" How far is the law to be bent? Either the law is upheld or it is not.

Let us be sensible about it. Let us tell the Licensing Commission that this Parliament and the Government believe that, if it is convenient, the windows should be open and the doors should be open—in other words, there should be the same drinking conditions as on any other day of the week, whether it be a Sunday with the Salvation Army outside or a Saturday with the Seventh Day Adventists going to church—and that bottle sales should be permitted within the trading hours. If anyone breaks the law by sitting out on the footpath and drinking liquor, or something of that sort, let the other parts of the law come into play and let us hit him and hit him hard. He should be made to pay the full penalty. On the other hand, let us not create the ridiculous situation in which one can say to international visitors who come here, "Yes, we can have a drink on Sundays", and then have to take them inside closed doors and windows to a dark room full of smoke.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: Why haven't you done something about that over the last eight years? It has been in existence in the rest of Queensland.

Mr. HOUSTON: I say to the Minister that the policy of the Australian Labour Party said exactly that.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: When did you say it?

Mr. HOUSTON: I have been chided that the A.L.P. is the party that wants hotels open on Sundays. I do not deny it. I said that the conditions of Sunday trading would be the same as those applying on every other day of the week, except that hotels would be open for two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon—the same hours as now apply in country areas.

I assure the hon. gentleman that people outside are convinced that this is only another case of "at this point of time", and I believe that the Minister would be wise to make a clear statement one way or the other and let the matter go to the vote because the people and the great majority of hon. members want sane drinking conditions.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT (Chatsworth) (1.23 a.m.): On the question of the sales of bottles of liquor on Sundays, I say that a clear decision was made that no such sales will be allowed, and I stand by that.

Mr. Houston: Is that the decision of your caucus?

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: That is the decision that I accepted.

On the question of the opening of doors and windows on Sundays, I find written into the amendment a discretionary power to the Commission. I have put a case in which I believe that certain hotels, at least, should be permitted to open their doors and windows, even if, in the judgment of many, all hotels should now open their doors and windows.

All I look for from the Minister is a simple statement that reasonable discretion will be exercised in this matter, and I believe that if the Minister will stand up and express himself in these terms, we can short-circuit the discussion on this clause and move on with the debate. I do not think that request is unreasonable, and I ask the Minister to clarify the situation.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (1.24 a.m.): It has been a very boring two hours—

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I have listened to the same thing over and over again. I repeat what I said two hours ago: When the Bill is carried, the Commission will have full discretion to do what it likes relative to doors and windows and bottle sales on Sunday. That is all I have to say.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Hooper—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has exhausted the time allowed him under Standing Orders.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona): Mr. Hooper—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Baroona has exhausted the time allowed him under Standing Orders.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane): Mr. Hooper—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (1.26 a.m.): We have heard three different statements this evening, one from the hon. member for Chatsworth, who said straight out that a decision was made by caucus against bottle sales. Then we heard the Minister for Lands make another statement in regard to what had gone on, apparently in Cabinet. This seemed to be divorced from caucus because he said he was expressing this as a Cabinet decision. Then another Minister came up with another statement in regard to it. The position has become completely confused in the last half hour and one could be forgiven, after listening to the hon. member for Chatsworth, the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Conservation—

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt: I did not mention bottle sales.

Mr. TUCKER: One could be forgiven for thinking that a decision was taken at Cabinet level in which there was some sort of a split and that this decision was not passed on to the Government caucus. Government caucus does not seem to be aware of where it stands in relation to Cabinet.

If this is the case, I can well understand the dilemma of the Minister for Justice. Obviously it was a split decision. The Minister must be saying to himself, "Let this simmer down for a while. Let us go on for a few months, say nothing at all, and then if anything is brought up by Cabinet or caucus let us get regulations through the Commission to allow doors and windows to remain open and bottle sales to take place.

If I am wrong, the Opposition has been misled tonight by the various statements that have come from the Government side. I think that is a fair summing-up of the position. Is it any wonder that we have asked the Minister, in the light of the confusion and the conflicting statements that have been made, to stand up and make a definite statement on where the Government stands? Obviously he is not prepared to do so. I feel sorry for him because he is obviously in the position that, whatever he says, he will come into conflict with some part of the Government. Consequently he is adopting the line of least resistance and saying nothing, but this, of course, does not suit the Opposition. We again ask him, and challenge him, to make some definite statement as to whether doors and windows will be open or remain shut and whether or not we will be able to buy a bottle of beer on Sundays.

That is all that the Opposition asks. The Government is obviously split on this issue and the Minister is hoping that everything will die down and that he can then bring forward something on the matter.

Mr. MURRAY (Clayfield) (1.29 a.m.): This looks as though it will continue all night. Might I suggest to the Minister that he adjourn, or report progress, or do whatever one does in these circumstances, that we get away and have a shave and a bath, and come back at a respectable hour, at which time the Minister might then proceed to tell us what is the score? This is getting quite ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. MURRAY: I think hon. members on both sides are making a reasonable request to the Minister. We all want to know. May I suggest seriously that we go home and come back again?

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (1.30 a.m.): I will not adopt the tactics of the hon. member for Clayfield and get down on my knees and start pleading with the Minister.

