Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 1911

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 16 NOVEMBER, 1911.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. D. Armstrong, *Lockyer*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

FATALITIES IN MORETON BAY.

Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*) asked the Treasurer—

"In view of the frequent fatalities in Moreton Bay, will he give instructions to have a properly equipped motor lifeboat stationed at the mouth of the Brisbane River?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

"Fortunately boating fatalities are not of frequent occurrence in Moreton Bay, and, owing to its extent, it is considered that a lifeboat stationed at the mouth of the river would be useless. Had not such unusually hazy weather conditions prevailed, doubtless the recent capsize would have been observed from the Pile Light, and most probably the lamentable loss of life averted by prompt action of the officers of that station."

ROOFING-IN OF HOARDINGS.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"Has he any power to insist upon the roofing-in of hoardings abutting on footpaths fronting public streets, as is the custom in New South Wales?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

"No. This is a matter for local authorities."

LIQUOR BILL.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

MAINTENANCE OF ORDER.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stodart, *Logan*): Before commencing the business this afternoon, I wish to appeal to hon. members to assist me in maintaining better order than we have had during recent sittings, and to abstain from general conversations while business is being transacted. I have received many complaints from hon. members that they have not been able to hear speakers who have addressed the Committee, and I have received a similar complaint from the Chief of the *Hansard* staff. I am sure that I have only to mention this to secure the assistance of hon. members to maintain order in the Committee.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On clause 162—"Local option—definitions"—

Mr. LENNON said he wished to see if he could not get the Committee to take a rational view of this matter. Last week he gave notice of a contingent motion for an instruction to the Committee, which motion Mr. Speaker ruled out of order. Now the Home Secretary had given notice of a variety of changes in the local option machinery of the Bill, a number of which would involve increased cost.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. LENNON: They would require a larger appropriation. Under the Bill, as originally introduced, a prohibition vote could not be taken unless certain other resolutions had been previously passed, and it might happen under that provision that a prohibition vote would never occur. Now notice was given of an amendment to the effect that a poll on Resolution D might be taken in 1925, whether any of the other resolutions had been passed or not, and that might mean additional expenditure. He contended that the proposals of the Minister were outside the scope of the Bill as read a second time. On this point the Speaker said, page 320 of "Votes and Proceedings"—

"There is on the paper a notice of an instruction standing in the name of the hon. member for Herbert, and I wish to make a few observations upon the subject of instructions to a Committee upon a Bill.

"The difference between an instruction to a Committee and an amendment moved upon the second reading of a Bill is that when a Bill is undergoing its second reading amendments altering or enlarging a principle may be moved. These are accepted or rejected.

"When the second reading is passed the principles of the Bill are established. At this point Standing Orders Nos. 176, 177, 178 can operate in conformity with parliamentary practice."

The effect of an instruction to the Committee was stated in Standing Order No. 176, which read as follows:—

"An instruction shall empower a committee of the whole House to consider matters not already referred to it."

Under that Standing Order he contended that he was perfectly justified in submitting the motion of which he gave notice, as the matter had not already been referred to the Committee, but the Speaker ruled that the motion was not in order. Standing Order No. 178 dealt with instructions to the Committee after the second reading and after the first sitting of a Committee on a Bill, and read as follows:—

"When after the first sitting of a committee it is proposed to move a distinct instruction it shall be done before the Order of the Day for the committee is read."

He contended that in order to put the Home Secretary right in this matter, he should move a motion giving a distinct instruction to the Committee, and that without such instruction the hon. gentleman's amendments were distinctly out of order. Chameleon-like changes had taken place in the attitude of the Government with regard to this measure—changes which showed that the Government were being pulled different ways by various sections of the community. They were "everything by turns and nothing long." There was no stability or consistency about them. The proposals he had submitted were clear and business-like. He had submitted a motion to widen the scope of the Bill in order to consider those proposals, and enable the Committee to determine what should be done with regard to the liquor traffic, but that was rejected by the Speaker.

The PREMIER: It was rejected by the House also—by a vote.

Mr. LENNON: No; it was rejected by the Speaker.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was rejected by the House on your amendment on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LENNON: That was only a vote on the general principle, while in his motion he gave full details. Many hon. members opposite were silent on the second reading of the Bill, but now that they were in Committee on the measure they discovered that it was very drastic and uncomfortable, and

that there were many objections to it, which showed that they did not regard the Bill with favour. His party offered members opposite the opportunity of showing that they did not regard the Bill in a favourable light, but they did not take advantage of the opportunity. The number of amendments proved that the Bill was a crude and ill-considered measure; and now the Government found they were on the wrong track they were trying to put themselves right. Perhaps it would be wise for them to get the measure off the paper, because if it remained there much longer it would bear no resemblance to what it was when introduced.

Mr. LESINA: It is anybody's Bill.

Mr. LENNON: Anybody's Bill—or nobody's Bill. Now he wanted to remind the Committee of the business-like proposition he endeavoured to bring forward. He wanted power given to the Committee to recast Part VIII. to make provision for—

"(1.) State option in lieu of local option.

"(2.) Substitution of the following resolutions for those in the present Bill:—

"(*a*) That no more new licenses shall be granted in the State;

"(*b*) That the State shall manage all new licenses, if new licenses are to be granted;

"(*c*) That the sale of liquors in the State shall be prohibited;

"(*d*) That the State manage the whole liquor trade if the sale of liquor is not prohibited.

"(3.) A poll on (*a*) and (*b*) to be taken on such day in the month of June, 1913, as the Minister may fix by notification in the *Government Gazette*.

"(4.) A poll on (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), and (*d*) to be taken in the month of June, 1918, and thereafter every three years."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to speak to the question before the Committee, which is that clause 162 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. LENNON: He wanted to show that, owing to the alterations to which he had referred, the Minister proposed, without regard to local option Resolutions A, B, C, that a poll should be taken on Resolution D.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that he is wandering away from the question before the Committee. The resolutions to which the hon. gentleman referred were dealt with in a subsequent clause.

Mr. LENNON: He was dealing with clause 162. He understood, however, that he could deal with the matter of the resolutions at a later stage; and he would defer his remarks till then if the Chairman ruled that he was out of order.

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course you are out of order.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*) thought it was only right that they should be allowed to show how much better was the proposal of the Labour party than the proposal contained in the Bill.

The PREMIER: It has been ruled out of order.

Mr. RYLAND: If they could not give reasons why their proposal was better than that of the Government, they might as well chuck the clause out right away without wasting further time over it. What they wanted was for the people of the State to have the opportunity of voting as to whether there should be any more new licenses, whether the State should manage all new licenses, whether the sale of liquor should be prohibited, or whether the State should manage the liquor trade if the sale of liquor was not prohibited; but under clause 162 there would be no opportunity for the people to decide on those matters. He would just as soon see Part VIII. knocked out of the Bill if the people were not to be given the opportunity of expressing their opinion on those matters. He stood every time for prohibition, which was far better than this proposal. It would be just as well to knock out Part VIII.

The PREMIER: And have no local option of any character?

Mr. RYLAND: If you are not going to allow the people——

The PREMIER: Don't shuffle.

