




Speech By
Robbie Katter

MEMBER FOR TRAEGER

Record of Proceedings, 17 November 2021

**JUSTICE LEGISLATION (COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE—PERMANENCY)
AMENDMENT BILL**

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (4.29 pm): I rise to make a relatively brief contribution to the Justice Legislation (COVID-19 Emergency Response—Permanency) Amendment Bill. My contribution will be focused around amendments to the Liquor Act. I took particular interest in the submissions of the QHA. I have a particular interest in that regulated space for pubs. I think there is an ongoing potential threat with disruptive technologies and new innovations to encroach on that space. I want to focus on the fact that many of these policies and ideas that come out of George Street and permeate out through the regions have inadvertent negative consequences. They are quite often unintended but have a different application.

The regions do not enjoy the fluidity of labour and capital as is enjoyed in the city. I listened with interest to the contribution of the member for Clayfield, which was fairly comprehensive. The member went through a number of the new innovative ideas, such as Deliveroo, which delivers food, but I am not sure anyone has touched on the fact that Pizza Hut has been identified as a place where you can get a pizza pie with a six-pack delivered. That is nothing to do with this legislation, but it is an unintended consequence of when this type of innovation is rolled out. I am pretty sure we could rely on the fact that not all those delivery persons for Pizza Hut are going to have an RSA. I know the Attorney-General is aware of this and is trying to remedy it.

I am appreciative of the fact that the Attorney-General took the extension of the wine—the beer, cider, craft beers and premixed drinks—out of the takeaway meals. I still labour the point that out in the regions it could be an expectation that you are creating a different experience at a cafe in a city by making these permanent changes where the winery from down south supplies wine to a cafe and they say, 'Did you enjoy your meal? We have another couple of bottles of wine here. We can supply you with that,' therefore bypassing the hotels. I do acknowledge the point that was made that in a lot of these areas they buy from the hotels, but I think it is pretty safe to assume that when we are talking about innovation there is an expectation that people will move more towards that space where you are dealing direct with those suppliers of wines and therefore you are cutting out the hotels.

In the city it is reasonable to assume you create more market because there is a massive tourism market to tap into, but if you are in Julia Creek or Hughenden you are really just robbing Peter to pay Paul. If there is a cafe across the road from the pub, you are not magically creating a different market or drawing on different clientele; it is the same people, the same town. You have just set the local cafe against the pub. I do not think most cafes in regional areas were geared up and thinking, 'You beauty, this is coming in. It will be a huge advantage to us.' I think it is much more likely to be in the metropolitan areas where they would see a direct and immediate benefit. It was an idea that was made with the city in mind and not initially considering the unintended consequences that would be more acute in rural and remote areas.

I am still unsure, and I would ask for some clarity around this in the minister's response, about the fee structure. Again there are unintended consequences. It has been said, 'It is just selling a bit more booze,' but built into the fee structure for pubs is the fact that we have to monitor, police and

regulate these things. That all costs money and we are going to pass it back on to you. Now we have another 8,000 potential outlets that will move into this space that are not contributing to that. The proposal was that they pay \$220. Are they paying their fair share of the contribution that the pubs do in their fee structure? I am also unsure whether they still have the same requirements on the managers that oversee the RSA. They need special certification for the on-site duty manager.

In closing, I do not like the fact that we are expanding this. I think it is safe to assume that there will be more effort in the future some time to expand on this. It does represent a direct threat. I do not accept the conclusion that the member for Clayfield drew that liquor sales have gone up and therefore it should not be a problem, because that is just a bump. I think the liquor sales will level out in those regions. We should be thinking about the impact of this policy in the long term not just as it applies now. Having a good stimulus of alcohol sales in the last year or two does not negate the fact that it will diminish the trade that these places have, and it must in these regional areas where they directly compete. I do not see where there is benefit. Talking about Deliveroo is irrelevant in Julia Creek, Hughenden, Mirani and the areas of Hill and Hinchinbrook. That is not reality. It has a different application. Cafes are geared for selling food and pubs are geared for the security around the selling of alcohol.

The last point I would like to make is that in Mount Isa we are acutely aware of alcohol consumption. We successfully knocked out the building of a new bottle shop in the middle of town. We are trying to restrict the access to alcohol, particularly for people coming out of the riverbed in Mount Isa. It is a bit uncomfortable to talk about actions that are going to create more access to alcohol. I know that is drawing a long bow as we are only talking about wine at cafes and restaurants, but it is another consideration for the future when these issues come up.