The Minister says that the last two hours have been boring. I think that the Opposition is entitled to be bored because the Minister has been quite satisfied to sit there and sulk, and then say, "I am not going to tell you."

However, he made it quite clear to the Committee that he would make no declaration on Government policy and that the opening and closing of doors and sales of bottled liquor would be the prerogative of the Commission.

Mr. Houston: That was added to by the statements made by the hon. member for Chatsworth and the Minister for Lands.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Yes; but, whereas some people might have been fooled, and while the Minister might sit there in righteous indignation and say, "This will be the prerogative of the Commission," he had not allowed for the clanger dropped by the hon. member for Chatsworth, who said quite clearly and concisely that a decision had been made that would prohibit the sale of bottled beer.

Is the Minister being honest to the Committee in saying that it will be the prerogative of the Commission to decide these things? One of his junior members clearly says that it is not going to be the prerogative of the Commission and that the Commission will be instructed that it is a Government decision that trading in liquor on Sundays will not include the sale of bottled beer.

Mr. Hanlon: It is no wonder "Uncle Joh" went to Rockhampton and left poor old "Chalkie" to handle it.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: No, it is not. Is it any wonder that the people regard the Government as a circus? Mr. Hulme referred to the Treasurer as a juggler; the Premier is becoming known as "Joh, the artful dodger"; and now the Minister for Justice performs the greatest acrobatic feat of all times. He gets up and says, "We are not going to direct the Commission; the matter will be the Commission's prerogative," but he forgot to allow for the fact that the hon. member for Chatsworth would pull the tumble mat from underneath him.

Mr. Houston: Also the Minister for Lands said that there would not be open doors and windows.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: He, too, is one of the greatest bell-ringers of all time because of the clangers he dropped this evening.

Can anybody have any faith in what is said by Ministers in this Chamber? On the one hand the Committee is told that it will be the prerogative of the Commission; on the other hand, the Committee already knows that on several matters a decision has been reached, and there is no doubt that it would be passed on to the Commission for its consideration and decision when framing the conditions that will apply to Sunday trading.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted in clause 37 (Mr. Hanlon's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 30

Aiken
Bennett
Bousen
Bromley
Casey
Davies
Davis
Dean
Hanlon
Hanson
Harris
Houston
Inch
Jensen
Jones, R.
Jordan
Marginson

Melloy
Moore, F. P.
Newton
O'Donnell
Sherrington
Thackeray
Tucker
Wallis-Smith
Wood, B.
Wood, P.
Wright

Tellers:

Baldwin
Blake

NOES, 36

Armstrong
Bird
Campbell
Chalk
Chinchen
Cory
Delamothe
Fletcher
Heatley
Herbert
Hewitt, N. T. E.
Hewitt, W. D.
Hinze
Houghton
Hughes
Jones, V. E.
Kaus
Knox
Lee
Low

McKechnie
Miller
Moore, R. E.
Muller
Murray
Newbery
Porter
Rae
Ramsden
Row
Sullivan
Tomkins
Tooth
Wharton

Tellers:

Ahern
Lickiss

Pair

Lloyd

Camm

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (1.41 a.m.): This is quite a lengthy clause. Part of section 69 (8B), which it repeals, reads—

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

This, more than any other clause in the Bill or section in the Act, has occupied the time, consideration and attention of hon. members. Unfortunately, the Government has manoeuvred itself into an invidious position. This has been dealt with over the past 2½ years, and there has been some seesawing about what is best. Should we have drinking within a 40-mile radius or not and should the permitted hours be those prescribed in this clause? I have said much on this previously.

Mr. Bennett: Do you want to be here all night?

Mr. HUGHES: No. I rather abhor speaking at 17 minutes to 2 in the morning. I do not think that members can be expected to do their best at this time, I can understand tempers being a little frayed, and I do not think this is to the credit of the Government. However, if we are to plunge on with this midnight madness, let us do so.

What should we do in dealing with this matter? Should we consider the proposals after calling for suggestions and criticism which would be the responsible attitude; should it be done by ballot; or should the Government, as is prescribed, go ahead and govern? In normal circumstances, Governments should govern. However, because of interpretation and charges of breach of faith these are not normal circumstances.

Regarding consideration being given as to whether there should be a poll taken on this matter, the "Courier-Mail" article in this regard was quite erroneous, mischievous and wrong. The credibility of the Government and the interpretation to be placed on its policy speech have been discussed. Clause 37 contains nothing about removing the restriction within the 40-mile radius. Yet, because it does not include section 69 (8B), a licensed victualler may sell liquor at certain times on certain days of the week, which include Sunday. In this regard, many people have given their interpretation of what the Government meant and question the credibility of the Government.

The question of whether there should be a referendum has been raised. It was my desire to move the following amendment—

"On page 24, after line 11, insert the following paragraph—

"This subsection shall not apply in relation to the licensed premises of licensed victuallers that are situated

within the area comprised within a radius of forty miles from the General Post Office in Queen Street in the City of Brisbane until after the taking of a poll of electors resident within that area which shows a majority of the electors entitled to vote and voting at that poll in favour of the operation of this subsection in relation to those licensed premises.'"