Mr. RYLAND: He was pointing out the weakness of the proposals of the Government.

The PREMIER: No, no! Do you want to knock it out?

Mr. RYLAND: Unless the Committee were prepared to put better provisions into the Bill it was not worth anything.

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*): The hon. gentleman who had just spoken said he would rather have the whole section dealing with local option knocked out of the Bill, so that hereafter there would be no local control of the liquor traffic.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman stated that distinctly. Part VIII. of the Bill provided for a continuation under improved conditions of the existing local option clauses until a certain date, when local option would be in force with the electoral franchise giving everybody a vote; but the hon. member for Gympie was so obsessed with State control that he would not give the people any control at all. When Part VIII. was investigated, it would be seen that it met the situation most thoroughly. As to the rambling statements of the deputy leader of the Opposition, they were irrelevant and rambling.

Mr. LENNON: Rambling, were they?

The PREMIER: Particularly so. The hon. member said the Bill had been altered out of sight, but it would be generally admitted that some of the amendments would improve the Bill. The principle of the Bill had not been touched. (Hear, hear!) Would the hon. gentleman say that his own amendment that hotels should not be open during hours of poll on polling-days had ruined the Bill? Would the amendment of the hon. member for Rockhampton that hereafter no license should be granted until the people said "Yea" or "Nay"?

Mr. COYNE rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member in order in his remarks, seeing that the Committee were dealing with the definition of a town?

The PREMIER: Might he just remark that the Committee permitted the deputy leader of the Opposition to make certain incoherent remarks. (Opposition laughter.)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Do you want to do the same? (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: No. They had come to a very important part of the Bill dealing

with local option; yet it was proposed by an hon. member who had posed in the House as a strong advocate of total abstinence—who had year after year brought in a motion to do away with the bar of the refreshment-room. There was a pretty kind of teetotaller! He said, "Give us a Licensing Bill, but delete all power of local option." There was no getting away from that; and it would stand against his name, and be quoted against him as one of the shining lights who wanted a Licensing Bill altogether without local option.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYLAND (who was received with uproarious laughter) said that he wished to make a personal explanation. (Government laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: You cannot explain away your inconsistency.

The CHAIRMAN: I permitted the leader of the Opposition to go a good deal further, perhaps, than I should have done, and I therefore considered it only right to allow the Premier to reply.

Mr. RYLAND (who was again received with general laughter) said that he considered he was justified in voting against this clause.

The PREMIER: No; you spoke of voting against the whole of Part VIII.

Mr. RYLAND: As a temperance reformer, he was in favour of State prohibition.

The HOME SECRETARY: No good; no good!

Mr. RYLAND: One of the weaknesses in connection with prohibition in America, New Zealand, and elsewhere was that there was simply one little patch "dry" and the rest of the State or district was "wet."

Mr. CORSER: You cannot wriggle out of it.

The HOME SECRETARY: You want to have it "wet" all over, with nationalisation of the trade.

Mr. RYLAND: In the State of Maine at the present time there were 722 licensed houses.

The HOME SECRETARY: And you want the same thing in Queensland.

Mr. RYLAND: He believed in State prohibition, and that was the weakness in the system in force in the places he had spoken of. Now was the time to put the matter right in this clause, and see if they could not get prohibition extended instead of having it in little patches. Temperance reformers all over the world had always advocated total abstinence for the individual and prohibition for the State. They did not want prohibition at Toowong, Oxley, and Bulimba, but prohibition for all Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: You cannot crawl out of it.

Mr. RYLAND: The Premier was not correct when he said that he (Mr. Ryland) was opposed to doing away with the drink traffic because he would not vote for his pettifogging Bill. (Great laughter.) What sort of a Bill was this to thrust in the face of temperance people? He thought he was quite justified in voting against this clause. (Renewed uproarious laughter and cheers.)

Mr. ADAMSON (*Rockhampton*) moved the insertion in line 29, after the word "license," of the words "and railway refreshment-room licenses." The amendment would bring the railway refreshment-rooms under the provisions of the local option provisions of the Bill as well as other places.

Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*): Licenses for railway refreshment-rooms were not granted in the same way as hotel licenses. They were granted under the Railways Act.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The matter is under the control of the Commissioner for Railways.

Mr. MURPHY: He did not think that the mere fact of the people in a district voting "No license" would affect the railway refreshment-rooms, because the Commissioner had absolute power in the matter. Personally, he did not care whether the amendment was agreed to or not, but it must be remembered that the railway refreshment-rooms were for the convenience of the travelling public, and not for the use of the residents in the particular district in which they were situated. Even now the local people were not supposed—on Sundays, at any rate—to go to the railway refreshment-rooms for liquor unless they were travelling. They had to produce a railway ticket.

The HOME SECRETARY: They will have to produce a ticket for a forward journey of 20 miles under this Bill.

Mr. MURPHY: He did not know that the amendment was going to do any vast amount of good, and he did not suppose it was going to do much harm.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Moreton*): In connection with railway refreshment-rooms the question arose who was going to vote?

Mr. RYLAND: The electors in the local option area.

Mr. FORSYTH: He did not see how that would apply. The people who used a railway refreshment-room were not the people who resided in the district, but the travelling public. For instance, the people who used the Landsborough refreshment-room were the people travelling to and from Maryborough, Bundaberg, Rockhampton, and away beyond Rockhampton. Why, then, should they allow the people in the district where the railway refreshment-room was situated to vote as to whether it should remain open or whether it should be closed?

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*) quite agreed with what the hon. member for Moreton had said. He did not see why the travelling public should be deprived of the right [4 p.m.] to have a drink at a railway refreshment-room if they wanted it. If the amendment were agreed to it would be contrary to clause 199.

Mr. ADAMSON: We can alter that.

Mr. VOWLES: Clause 199 provided—

"(*a*) Such liquor shall be sold only within a reasonable time before and after the arrival or departure of any passenger train at or from such station;

"(*b*) During any time when the premises of licensed victuallers are required under this Act to be closed, liquor shall only be sold or supplied to passengers who are in possession of and produce to the licensee, or to any inspector or police officer, a ticket or authority

authorising them to travel by railway for a journey of at least twenty miles beyond such station."

Mr. FOLEY: A reasonable time may be any time.

Mr. VOWLES: Were they going to prohibit the travelling public from having refreshments? The general public did not go there at all, and, as one of the travelling public, he would oppose the amendment. He could assure hon. members that members of the travelling public would be very pleased to know that they had opposed the amendment.

Mr. ADAMSON said the railway refreshment-room bars stood as a temptation to engine-drivers and guards on the railways.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: But they are debarred.

Mr. ADAMSON: They might be debarred, but some of the travelling public were always placing temptation in their way even to-day, and some of those men drank at the bars.

Mr. LESINA: They may carry a flask.

Mr. ADAMSON: It was a direct temptation, and if those men were found drunk on duty, and an accident happened, the men were blamed.

Mr. LESINA: No such accident has happened in the last ten years.

Mr. ADAMSON: An accident happened only a few years ago through drunkenness.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They have to travel 20 miles before they can get a drink.