This amendment has been printed and circulated.

I have discussed the matter with the Clerk of the Parliament, and I have been advised that the amendment is out of order because, and I quote, "it introduces a new principle to the Bill as agreed to, and is outside the order of leave and must be ruled out of order."

I believe that the Government should have held a referendum, and I believe that it is not too late to do it. It would be academic, and abortive, to attempt to pursue the amendment now. All I can say is that, whilst the situation is unfortunate, I have no avenue open for pursuing the call for a referendum. I am out of order in moving the amendment and it will not be accepted by the Chairman of Committees. I hope that we all learn a lesson and that in future we will be cognisant of the wishes and opinions of the people. The people want a referendum. I am frustrated, but I can do no more. Public opinion polls have shown that up to 76 per cent. of the people approached do not want Sunday trading. I have stated my position before; I am not for sectional legislation. I have supported, here and in other places, the removal of sectional legislation and have spoken in favour of it in this Chamber. There cannot be one law for the people of Southport and a different law for the people of Brisbane. There should be a sameness and a oneness about the law. The Government should have called for objections and considered amendments, governed resolutely, and been responsible to electors at the ballot box.

Because my proposed amendment is out of order, I am not in a position to pursue this matter further. However, I believe that we should all learn a lesson from the present position, and in future vote with full cognisance of the will of the public. The view of the public must be taken into account when legislation as controversial as this Bill is being framed.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (1.49 a.m.): With my colleague the hon. member for Ithaca, I contemplated some modest amendments directly aimed at maintaining the present Sunday liquor trading position, which many genuinely, if quite erroneously, believed was part of the 1969 electoral mandate given to the Government. The amendments were designed to single out those portions of clause 37 that would enable us, with the amendments, to retain the status quo of no Sunday hotel trading in Brisbane and within a 40-mile radius, and no bar trading anywhere in the State.

However, some of my colleagues believed that this method would perhaps be too cumbersome to register our stand, and have encouraged us to vote against clause 37.

Mr. Bennett: You are backing out.

Mr. PORTER: No, far from it. The hon. member completely misjudges the calibre and temper on this side of the Chamber. He jumps to conclusions very readily.

I am quite happy to do that, because the clause, by completely rewriting the existing section 69, is the source power, as it were, for introducing what I certainly regard as the pernicious and largely unwarranted Sunday trading extensions. But, of course, the clause contains many other matters that I do support; so, in registering a vote against the clause, I want it to be understood that this is the way in which I register my disapproval of the Sunday trading changes and it is certainly not a vote against other provisions in the clause.

There is little purpose in repeating the points that I made in my speech in the second-reading debate, which I made, I hope, as briefly and as inoffensively as possible. My colleague the hon. member for Kurilpa mentioned a moment ago the justification for changing Sunday trading provided by the necessity to avoid sectional legislation. That argument has been reiterated, but I find it one that is rather difficult to accept. Everyone says, "Surely you don't want sectional legislation?" It is like the old question, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" Nobody likes sectional legislation; nobody likes sin. But the point is that sectional legislation cannot be avoided, and the Statute Book is crammed with examples of it. It surprises me that all hon. members should show such concern about sectional legislation when it has to do with free access to beer.

I am one who believes that some sectional legislation is proper and some is necessary. For instance, I believe that Brisbane and the rural areas of the State are quite different in a whole host of ways, and cannot be treated in an identical fashion. Brisbane is a capital city with a population heading towards 1,000,000. It has its own particular problems and its own capacities for sophisticated services. So the argument that one cannot do differently for Brisbane from what one does outside does not cut much ice with me.

I am constantly surprised to find that if one or two members on this side of the Chamber dissent from a party view and indicate that they will vote against the party view on the floor of the Chamber, hon. members opposite should find this such a remarkable business, particularly when the dissent is on a matter of conscience. This is being blown up out of all proportion. Voicing of dissent is normal and proper, and I think it should be accepted without notice.

Mr. Bennett: You are trying to apologise for yourself now.

Mr. PORTER: Perhaps I am. If I am, I believe the apology is a rational and sensible one, and it would do hon. members opposite good to take heed of what I say because I am quite certain that parliamentary democracy survives only when members have some freedom and are not rigidly tied by a party machine. Hon. members on this side of the Chamber have that freedom. We recognise what the principle is; we honour it because each member on this side has that inalienable gift. We recognise that we have to discharge our responsibilities in a very serious way. The result is that hon. members on this side of the Chamber do not cross the floor lightly or often. This is only the second occasion in all the years that I have been here—five now; it seems longer—that I have done it.

It may be of interest to hon. members to recall that on the front page of virtually every newspaper in Australia today the Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton, made it quite plain that he was willing to accept from Government members amendments to Government Bills on the floor of the House. So we on this side of the Chamber have something which gives us a residual strength that hon. members opposite do not have; and I reiterate that that is the reason why they continually find it difficult to win elections.

I regret that I cannot subscribe to the vast Sunday liquor changes that are permitted by parts of this clause. I think that far more than a mere majority of people—I should say an overwhelming majority of people—do not want them, and certainly they go far beyond the position that exists in any other State in Australia. I find them unacceptable in moral terms. I believe they will prove destructive in social terms, and I fear also that they may prove expensive in political terms. Therefore, I shall vote against this clause.

Mr. MURRAY (Clayfield) (1.55 a.m.): We have now reached the clause that has caused such a furore outside Parliament and problems inside it in the last hour or so. I would have fully supported the amendments that were circulated by the hon. member for Toowong and the hon. member for Ithaca but, as the hon. member for Toowong has pointed out, for various reasons—

An Opposition Member: What reasons?

Mr. MURRAY: He explained them. I will not go over them again. For the same sort of reasons, I will now also object to this clause as a whole. I would have preferred to take the matter piecemeal as the amendments are dissected, but I want it clearly known at this point of time exactly what I am going to do.

Since the very first discussions a couple of years ago, I have not changed my opinions on this matter. Of course, it is history now

that the majority of members on this side of the Chamber felt as I did a few years ago, namely, that we should not have much variation to Sunday trading.

Mr. Houston: Who persuaded you?

Mr. MURRAY: Time changes quite a lot, and gradually a change has taken place. One must recognise the fact that through one means or another opinions have changed until we have reached the stage where the Government is now introducing the whole measure and can do so with little dissent and carry it through. Eighteen months ago it might have passed 99 per cent. of the measure but certainly not this particular section, dealing with such vast variations to Sunday trading. As I say, the great majority here want it, but that does not alter my opinion and firm conviction which I have carried right through. I feel as the hon. member for Toowong does and for the same reasons, and nothing will make me change.

Mr. Houston: You said earlier that you wanted doors and windows open, but you are still voting against our amendment.

Mr. MURRAY: I did not say I wanted doors and windows open. All I want is clarification. There is no doubt about that. I asked the Minister for clarification. As a matter of fact, I endeavoured to assist the Opposition. I think they are quite correctly pressing for clarification on that matter.

I do not think the drastic changes that this is making to bar trading throughout the whole State, and the variation of Sunday trading in the metropolitan area, are desirable, and I feel that the people generally do not want them. I may be wrong, but I honestly feel that the people do not want them and I think that the Government should therefore be very sure indeed before it puts into effect this type of social change. It is a drastic social change.

When listening to the discussions that have taken place here in the last hour or so as to whether doors and windows should be open, I could not help but detect a great deal of guilt feeling on this problem—we must not offend people going to church; it is better that people do not see through the doors and windows and so on. This is the type of thinking that came out of it, and there were as many different opinions as there were members on their feet expressing them.

Mr. Houston: That is what you believe.

Mr. MURRAY: There were. It is obvious. I have ears and I listened.

Mr. Hanlon: On the Government side.

Mr. MURRAY: Well, there were varying opinions. Various opinions are held in the private thoughts and consciences of members of the Opposition.

Mr. Houston: You cannot say that.

Mr. MURRAY: Of course I can. The Government should be very careful before it puts this rather drastic social change into effect. I am disappointed that it is, because, like the hon. members for Toowong and Ithaca, as well as others, I do not think this change will help the family life. It is not necessary or desirable. I do not think there has been a clamour for it. Certainly I have felt clamour for continued closure of hotels on Sunday, and possibly that has been stirred up emotionally by small sections of the community. I have not heard any demand made, except one from a husband and wife in my electorate who wrote to me and said that they demand the right to drink anywhere, at any time, 24 hours a day, anywhere throughout the State.

Much play has been made of the fact that if we had put this matter to a public vote possibly we would have taken from the section of people outside the 40-mile limit something that they already had, and this would have been grossly unfair. It is about time that we thought of what we are taking away from a great section of the community, half the population of Queensland, by this action. We are depriving this majority of people of their enjoyment of their Sunday, as they know it. We will open hotels on Sunday, and those people may not come in contact with them or even see them, but they will know that the hotels are open and that possibly their teenage children will be attracted to them.

Mr. Houston: What happens when their teenage children go to the Gold Coast?

Mr. MURRAY: All I am saying is that many thousands of people in the metropolitan area do not want Sunday trading and feel that they are now being deprived of something and that something else is being forced upon them. We should think of those people as we think of the possibility that we may have deprived people in other parts of the State of something that they already have. I feel sure that in the main the people of Brisbane want their Sundays as they enjoy them now.

As for sectional legislation, my colleague from Toowong has touched on this matter. Goodness gracious me, the Statute books are loaded with it, so let us have no nonsense about sectional legislation.

Mr. Bennett: That is not true.

Mr. MURRAY: The hon. member for South Brisbane knows how true it is.

The Minister referred to Sunday bar trading as being a desirable social reform. I want to dwell on those words because I disagree violently with this provision in clause 37. The Government has a responsibility to try to reduce the heavy bar swill as we know it. But we are only increasing opportunities to drink at the bar. If that is a desirable social reform I want to hear more about it. I want to hear what some social workers

have to say about it if it is a desirable social reform. That is why I repeat it is essential that the Government think very hard before it makes a drastic social change of this nature.

Mr. Houston: In your caucus meeting, did you get much of an explanation about why the change was desired, and who wanted it?

Mr. MURRAY: I do not think we need go into that. The Leader of the Opposition has read a great deal in the Press, and no doubt he knows what happened.