Mr. ADAMSON: Did the hon. member mean that no drinking goes on in the Brisbane refreshment-room or in Toowoomba?

The HOME SECRETARY: We are obviating that under this measure.

Mr. ADAMSON thought the amendment was in harmony with other amendments he had moved, and it was in harmony with the principle of local option, and if the Government were consistent in the matter, and wished to apply local option to all kinds of licenses, they would be willing to accept the amendment and alter clause 199.

The PREMIER: Your leader objects to amendments. He has already complained.

Mr. ADAMSON did not think his leader objected to amendments that were fair. His complaint was that his amendments had not been treated fairly—that hon. members had not had an opportunity of discussing State option, and the hon. member wanted his amendments dealt with in the same way as amendments brought in by the Home Secretary. It was all very well for hon. members to say those places would not be the rendevous for local people as well as the travelling public. They would be, and it was just giving another place where people could obtain liquor at all times.

Mr. CORSER: The time is defined.

Mr. ADAMSON: The sale went on all the same.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Gympie wanted to increase the time by a quarter of an hour.

Mr. ADAMSON: If he could include his amendment and a consequential amendment, it would improve the Bill, and take away temptation from men who were punished if they got drunk while on duty. He had seen people belonging to the Railway Department in a condition they ought not to have been in, and if they had been in uniform they would have been dealt with. All men in the Railway Department ought to be treated alike. If it be the Commissioner or anybody else, and he got drunk, he should be dealt with.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Even the Minister.

Mr. ADAMSON: Even the Minister.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) said he must again admit the sincerity of the hon. member for Rockhampton in trying to carry out, even in a piecemeal sort of way, his policy of prohibition. The amendment was an attempt to secure prohibition so far as the travelling public was concerned. The hon. member wanted the electors of a district which voted "no license" to shut up the railway refreshment-rooms, although those licenses stood on an entirely different footing to other licenses. There was an Act on the statute-book which gave the Railway Commissioner power to call tenders for refreshment-room licenses throughout Queensland, and the Commissioner accepted tenders for a certain period of time. Refreshment-room licenses were under the control of the Railway Commissioner, nevertheless the licenses were supervised to some extent by other Acts, and that Bill proposed to supervise them very strictly, and also to supervise and restrict the conditions under which the liquor could be sold. The hon. member wanted to go further—he wanted the people who were only remotely interested in the matter to be able to close up those refreshment-rooms. There were scores of people who never go on a railway platform, but who might go to the hotel in the district. Men in other parts, travelling backwards and forwards, found it necessary, after a long journey, to secure some refreshment. It might be argued that if a district voted "no license" and the railway refreshment-room was open the local people could get drink there, but other clauses in the Bill provided that a man must travel 20 miles before he could get a drink. The New Zealand Government had adopted the principle of the amendment, and they had wiped out the refreshment-rooms on railway lines right throughout the Dominion. He had travelled right through that system, and in some of the railway refreshment-rooms there it was a common thing to see a number of persons sit down at the refreshment table and produce flasks of whisky and call for soda at the bar, pour out their whisky, and drink it there. The people could not carry large quantities of beer, and the result was they carried it in the most convenient form—that was, in the spirit. They carried handy flasks to put in the hip pocket or breast pocket. If you had not got a flask you had to get a temperance drink, and all New Zealand refreshment-rooms had a number of patent drinks—various kinds of wines and ciders and coloured drinks—which were very attractive to the eye but repellant to the stomach of a healthy citizen. (Laughter.) They put on the market parsnip wine—non-alcoholic—but he ventured to say that it contained a greater percentage of alcohol than any beer, draught or bottled. This was placed on the shelves—elderberry wine, ginger wine, and various kinds of hop beer. One kind of hop beer which had been recently seized by the department was discovered to contain considerably more alcohol than ordinary colonial beer. This was the

outcome of the system of restricting the travelling public from consuming alcoholic refreshment after a long railway journey. Anyone travelling in this State—and this State deserved more consideration than New Zealand, which was a cold country, while this country was a sub-tropical country, and in the North a highly tropical country—after a long exhausting journey a man stepped out on to the platform, and went into the refreshment-room feeling that nothing would do him so much good as a glass of champagne, brandy and soda, or a long foaming pewter of beer with white froth on the top of it. (Laughter.) But under the amendment he could get none of these things. He could call for parsnip wine or hop beer, or some other repellant beverage that would upset his stomach after a long railway journey. We must not only consider the people in the area, but also commercial men, those ambassadors of commerce, who carried trade through Queensland, and who did more hard work from one year to another than even politicians. (Laughter.)

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Do you mean teamsters?

Mr. LESINA: They also; he was not speaking of teamsters, because they did not necessarily travel on the railways—he was speaking of commercial men who represented big trading organisations, and who carried the products of civilisation and industry to the remotest parts of Australia. They were nearly all drinking men; some were teetotallers, but the majority were men who drank and smoked. If they came to a "dry" area, and the refreshment-room was closed, they would have to carry the liquor with them. The hon. member would admit that it was not desirable that commercial men should carry liquor in their boxes and packages. Then the people who came here as tourists from other States wanted refreshments which they had been in the habit of getting in their own States, and why should they be deprived of the glass of claret and a biscuit? They would advertise this State as a "wowser" State, where a man could not get a glass of grog. They would warn people to keep away, and it would drive capital away. There was another aspect: We were anxious to induce immigrants to come here. When bodies of men came from Victoria or South Australia we gave them free passes to travel, and, if they closed the refreshment-rooms, they would prevent them from getting refreshments. They would say, "What sort of a country is this?" and they would go back and warn their friends to stay away. These things might be small, but they all went to make up the sum total of social life; and, if they stripped the people of their rights here and there, they would make our social life absolutely naked. The people wanted these pleasant relaxations. He hoped hon. members would have a little consideration for the travelling public, and defeat this amendment. He did not think it was in order, but if the Chairman should rule it in order, he did not think it should be carried. The Committee would be well advised if they bumped it out with a sounding bang when the opportunity offered.

Mr. BOOKER (*Maryborough*): Everyone recognised that the hon. member for Rockhampton was an ultra democrat, but this amendment was anything but democratic. Democracy was government by the people for the people, and not by a small section of the people. The refreshment-room at Landsborough might be shut down by a handful of people there, but that was a room which, perhaps, served more people with refreshments than any other refreshment-room from Brisbane to Bundaberg, and it would be a gross injustice to the travelling public, who were more concerned than any other section of the community, to close it. Was it fair in weather like this that people leaving Bundaberg at 8 a.m., and reaching Brisbane at 6.30 p.m., should not be able to get some stimulant at some place at midday, and at Landsborough in the afternoon, or vice versâ on the return journey? The amendment was not a fair deal to the travelling public, who were most concerned. It did not concern a small community like Landsborough, and it would be an injustice to allow a handful of people there to deny the travelling public some refreshment at that particular place. The Commissioner for Railways was a prohibitionist, as a matter of fact, at Maryborough. The desire was expressed by some people that there should be a refreshment-room there for selling spirituous liquors, but the Commissioner decided that there was no necessity for it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is so.