This Bill gave us an opportunity to reduce what I might term the worshipping at the altar of the bar. That is what the great Australian habit—the great Australian swill—virtually amounts to. Why perpetuate it? I believe that 99 per cent. of the Bill's provisions are good. I agree with them without question or qualification because they effect desirable social changes. But this provision encourages bar trading and is bad for the community. I am indeed disappointed that we are implementing it. We had an opportunity to decrease bar trading without tears, without hurting anyone, and the Government has a responsibility to give a lead in these matters.

An Opposition Member: The Government would not lead anybody.

Mr. MURRAY: That is not fair.

To say the least, we have double standards. We are taking drastic action to curb drug traffic and make drugs harder to obtain. I hope that we will take drastic action on cigarettes, which are a danger to health, but by this measure we are making it far easier for the manufacture, distribution and sale of liquor. I am not a "wowsler"; I enjoy a drink, but drink is a great problem in the community. We have double standards because we grant money to certain bodies to try to do something about the social problems of drink then wash our hands of them. We are taking drastic action on problems that are less important to the community when they are analysed and dissected. The alcoholic problem is serious and we must face up to it. But we must be very careful in our approach to it.

We should recognise that the family unit is the very backbone of our society, although some of us believe that society seems to be turning to permissiveness and is becoming sick. We should be very careful about where we are going with some of these things. I repeat that 99 per cent. of the measures in this Bill, which is a Bill for adults in the main, are good. Most of them deal with acceptable social reforms but clause 37 will not do much good at all. I will therefore oppose it.

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (2.10 a.m.): In my introductory speech I made it clear that I was totally opposed to any extension of Sunday trading, and I repeat that I am still

opposed to it. Clause 37 is obnoxious to me because it not only extends Sunday trading throughout Queensland but also opens bars that have not been opened before. I am one of those people who believe that our policy speech promised no extension of Sunday trading. I may have misunderstood—

Mr. P. Wood interjected.

Mr. MILLER: As the hon. member for Toowoomba East interjects, many other people also misunderstood. I consulted my electorate because I am interested in how my electors feel on legislation introduced into this Parliament.

Mr. Marginson: You stuck to the policy and you got the votes.

Mr. MILLER: I intend sticking to the policy as I think it was given to the people.

I believe that a member owes a responsibility to his electors. He is firstly a representative of the people and secondly a representative of his party. I feel that sometimes we get too far removed from our electors. There is a need for members to get back to the grass roots and into touch with their electors.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. MILLER: I do not think I am speaking only for myself on this. If the hon. member thinks that Sunday trading is wanted in Queensland, I claim that he and anybody else who says that are far removed from the thinking of the people.

Random Gallup polls, which were conducted in different parts of the State, showed that the people do not want Sunday bar trading. A poll was conducted on the Gold Coast where Sunday lounge trading has been permitted for eight years. That poll showed that over 70 per cent. of the people did not want bar trading. Even though that was the decision of only 10 per cent. of the electors, I believe we can accept it as a fair representation of all electors' opinions.

I admit that most of the people I interviewed in my electorate were women, but over 80 per cent. of them were opposed to any extension of Sunday trading in the Ithaca electorate.

This clause will allow not only hotel lounge drinking but also Sunday bar trading. I believe that Sunday is a family day. I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who said that the people would be better off if they could buy a bottle of beer and take it home and drink it with their families rather than stand at the bar on Sundays. I quite agree that they should be drinking their bottles of beer at home on Sundays. And they can buy them on Saturday.

An Opposition Member: No they can't.

Mr. MILLER: Yes they can. There is no reason why they should have to go down on Sunday to buy them. We say that we are living in an affluent society, yet hon. members opposite are trying to tell me that people who want to drink cannot have half a dozen bottles stored in a cupboard at home. They are saying that they have to wait till the last minute when friends arrive, and then race down on Sunday to buy some bottles.

Mr. Houston: You admit that people have to buy butter and many other things on Sundays.

Mr. MILLER: I am glad the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned that, because I am about to come to it. In recent months applications have been made by the Shop Assistants' Union for the abolition of trading on Saturday mornings. I quite agree with them in that approach. I believe that the more people there are who can have a full week-end off, the better it will be for the community as a whole. But how can we agree with the Shop Assistants' Union, on the one hand, and say, "Yes, let us close shops on Saturday," whilst, on the other hand, we say to hotel employees, "But you will have to work because we want bars open on Sundays?"

Mr. Davies: Do you want cafes at sea-side resorts closed, too?

Mr. MILLER: We have heard during this debate talk about sectional legislation, and I intend to deal with that now. It has been referred to by members on both sides of the Chamber. At the second-reading stage the hon. member for Baroona quoted what was said by the then Leader of the Opposition when the 40-mile limit was introduced in 1961. I hope the Committee will be patient while I read one small section of that speech. The then Leader of the Opposition said—

"We can apply the principle in so many directions, but the point we make here is that we make a plea to the Minister on the second-reading stage to consider some of the reasons why we voted against this measure as a discriminating one. He rejected our plea, so we were left with no alternative but to move an amendment to provide that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. If it is good for Toowoomba, Gatton, Maryborough, Gympie and other outlying places to have the opportunity of engaging in Sunday trading in whatever hours are prescribed by the Government, and I have indicated that they should be of four hours' duration in one day, and if we are to have any respect for the law, it should apply generally. How can anyone say that at least 50 per cent. of the population of Queensland should be denied the opportunity of Sunday trading? The population of Brisbane is, in relation to the rest of the State, something of the order of 40 per cent."

That was said by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. J. E. Duggan.

From reading that, one would not know whether he was talking about liquor, food or any thing else. I admit that I have taken only a section from a paragraph, but I have no intention of taking it out of its context. I am saying that the passage that I have read from that paragraph could refer to anything at all, although in this particular case it refers to liquor.

Mr. Houston: But you don't know whether Jack Duggan would have said the same thing if he was referring to something else. You are only surmising.

Mr. MILLER: I have already said that the then Leader of the Opposition was referring to liquor.

Mr. Houston: But you can't assume that that statement would refer to something else.

Mr. MILLER: But do I find the hon. member consistent in this? That was said in 1961.

Can the people of Brisbane shop on Saturday afternoon as the people of Redcliffe can? Can the people of Brisbane buy fresh bread on Sunday as people on the Gold Coast can?

Mr. Newton: Yes, you can get it in Brisbane on Sunday.

Mr. MILLER: I cannot buy hot bread in Brisbane on Sunday. Can people buy groceries in Brisbane at the week-end as the people on the Gold Coast can? No. Surely that is sectional legislation.

In 1961 hon. members opposite claimed that sectional legislation was being introduced, yet not on one occasion have they tried to do anything for the people of Brisbane in the field of food. Is it only liquor that hon. members opposite are interested in?

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLER: I say to the Opposition that in Queensland, where there is no Upper House to protect the interests of the people, there is, I believe, a heavier burden on the Opposition.

Mr. Sherrington: What rot!

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member for Salisbury said, "What rot!" I should like him to tell me what the role of the Upper House is in other States.

The fact is that sectional legislation is no argument in favour of the implementation of clause 37. This is a moral issue, not a party or political issue, and I hope that hon. members will vote on it according to their consciences.

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (2.22 a.m.): Many months ago members of the community in various electorates wrote to their respective members requesting a statement as to where they stood on the question of Sunday hotel trading. I hope I am not odd in believing that I have an obligation to let my constituents know precisely where I stand. I did so on that occasion.

The policy speech of the Government was announced, and I took a great deal of satisfaction in my interpretation of what was contained in that policy speech.

Mr. Newton: You made a statement on behalf of the Government in November last year on Sunday trading, too.

Mr. LICKISS: I am reminded by the hon. member for Belmont that in the "Telegraph" on Thursday, 13 November, 1969, I made a statement relative to Sunday trading.

Mr. Newton: On behalf of the Government.

Mr. LICKISS: I made the statement on behalf of myself. What is more, I confirmed that statement as being factual, as far as I was concerned, in a speech made in this Chamber on 2 December last year. Let me remind the Committee that I made that statement before there was any controversy about whether or not there was to be an extension of Sunday trading.

As far as I am concerned—I am responsible for my own conscience in relation to this—I believe that I can make an average assessment of the English language and what it means. I believe that I was acting well within the policy speech of the Government on which I was elected to Parliament, the Government of which I am a member. I make this position quite clear. This is my assessment and I am answerable to my conscience. But let me make my position quite clear at this point of time. I have never diverged from the opinion that I gave my constituents prior to the policy speech, subsequent to the policy speech, or at this point of time. I believe the stand that I have taken to be in line with the Government policy speech.

I do not believe that I have to make any excuses in relation to this matter and I do not intend to make any. It becomes a question of conscience for me. Other people might see it differently.

This section, which is clause 37, is the operative clause that, in fact, varies Sunday trading, not only within the 40-mile limit by introducing bar trading on Sunday in the metropolitan area, but throughout the State by extending trading from lounge drinking to bar drinking. Whether or not I like this innovation I accept it as a Government member and believe I should go along with the majority ruling. But, it is equally plain that I can express my views on the matter.

I have never heard a call for Sunday drinking in my electorate and I hope I will be forgiven if I say that I have not yet determined who wants an extension of hotel drinking on Sundays. I believe that the basis of our civilised society is the family unit, and if Sunday drinking in the metropolitan area and/or bar drinking in any other part of Queensland will assist the family unit, then I have a warped idea of what is good for the family unit or the community at large. That is my opinion but, as I see it, as a member of the Government, I would be prepared to accept the majority decision. As a matter of conscience I have to take a stand in relation to the matter. I stand on conscience, and in those circumstances, and as I have repeatedly said in relation to this matter, as I stand by my word which I gave to my constituents, I will not support this section.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba—Leader of the Opposition) (2.29 a.m.): I am sure that everybody who has heard the speeches on this clause will agree with me that we have heard hypocritical speeches. To say that their consciences were bothering them would have been all right had they taken a stand at the introductory stage but, from my understanding in what the Premier said, he mentioned that the Government would introduce certain amendments at the now famous point of time. However, he only mentioned the three or four amendments introduced in December.