Mr. BOOKER: Isis Junction was a licensed house, in some respects, and so was Theebine. People could have refreshment there, and the Commissioner saw no necessity to make the Maryborough refreshment-room a hotel, so he was a prohibitionist.

Mr. RYLAND: The amendment of the hon. member for Rockhampton simply meant that when a prohibition poll was carried in a district which wiped out the private hotels, then you could come along with a semi-private hotel under the supervision of the Commissioner for Railways, and practically frustrate the wish of the electors.

Mr. MANN: That would be nationalisation.

Mr. MURPHY: You want nationalisation, don't you?

Mr. RYLAND: He wanted popular control—the electors to be supreme in this matter. If they carried prohibition in Gympie, and there were refreshment-rooms at Gympie Station, Nashville, and Monkland, there would practically be three hotels in that limited area. That showed that it was necessary for the amendment to be put in here. It was simply bringing these railway hotels under the popular vote, and if the vote was carried in the area, then the railway hotel shut up the same as any other hotel. What was the use of shutting up private hotels and leaving railway hotels open? The Premier had opposed an amendment from this side to have State management, because he said they could get drunk under State management just as well as any other.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RYLAND: He was quoting the Premier's own argument; but the hon. gentleman now said they would not get drunk—that they would not waste their substance in riotous living, and would not spend money there. They wanted the railway hotels to be shut up as well as the other hotels where the local option vote was carried.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: If the Home Secretary was really genuine in his desire to

carry out the local option provisions thoroughly, he could not consistently refuse to accept the amendment.

The PREMIER: It does not affect the local people at all.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: He knew it did not affect the local people, but it did affect the travelling public. If a man travelled through a "dry" area, when he got to an area where local option did not prevail he could get a drink, but a man who had to stop at a "dry" area to do his business would be placed in a worse position in not being able to get a drink. Local option meant that there should be no liquor sold in the area where local option was carried, and the Home Secretary could not do anything else but accept it. The Home Secretary wanted to do it partially by having only the hotels closed.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is better than what the hon. member for Gympie proposed.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: It might be better, but it was lopsided local option all the same. They would have the hotels unable to serve drink, but a man would be able to get drink at the railway refreshment-room.

The HOME SECRETARY: But the local people don't get it.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: If the Home Secretary showed any earnestness, he would accept the amendment.

The PREMIER: The granting of refreshment-room licenses was a matter for the Commissioner, and did not come before the licensing bench at all. The Commissioner could at any time cancel any license granted to a refreshment-room by paying compensation. An hon. member had extolled Mr. Airey as Home Secretary. When he (Mr. Denham) was Home Secretary he put into force the Sunday-closing provisions of the Act as far as he possibly could, and he requested the Commissioner to cancel the authority given to refreshment-rooms at the Central Station to sell liquor on Sunday. The Commissioner, Mr. Thallon, said that he could not do it without paying compensation, and he (Mr. Denham) told him to pay compensation. The authority to sell liquor at the Central Station on Sunday was therefore cancelled at his (Mr. Denham's) request. He had no doubt that if any area was put under prohibition, the Commissioner would carefully consider hereafter whether he ought not to cancel the authority to sell liquor at the refreshment-room also where the reduction vote was carried. It was a matter that rested entirely with the Commissioner, and he had no doubt he would carry out the wish of the electors as expressed at the local option poll.

Mr. MANN took exception to the suggestion of the hon. member for Gympie, as he should have moved to nationalise the railway refreshment-rooms if he wanted to be consistent. If he had succeeded in nationalising the refreshment-rooms, then, after three or four years, he could show how successfully they were being run, and could then urge on the necessity of having the other hotels nationalised. The hon. member was against nationalisation now, and wanted to close the refreshment-rooms altogether. In discussing the Harbour Board Bill the hon. member for Gympie wanted to give votes to all the creators of values, but he did not want to give votes to all those concerned in this matter. He only wanted to give votes to the people living in the locality, whereas it was the travelling public who were mostly affected. Take Kuranda, for instance. The local people, who numbered only seventy or eighty, might carry a vote against the refreshment-room at that place, and the hundreds and thousands of people who visited Kuranda from the South and from the hinterland would have no say in the matter at all.

Mr. ADAMSON: Judging from the support which the amendment had not received from the temperance men on the other side, he did not think it wise to press the matter to a division. He had sought to be consistent, and he thought the Government should also be consistent. He was glad to have the assurance from the Chief Secretary that the Commissioner would most likely be sympathetic as regarded the local option areas, and he knew that the present Commissioner had already expressed his sympathy with that to a deputation that waited on him. He thought the Minister for Railways would have supported it because of that. He did not trouble about the remarks of the hon. member for Clermont as to the disabilities the travelling public would suffer. They knew that some men took liquor to make them warm, and others took it to make them cool, but the generals of armies and explorers told them that the men who did the best work were the men who kept clear of it altogether. If people would be content to take a cup of tea at railway refreshment-rooms, it would do them more good and be less of a danger to the travelling public. The refreshment bars were a menace to the safety of the travelling public. If an engine-driver or a guard got more drink than was good for them, and an accident happened, the heads of the Railway Department would blame the men, and yet they placed temptation in their way. He was surprised that the temperance men on the other side had not supported the amendment, and he was surprised the way the liquor traffic was dealt with during the discussion of the Bill. He would withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. RYLAND moved that after the word "club," on line 30, there be inserted the words "and any authority that sells liquor in a refreshment-room at the Houses of Parliament." The amendment simply meant that if a local option vote was

[4.30 p.m.] taken in the area in which Parliament House was situated, and that area was declared "dry," they should shut up the refreshment-room in Parliament House. Members should not claim privileges for themselves which they denied to the people outside. It might be a long time before the people declared the area in which Parliament House was situated a "dry" area, but when it was declared a "dry" area, the bar should be closed. He had tried to get this done by a vote of the House, and had succeeded in carrying in the Assembly a motion to close the bar, but that motion had been rejected by another place. Now he proposed to appeal to a higher tribunal, and allow the electors in the local option area to say whether they should have drink in Parliament House or not.

Mr. MAY was not going to vote for this amendment. He was dead against it. (Laughter.) He made that straightout assertion, and members could take it what way they liked. He was positively against doing away with the refreshment in Parliament Buildings.

Mr. MURPHY: With the national bar.

Mr. MAY: Yes, he was against doing away with the national bar, as the hon. member for Croydon called it. Members represented the whole of the people of Queensland, and Parliament House should be outside any electorate, and the bar should not be closed until there was total prohibition throughout the State. This was a perennial subject with the hon. member for Gympie, which he brought up every year until it had got stale and out of fashion. The hon. member ought to be ashamed to bring it forward any more.

Mr. MURPHY intended to support the amendment because it was a good amendment. They were not going to abolish the bar until the people of the electorate of Brisbane North decided in favour of prohibition, and he believed they were not likely for quite a number of years to declare in favour of prohibition. But by putting the amendment in the Bill the Committee would be doing a kindly action to the hon. member for Gympie, and would not do anything unkindly to those members who would follow them in that Chamber.