If hon. members are now going to stand on their principles, they were given no mandate at all to introduce tavern licences but they all voted for them.

Mr. Miller: What rot!

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member and those supporting him have had no mandate at all for limited hotel licences, but they voted for them; they had no mandate for spirit merchants' licences, but they voted for them; they had no mandate for cabaret licences, but they voted for them; they had no mandate for function room, airport, theatre, resort or international hotel licences, but they solidly voted for them. When we tested them on the international issue, on which they have denied their constituents, in whom they claim they are so interested, the right to ask for local option polls or to present to the Licensing Commission cases against the establishment of an international hotel next to their homes, they voted against the Opposition's amendment. It is easy for those Government members to make speeches and declare that they are sanctimonious, would not do anything wrong and are pillars of virtue. The point is that they know what the Opposition will do in this matter. I have said that the Opposition will support Sunday drinking, so it is easy for those Government members to say that they will cross the floor and vote against their Government.

The hon. members for Toowong, Ithaca and Kurilpa decided that they would move amendments, and they carried them round.

Mr. Hinze: How long did you have them in the A.L.P.?

Mr. HOUSTON: One thing that A.L.P. members take pride in is their belief in democracy, their acceptance of majority rule, and the fact that they do not rat on their mates.

The three amendments were tabled, assisted, I imagine, by the Parliamentary Draftsman—and I have no quarrel with that—so that the respective hon. members had contemplated their actions. However, each of those hon. members has come up with some sort of cock-and-bull story about why he is not proceeding with his amendment. Why don't the three hon. members be honest and tell us that the whips were cracked? That is what happened at a special caucus meeting. I do not blame their leader for standing over them, because they went back on an undertaking they gave when they stood as Liberal Party candidates. When a Liberal Party candidate goes before his selection committee and submits why he should be the candidate selected he says that he will abide by majority decisions. But now the three Government members to whom I have referred seek to gain political advantage over the heads of their mates and colleagues. I do not give credit to any man who does that.

Mr. Miller: I do not want any of your credit.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member should have been out earlier in the night. He should have supported us on the other issues. He tabled his amendment, and I would have thought more of him if he had gone ahead with it.

Mr. Hanlon: He knew it would have been ruled out of order.

Mr. HOUSTON: Those proposed by the hon. members for Toowong and Ithaca would not have been ruled out of order. The three members decided voluntarily to withdraw their amendments. I would have given them more credit if they had gone ahead with them. The only purpose of the speeches made by those three Government members tonight is to fool their electors again into believing that the members are taking this stand as a matter of conscience. It was not until just before the dinner adjournment when the hon. member for Baroona made the Opposition's attitude very clear that the three Government members decided they would vote against their Government. They said they were confused. Many Government members, including the hon. member for Clayfield, said that they were confused by the Government's attitude towards closing the hotel doors and windows. Surely when Government members voted in caucus they

knew what they were voting for; surely they did not vote like blind sheep, because someone said, "Put your hands up." Now they are complaining about their own incompetence in understanding what was put before them.

Without labouring the point I state on behalf of the Opposition that we will not change our views. We will support the clause but we will not support those whom we believe have done the wrong thing, even by the Government of which they are members.

Mr. LICKISS (Mt. Coot-tha) (2.36 a.m.): It is very interesting indeed to receive a lecture from the Leader of the Opposition and to have the operations of Labour caucus projected into what he considers should be the position on this side. The Leader of the Opposition is infuriated to realise what happened to Dent and others, and to realise that when the Q.C.E. cracks the whip Opposition members have to toe the line.

The Leader of the Opposition chastised a number of Government members because they did not speak at the introductory stage. I remind the hon. gentleman that on 3 December we stood up, and were counted, when he was rabble rousing. If he cares to look at "Hansard" he can prove that for himself. If he cares to read the Press, which made it public, he will see for himself precisely where we stood when he, with all the ingenious machinations at his disposal, tried to encourage the Government to introduce Sunday trading on that occasion. He got the answer which still exists so far as some of us are concerned.

Mr. Sherrington: As "Chalky" said, we have to get rid of the rats.

Mr. LICKISS: I expect that sort of interjection from the type of person who made it: the hon. member for Salisbury associates with people like that.

Mr. Sherrington: I have not ratted on anybody.

Mr. LICKISS: It is a question of what is a rat, and what is ratting. No-one knows that better than the hon. member.

We have made our position quite clear. If a person states where he stands in relation to his conscience I do not think abuse should be hurled at him by hon. members who have not got a conscience, or have not got the guts to stand up. The whole premise of the Labour Party is that it is a machine, and the machine must work as it is manipulated by the power on top. If the Liberal Party ever reaches the stage—I am sure it will not—where that obtains, I will not be a member of it. I came into politics by choosing a party with a policy to my liking and a constitution that allows a member to give of his best. I did not come in by way of a trade union junket, with promotion for services rendered, merely to toe the line and be a puppet in the hands of the Q.C.E.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LICKISS: If hon. members opposite want to mix it with me on these matters, I am quite happy to mix it with them.

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

Mr. LICKISS: In case I have not, I point out that I have a little more I would like to dish out, but that will suffice. I believe I have made the position clear. It is not an easy situation because I am mindful of my responsibility to a Government in this matter. I hope it will be taken in the spirit in which it has been stated.

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (2.40 a.m.): Firstly I should like to deny the Leader of the Opposition's claim that I told a cock-and-bull story about why I did not go ahead with my foreshadowed amendment. I hope he will pay me the courtesy of reading my speech tomorrow morning. Perhaps then he will withdraw that statement. I did not tell a cock-and-bull story. I said that, in my introductory speech, which he said I did not make, I made it quite clear that I was opposed to any extension of Sunday trading.

Mr. Houston: I said that that is what you should have voted on.

Mr. MILLER: As I said in my introductory speech, I am not opposed to the other provisions of the Bill. I believe that most of the proposals are first class, and I shall say why. For many years we have witnessed the mob rule at Coolangatta on New Year's Eve.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. MILLER: The Opposition is suggesting I throw the Bill out and I am saying why I will not. I ask Opposition members to have the courtesy to let me say why.

Mr. Bennett: You are a comedian.

Mr. MILLER: I could not say that about the hon. member.

Every year the bar is closed at 10 o'clock and the young people are tossed out into the street.

Mr. Houston: Young people tossed out of a hotel?

Mr. MILLER: I consider people of 21 and 22 years of age are young. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition thinks he is young at 46 or whatever age he is. He is trying to be facetious because he knows what I am saying is correct.

The young people are tossed out into the street and there is nothing for them to do between 10 and 12 o'clock. And we wonder why they get into trouble!

Mr. P. Wood interjected.

Mr. MILLER: Of course they must, and we are trying to overcome it. And the Leader of the Opposition says I should have voted against the introduction of this Bill.

There are many good provisions in the Bill. I hope that we have taverns in our suburbs, so that people on their way home from work can go to them for a drink. I am not opposed to taverns, and I made that clear in my introductory speech.

I am not opposed to most of the provisions in the Bill. But the Leader of the Opposition said that I should have opposed it simply because we did not go to the people and say we intended to introduce it. Does he claim that the Government must go to the people during an election campaign and lay out all of the legislation it intends to implement if it is elected? Of course it cannot do that. However, I am opposed to going to the people and saying this, and I intend to read the final paragraph of the policy speech. This is why I have taken my stand.

Mr. Houston: Is that the Liberal Party or Country Party policy?

Mr. MILLER: This is the joint party policy speech. It reads—

"It is too easy for our political opponents to promise an open go on this 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."

The Leader of the Opposition said I was a rat or ratting on my mates.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLER: He referred to me as a rat because he said I ratted on my mates. And he is not the only member of the Opposition to say that; the hon. member for Logan said exactly the same thing at the introductory stage. That is their way of life, and the way in which they look at things. To them, a member of this Assembly is not here to represent the people.

Mr. Baldwin: I never said that.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member accused me of ratting on my mates. I say that we are here to represent the people, and, if we think that something is wrong, it is our duty to put forward a case on their behalf. That is what I shall continue to do for as long as I am here. I do not care whether the Leader of the Opposition refers to me as a rat, or as anything else. If something is wrong, I shall endeavour to fight it.

Question—That clause 37, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided.

Resolved in the affirmative under Standing Order No. 148.

Clauses 38 to 64, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 65—New Part VIC—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (2.50 a.m.): For some reason or other the Government has seen fit not to make it an offence to take liquor away from a licensed theatre. That seems to me to be an anomaly when people are forbidden to take liquor away from licensed restaurants and other such places. I think that a person who had bottled liquor at a theatre would be a bigger nuisance than he would be anywhere else.

I wish only to draw attention to the fact that the Opposition has noted what it considers to be an anomaly. I do not wish to say any more about it.

Clause 65, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 66 and 67, as read, agreed to.

Clause 68—New Part VIF—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (2.51 a.m.): On the question of limited hotel licences, I point out that the clause contains a provision that guests in the company of a lodger, and at the expense of the lodger, are permitted to consume liquor in his unit. It seems to the Opposition that it is rather a pious aspiration to provide that it shall be at the expense of the lodger. The point is that the lodger can call a stop to room service when he wants to. In our opinion, the provision will be impossible to police.

Clause 68, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 69 to 72, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (2.52 a.m.): Hon. members will notice that the amendment to section 151B, which immediately follows clause 72, is not numbered. I seek leave of the Committee to have it numbered. It should be clause 73.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the number "73" should be included in the Bill? The clause will now be clause 73.

Mr. Hanlon: The others will automatically move on one?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Yes.

Clause 73, as read, agreed to.

Clause 74, as read, agreed to.

Clause 75—New s. 166D—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (2.53 a.m.): Clause 75—it appears in the Bill as clause 74—deals with unlicensed club permits. I do not intend to take any time on it other than to say that some resentment has been expressed about the provisions of the Bill not extending licences to some sporting clubs. However, it seems to me that unlicensed club permits will give an opportunity to most of these clubs. There seems to be no restriction on the number of such permits and they probably will be available fairly freely.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (2.54 a.m.): The hon. member is correct, and I will arrange by regulation that sporting clubs can get a repeating permit for a period of time.

Clause 75, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

The House adjourned at 2.55 a.m. (Friday).