Mr. LESINA: The amendment proposed to take away from the House the power of local option which it now possessed. Parliament was a self-governing institution, a small democracy governed by its own laws; it had established among other things a refreshment-room and a visitors' room, and by a vote of members could abolish either or both of those institutions. Now it was proposed that that power should be taken away from the House and handed over to the irresponsible electors of North Brisbane. The time might come when the electors of North Brisbane would consist almost exclusively of "wowsers," and they might wipe out the refreshment-room. The members of the Assembly were drawn from constituencies all over Queensland; some of them were "wet" and others "dry"; they had certain duties to perform in the House, and why should they be deprived of the ordinary refreshments they were used to in their own constituencies? The proposition was an improper and undemocratic one. If they were to carry the amendment, what would happen? Members would still have the right to bring drink into the Chamber. By a majority vote they could secure that the Speaker of the Assembly and the President of the Council should build small lockers under the seats in which members could stock their liquor supplies. Would the amendment prevent that? Of course, it would not. He thought that the hon. member would be wise to withdraw his amendment and let them get on with serious matters in the Bill.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: There had been a good deal of levity indulged in in connection with the amendment, but it should be considered seriously, though he was not going to support it, because it put off the closing of the parliamentary bar till too remote a period. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Gympie himself admitted that it would not be closed in their time.

The HOME SECRETARY: Perhaps that is the reason why he moved it.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: It might be, but he had no hesitation in saying that the bar was no help to the business of the House. While he thought that the parliamentary bar should be placed on the same footing as other bars in the community, he was of opinion that they could deal with it themselves, and the sooner they dealt with it the better.

Mr. D. HUNTER said this question should have been fought much earlier—when they were considering the hours that "pubs" might keep open. No matter what might be decided outside, Parliament would always have the power to say, despite the will of the people, whether it would keep the bar open or not. He believed in closing the bar at 11 o'clock, and was prepared to vote in favour of closing it absolutely; but this was only playing with the question.

Amendment (*Mr. Ryland's*) put and negatived.

Mr. DOUGLAS (*Cook*) said that "licensee" meant the holder of a licensed victualler's license, and included a registered spirit merchant and the secretary of a registered club. Was there anything to prevent the registration of any number of wine and spirit merchants before the local option time came on?

The HOME SECRETARY: They have to apply, in the same way as any licensed victualler, to the licensing court for their licenses.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked what there was to prevent 3,000 or 4,000 of them getting licenses before local option came on?

The HOME SECRETARY: They are not likely to get them.

Mr. RYLAND rose to move a motion.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has already addressed the Committee three times on the question.

The HOME SECRETARY moved the insertion of the following definition after line 36:—

"'Senate election' means an election of members of the Senate of the Parliament of the Commonwealth for the State of Queensland."

This was necessitated owing to the fact that his amendment proposed to substitute the day of the Senate election in place of a day in the month of June every third year.

Mr. COLLINS (*Burke*): This was an innovation, but he did not think it was a good one; and it savoured of cowardice. The hon. gentleman believed in State rights, but now he wanted the poll to be taken on the day when there was a Senate election, which was not a fair thing to do. A poll of this description should be separate from either a Senate election or a State election.

The HOME SECRETARY said there was a general request from all sections of the community that the day for taking the poll should be altered, the ground being that it would be impossible to obtain a representative vote on what might be termed an "off day." It was then suggested, not alone by the temperance party, but also by the liquor party—it was a general request—that either the State general election day or the Commonwealth election day should be the day on which such a poll should be taken. It was directed in the Bill that these polls should be taken triennially, but the polling-day for each State general election could not be said to recur triennially.

Mr. HAMILTON: Nor may the Senate election, perhaps.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was the chance that it might not, but it had the least chance of not being triennial of any elective body; and that being so, it was

decided that the polls should be taken on the same day as the Senate elections, when there would be a larger attendance of electors than there would be if the day originally decided upon had been kept.

Mr. RYLAND thought the proposal highly objectionable. Why should they subordinate State business to a Senate election? Their one experience in connection with taking the referendum on the question of religious instruction in State schools on Federal election day resulted disastrously.

The HOME SECRETARY: Disastrously for whom?

Mr. RYLAND: Disastrously for those who were in favour of secular education.

The HOME SECRETARY: But what about those who believed in religious instruction? It did not result disastrously for them.

Mr. RYLAND: People had to vote for three senators, for a member of the House of Representatives, and they had also to vote on three Federal referenda, which was surely quite enough without asking them to vote on the State question of religious instruction too. He was opposed to voting on State questions on Federal election day. In the agenda-paper for the coming Commonwealth Labour Conference, which was to be held in Hobart in January next, there were several recommendations from organised Labour objecting to even Federal referenda being taken on Federal election day, so that matters should not be complicated. Why should they have a repetition of the results of last Federal election day by asking the electors of Queensland to vote on this very contentious question? It was a question big enough to be entitled to have a day to itself. There were big vested interests on the one side, and big humanitarian principles on the other. There need be no fear that there would not be a big vote. The leaders of the militant temperance party wanted to have the poll taken on a separate day, apart from either the State or Federal elections.

The HOME SECRETARY: They ask for this.

Mr. RYLAND did not think they had asked for it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then I am making a statement that is untrue. Does the hon. member assert that?

Mr. RYLAND: In the New South Wales Parliament there were only ten members who were in favour of a local option poll being taken on State election day, because it quite disorganised everything, distracted people's attention from political questions and centred it on the liquor question. The Minister would be well advised if he decided that the poll should be taken automatically every three years on a special day when there was neither a State nor a Federal election.

The HOME SECRETARY: I consider I am well advised in acceding to the request of both the temperance party and the liquor party.

Mr. RYLAND: The hon. gentleman should use his own judgment, and let the Committee use its own judgment quite irrespective of either party. It was not a fair thing that they should take a local option poll on a day set apart for the Senate election. They fell in over the referendum on religious instruction in State schools.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why, you voted for it.

Mr. RYLAND: He did not.

The HOME SECRETARY: You voted for the Bill.

Mr. RYLAND: He voted against the vote being taken on Federal election day. He did not believe it would have been carried if it had been held on a day separate from the Federal elections.

Mr. LENNON thought it was a mistake to saddle the Senate election with a matter that did not concern the Senate candidates at all. He admitted that on the second reading of the Bill he said that, though he would very much prefer to have State option, to secure as big a vote as possible they should take the poll at election time; but he believed the general consensus of opinion on the Opposition side was that it would be better to have a special day for the poll. He was not of that opinion. He thought they should have the poll at a general election, but it was not a fair thing to ask Senate candidates to carry that particular baby. Look at the field it would open up for wild, rambling, incoherent statements from the Premier! (Laughter.) All men could not afford to have their speeches typewritten, and hon. members might not be able to stick so closely to their text in that Chamber as they desired. But the hon. gentleman who accused him of making wild, rambling, incoherent statements was himself the biggest political rambler in Australia. He had rambled all over the shop, but all his rambles seemed to take him to the front Treasury bench. (Laughter.) It showed temerity on the part of the hon. gentleman and a great want of taste, particularly when he remembered that his speeches were typewritten for him.

The HOME SECRETARY: Surely the hon. member does not mean that!

Mr. LENNON: He did mean it. Everyone could not afford to have his speeches typewritten. He was not saying whether the Home Secretary had that done or not.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, I do not think the hon. member can infer it of the Premier, because it is not correct.

Mr. LENNON: The hon. gentleman sitting opposite to him, who was now laughing at him (indicating the Premier) had the temerity to speak about his rambling, incoherent speech, but he was well known to be the biggest political rambler in Australia, and it was a piece of effrontery on his part to dare to say such a thing as he did that afternoon. (Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member admits that he is a rambler.

Mr. LENNON: The man who said so had the reputation of being a political rambler—a political acrobat. It showed that he must have a hide like a rhinocerous. (Renewed laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

The PREMIER: Better than being a poltroon, anyhow.

Mr. LENNON: Well, he did not know about being a poltroon. If he wanted to recommend anybody as a clown for a circus,

he would recommend two or three gentlemen sitting on the front Treasury bench—(laughter)—because they filled the bill splendidly.

The HOME SECRETARY: And you are the leader of the clowns.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the question before the Committee.

Mr. LENNON: He was endeavouring to do so.

The HOME SECRETARY: He always rambles.

Mr. LENNON: Hon. members opposite did not always observe the Chairman's call to order, as he always did. Although the Home Secretary told them that both sections of the community principally concerned desired to have the poll taken on Senate election day, he had not seen of any public meeting being held, nor had any petition been presented to Parliament—though petitions had been presented with regard to many other matters involved in the Bill—where a demand was made for taking a poll at such a time. There was no necessity for it, and it would be a great impertinence on the part of the Queensland Parliament to saddle such a vexed question on Senate candidates. They ought to handle such troublesome questions themselves. He would very much prefer taking the poll at State election time; and, if a majority of hon. members preferred that they should set apart a special day for taking the poll, that was much better than submitting such a vexed question for settlement at a time that would inconvenience candidates for the Senate. Very grave issues were involved at Federal elections, and he was quite satis-
[5 p.m.] fied hon. members opposite would be very busy indeed endeavouring to secure the return of their three senatorial candidates on that day. The drink question, though very important, would probably be lost sight of and overshadowed by the greater questions involved. If the public were to have an opportunity of deciding such important issues as were involved in Part VIII. of the Bill, there should be as large a vote as possible, and, therefore, the poll should be held on a State election day; but, if it was taken apart from that, then they should select a certain day of a certain month every three years, so that the thing would become well known. Everyone would then know when the local option poll would take place, and be prepared for it, and the opposing sides could marshal their forces, round up as many supporters as possible, and get a very full vote. Without a full vote no satisfaction would result. He would like to see a full vote on that and every other question submitted to the people. He hoped the hon. member in charge of the Bill would give the Committee something more than the assurance that both sides desired it. There had been no agitation for it, and he challenged the hon. member to prove that it was a general desire. The hon. member said it was so, and it was up to him to prove it was a general desire that the local option poll should be taken at Senate election times.

The PREMIER said he did not propose to follow the hon. member in his very irrelevant opening remarks, but would deal with the latter part of his remarks. The hon. member admitted that in his second-reading speech he urged that the vote should be taken on a general election day.

Mr. LENNON: I do so now.

The PREMIER: The hon. member further urged to-day that it should be on a date that could be anticipated. He (Mr. Denham) would like to know if any member of the Committee could say when the next election would be held; or, when that came, how long after would the next one be. Let them take their minds back during the last few years, and they found there had been State elections at very irregular intervals and at different times of the year. If there was one thing settled and determined, it was the period of senatorial elections, as the only thing that could intervene was a disagreement between the two Houses. Of course, that might arise, but it was very improbable, so that it was pretty definitely settled when there would be an election. A gentleman who was in the House that afternoon, sitting outside the bar, had stated that the temperance party desired to have the poll on a public election day.

Mr. RYAN: Who is he?

The PREMIER: The Rev. Mr. Williams. Personally, he agreed with the deputy leader of the Opposition—he would rather have it on a State election day than on a Federal election day.

Mr RYAN: Would you?

The PREMIER: He would. It was a question he was quite willing to bring up on a State election day. He had advocated it on every occasion.

Mr. RYAN: You are alone.

The PREMIER: He was not alone. He was in a minority, he would allow. But the outstanding feature of it was that the parliamentary term of three years had very rarely been allowed to run its full course.

Mr. MAY: And you do not intend to allow it to run this time. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: The Bill, as introduced, provided for a day in June. The advocates of temperance reform and those interested in the liquor trade said that in the month of June there was not likely to be a big poll; consequently, in order to meet the wishes of both parties who advocated the vote be taken on a day when a big poll might be counted upon—everybody would allow that when there was a general election, either State or Federal, a wide interest arose, and a much larger number was brought to the poll than would be the case on a private day. If they were not to have the poll on the day the Senate election was held, then it would be a fair thing that there should be something in the nature of a minority vote, but he was opposed to that. All through that question, long before the Bill was introduced, he had said it would be a simple majority. Having regard to all the circumstances, it would be found to be more convenient and likely to conduce to a more widespread vote by having the poll on a senatorial day, because it was pretty generally known that that would occur in March or April, 1913, 1916, and so on. He had always urged that there should be a simple majority vote, just the same as at an ordinary election, but before a district was put to the turmoil and expense of a vote, a requisition of one-tenth was a fair thing. If the poll was held on a senatorial day, it could not be said in any

way to interfere with Federal matters. The Federal Parliament had no control of the drink traffic of the State.

Mr. RYAN: What about prohibiting importation?

The PREMIER: That was vested in the Federal Government, and he could not interfere with them. It could be said, at any rate, that on a senatorial day half the people on the roll would vote, and there would be a much larger vote than would be the case if the poll was taken in June, as intended. If the Committee urged June without any trammel, well and good; but he did not think it was a fair proposition, because he was afraid they would not get as full a vote as they should expect on a question of this sort.

Mr. WIENHOLT (*Fassifern*): When they were fighting the referendum campaign on different platforms, one of the strongest claims he made against it was that we should not mix up big national questions with our own local affairs.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WIENHOLT: There was another thing—why should we cater for those who would not come in and vote? People who would not roll up could not complain, and as long as they had a fair chance to come to the polling-booth, he thought they had done everything they could. If there were 1,000 people on the roll, and only three rolled up, and two voted against the proposition and one for it, in his opinion that was just as good a vote as if 600 had rolled up and 400 voted for it. Those who did not roll up were no good at all, and should not be counted. It was ridiculous to have this vote taken at a senatorial election, and he did not feel inclined to vote for it.

Mr. HAMILTON did not think we should mix up a big Federal or National question with a question affecting our own State. A Federal election was one of the worst times we could have for a poll in country districts on a big question like this. The last referendum vote was taken on a Federal election day, and while there was machinery provided at every Federal polling-place for taking the referendum on Bible teaching, there were very few polling-places in the Gregory electorate. There was a great number of people who had not an opportunity of voting, because there was no polling-booth provided for them within reasonable distance, and he supposed that would apply to many other large districts. There was not one-third the number of polling-booths provided by the Federal Government for taking the poll as was provided at a State election, and consequently hundreds of people in the electorate he represented did not get a vote at all for the referendum, because they would have had to travel 100 or 150 miles to a polling-booth. It was a very bad day, apart altogether from the big question of mixing it up with Federal politics. He thought that State matters should be dealt with on a State election day. If a local option poll was taken on other than an election day, he was certain that in the country districts people would not take the trouble to travel 40 or 50 miles or 100 miles, while in the larger centres they would probably get just as big a vote if they took it on any day in the year.

The PREMIER: If you got a partisan vote you would not get a big intermediate vote.

Mr. HAMILTON: They might get as big a vote in city electorates or in large centres of population, but not in country districts. He wanted to make his position clear. He was definitely opposed to this local option or reduction vote; he only believed in one kind of option—that was, State option.

The PREMIER: That is, that there shall be no drink anywhere in the State?

Mr. HAMILTON: That they should vote for its discontinuance or continuance throughout the State, because by reducing the number of hotels they would build up a monopoly for the few that remained, and he did not believe in that. If there were two good houses which were up to all requirements, they had as much right to close the two as the one. What satisfaction was there to the man who was closed if they closed one of them and left the other? One man was allowed a monopoly of the whole trade. He was opposed to the whole system of local option in any shape or form, and would only support a system of State option.

Mr. PAYNE: There was no doubt a good deal in what the hon. member for Gregory said in reference to the shortage of polling-booths at Federal elections compared with what there were at State elections. In the Mitchell electorate at the last Federal election, when the referendum on religious instruction in State schools was taken, there were only half the polling-booths as there were at an ordinary State election. He happened to be the supervising scrutineer at a polling-booth at Sandgate at the last Federal election, and after the close of the poll you could pick up handfuls of ballot-papers in every enclosure that were not used at all, owing to the complicated nature of the ballot-papers. The people openly said that there were so many ballot-papers, and so many questions to decide, that they got confused, and you had to direct them what to do. It was a mean thing for this House to bring on the vexed question of local option at a senatorial election. Let them bear the full brunt of the legislation which they passed here. He recognised the difficulty which the Premier pointed out, that they never knew when they were going to have a State election—no Government knew when they were going to be knocked out—but it would be wiser to set apart a separate day, so that people would vote intelligently and without any confusion. He hoped the Government would take it on our own election day, or fix a separate day for it.

Mr. CORSER thought it was absolutely essential that the vote should be taken on some election day, or else to have a minimum vote. There was an objection to a minimum vote by some people, who thought it was better to have a simple majority vote, even if the majority was only one. It was also essential before they took away a man's living from him, and before they took away the living of a number of orphans, that people should be compelled to vote on the question, or, at any rate, a certain number of them. Suppose only 15 per cent. of the whole electorate voted to take a man's living away from him, was it right to sanction a thing like that? They should insist on a certain number of votes being polled, or else hold it on a day when the representatives were elected for some Parliament, Senate, or otherwise.

Mr. MURPHY: When the question of the Bible lessons in State schools was before the House he argued on the same lines as the Premier—that it would be better to take the referendum on the day the Senate election was held, because he thought that more elec-

tors would take an interest in the matter and record their votes. What was the result? Simply this: There were so many important matters that the people had to decide in connection with Federal matters that the question of religious instruction in State schools was left in the background during the political fight. Although the Labour party had that question on its platform, they did not advocate it at that election.

The PREMIER: They shied at it.

Mr. LENNON: They did not. I did not, anyway.

Mr. MURPHY: At the conclusion of that election the *Worker* stated that the Labour party won the Senate campaign at the sacrifice of one of the most important planks in their platform. That was what happened, and that was what would happen if they took the vote on the occasion of the Senate election, when big national questions were being dealt with which would overshadow the drink question. They would leave the liquor question alone altogether. It would be the party that was organised that would go to the poll on election day, and they would have a repetition of what happened in connection with the Bible instruction in State schools referendum. The organised party would vote, the indifferent people would not vote, and the temperance party or licensed victuallers' party would win just according as they were organised. It would be better to have it on a day apart from elections altogether, and if people took a big interest in the liquor question they would go and vote on it. At the last Federal election they had three or four questions submitted by the National Parliament, and then in another booth they had to vote on the question of Bible instruction in State schools, and it would be far better just to have the one question dealt with on a separate day, and ask the people if they wanted liquor or were opposed to it.

Mr. ADAMSON remembered the experience they had on the Senate election day, and they would have the same experience if they had it again on the Senate election day. They had no right to interfere with great national questions belonging to Australia, but should have all State questions held on State election days. There were so many questions submitted at the last Federal election day that a good number of the people did not know how they were voting at all. A great number did not understand what they were doing. Some did not vote at all, and that was done designedly by the Government of the day, as they knew that if they mixed up the questions with the Federal questions it would cause confusion; and they were supported in that by the astute gentleman who was at the head of the Bible in State Schools League.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: How could they possibly know that there were to be Federal questions submitted to the people?

Mr. ADAMSON: State questions should be considered on State election day.

Mr. RYLAND: Why not have a separate day altogether?

Mr. ADAMSON: The liquor question was one of sufficient importance to claim a separate day altogether for it, and he believed that the temperance workers would get a satisfactory poll on that day. He believed in a simple majority, and if people would not go to the poll, they should not count in that great issue at all. The Federal men should not be hampered by such questions being mixed up with their election. He was told by Federal members that they were not going to jeopardise great national questions by taking up State questions.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is this not a great national question?

Mr. ADAMSON: It was a great national question, but to be a great national question in the widest sense of the word it should be dealt with by the Federal Parliament. Some people described the religious question in State schools as "tripe" compared with the other questions, but he regarded it as a question of great importance, and it should not have been allowed to interfere with other great questions. Men should be able to speak out on all these questions on the hustings, but the Federal members were afraid to jeopardise the national questions on Federal election day. If they were going to have it on an election day, it should be on the day of the election of State members, who were responsible for the introduction of the Bill. He was prepared at any time to fight the temperance question and go down on it at a State election, but it would be wise not to mix other questions with this one. If he had known, as he knew now, that some members on the other side were going to support his railway refreshment-rooms amendment, he would have pressed it to a division, and he was sorry he had not done so. All parties [5.30 p.m.] were divided on this question, and it was desirable that the referendum should be taken on a separate day, so that there should be no complications introduced into the voting, and he was of opinion, also, that a simple majority should be allowed to decide the question.

Mr. MAY was not going to support the amendment, because he held that the vote should not be taken on either a Senate election day or a State election day, but that it should be taken on a day specially set apart for that purpose. With only the one question of local option before them, the electors would grasp the importance and significance of the matter they had to decide much better than they would if they were called upon to vote on it at the same time as they were voting on other matters, whether they were matters of Federal or State concern. It was anticipated that at the next Federal election other referenda would be submitted to the people, and when a State election took place members all wanted to fight for their seats as hard as they could, and did not want to be hampered with any other controversy. He was strongly of opinion that when a vote was taken they should have the same polling-places as they had at State elections, as they were more numerous than those at Federal elections. In his own electorate, before the redistribution of seats took place, they had forty-two State polling-places, and at the Federal election there were only thirty.

Mr. RYLAND: That was because you did not ask for them.

Mr. MAY: It was not his province to ask for them. Why did not the Federal member ask for more polling-places? As to the question of the majority to be required to

decide a local option vote, he was in favour of a simple majority deciding it, provided not less than 65 per cent. of the electors recorded their votes.

Mr. FERRICKS was totally opposed to the amendment, as the matter on which the vote was to be taken was essentially a State matter, and should not be mixed up with Federal questions. The subject could never become a national subject in the true sense of the word until the National Parliament had control of the destinies of the liquor trade. So long as the National Parliament had not that control, it was the function of the State to take the vote on a State election day. The issues at stake at a Federal election were so important that they overshadowed purely State matters, and that was a sufficient reason for not taking the vote at the time of a Federal election. He did not agree with previous speakers that Federal candidates shirked or dodged the issue involved in the State referendum which was taken at the last Federal election. The Federal candidates on both sides were perfectly right in not touching on the merits or demerits of that question, and in his opinion Mr. Kidston gave an exhibition of abject cowardice——

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FERRICKS: In taking on a Senate election day a referendum on a purely State affair. The matter should have been decided when the people of Queensland were concerned with purely Queensland affairs, and he did not think it was the duty of the Federal candidates, or State members who might have been speaking in support of those candidates, to bring in the question of that referendum. If this amendment was carried, he held that it would not be the duty of members of the Assembly or of Federal candidates to drag in this liquor question of purely Queensland importance. There would be greater facilities for voting on such a matter at a State election than at a Federal election. He cast no reflection upon the administration of matters electoral by the Federal Authorities, because he realised that the Commonwealth was a big territory, and the Commonwealth Government could not attend to the details of each State in that connection as well as the various State Governments should do. The Government should not shirk responsibility in connection with the taking of a referendum. Wherever he went at election time, he would not shirk the question if it was brought forward.

Mr. HARDACRE: Why should a candidate for Parliament deal with the question of local option?

Mr. FERRICKS: Because it was a question that concerned the people at large, and if it was forced upon them they should not shirk it. They should not follow on the lines of Mr. Kidston, who brought in the matter as a bone of contention, and then discreetly stood aside and let others worry over it.

Mr. MANN said he held no brief for Mr. Kidston, but he wished to say that Mr. Kidston brought in a measure to alter the day of the referendum on the Bible in State schools to some other day than an election day, and he withdrew it owing to the fact that so much opposition was shown to it in the House. On page 967 of *Hansard* for 1909 hon. members would find this—

"The PREMIER, in moving—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Religious Instruction in State Schools Referendum Act of 1908, by altering the time at which the referendum poll shall be taken—

"said: I may just say, though it is unusual for any explanation to be given at this stage of a Bill—which is usually a formal stage—that circumstances have arisen which make it undesirable to take this referendum at the same time as the Federal election. And what is far more important, the Federal Government being unwilling to permit the referendum to be taken at their polling-booths, I think that this House, having approved of the referendum, we are under a moral obligation to make provision for the holding of the referendum at another date.

"Mr. MURPHY: This House approved of it being taken at the Federal election.

"The PREMIER: Hon. members know that I myself am opposed to any change being made in our Education Act. (Hear, hear!) But with regard to this referendum, I think it is a question on which the people of Queensland should be allowed to speak.

"Mr. HAMILTON: Do you intend to have polling-booths, returning officers, poll clerks, and all that sort of thing all over the State?

"The PREMIER: I think that members of this House are unanimous in the opinion that it would be exceedingly undesirable to hold a referendum on this question at the time of a State election.

"HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

"Mr. LENNON: Nothing of the sort. It should be held then."

And so on. There was such a big discussion over that—which really was simply a formal motion—that the measure was never tabled. An amendment by the hon. member for Leichhardt, Mr. Hardacre, was defeated by only four votes, the numbers recorded being 30 to 34. That was the only reason why the then Premier did not go on with the measure. On the first occasion on which the Referendum Bill was carried it was intended—he thought the majority of the House were of that opinion at the time—that the referendum would be taken at the first general election, whichever came first, State or Federal. He was of that opinion at the time, and it was only after the Bill was passed that he saw it was the election of representatives of Queensland to the Federal Parliament. He did not blame the Federal members for not mentioning the matter during the election, because it did not concern them, but he blamed the members who were opposed to the measure for not fighting the question.

The PREMIER: They shied off.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What did you do?

The PREMIER: I did nothing. (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN said he was otherwise engaged at the time, so he could not battle against the Bible in State schools, but the people of Cairns declared against it by a big majority. The *Trinity Times* fought against it consistently all through, but the *Worker* did not start squealing until the votes were recorded and the mischief was done. He thought it would be wise to keep this matter away from elections altogether, but if it was to be on the same day as an election, he would rather have a State

election, because the Federal members would refuse to deal with it, and would naturally ask State representatives supporting them on the platform not to raise the question because the issues would conflict. He went round nearly every polling-booth in Brisbane, and the only one where he found an advocate against the Bible in State schools was in Fortitude Valley, and he believed the woman who was there turned away a good few Labour voters because she told them how to vote for the Senate and for the House of Representatives, and said, "For God's sake, don't let the Bible-bangers catch you." After his experience on that occasion he believed that the poll should be taken at some other time than at an election; but, if it were held at some other time, then they should not insist on a minimum vote, because he was quite sure a great many people would not vote at all.

Mr. WINSTANLEY did not think it mattered very much whether the poll was taken at a State or a Federal election, for the simple reason that no poll could be taken at all unless there was a request for it from at least 10 per cent. of the electors in the local option area, and the probability was that there would not be a request from more than half a dozen electorates in the whole of Queensland, and the electors in the other districts would not have to vote at all. It would be infinitely worse to have the poll at a State election than at a Federal election, as it would interfere far more with the result of the State elections than with the result of the Federal elections. Hon. members might have been remiss in connection with the Bible in State schools referendum, and there might have been a lack of enthusiasm about it, but in this instance both the parties interested were apart from political parties, and they would put their views before the electors quite apart from politics. If a poll were taken at the time of the State elections, and there was a request for a poll in a thickly-populated district, it would be almost impossible to keep politics out of it; but, if it were taken at the time of a Federal election, there would be practically no connection between the two things. If a poll were taken at any other time, he was sure they would not get a satisfactory poll from the point of view of numbers. It might be an advantage to take it at a State election, so far as polling-places were concerned, but he did not know why there should not be as many polling-places for the Federal elections as there were for the State elections. The same number of electors was supposed to vote at the two elections, but there was no doubt that there was a great deal of ignorance on the part of the Federal Authorities about the conditions in Queensland. On one occasion when there was some delay in getting the ballot-boxes from Camooweal, the authorities in Melbourne wired and asked why they did not get a special train to bring the ballot-boxes from Camooweal to Charters Towers. Such ignorance seemed almost incredible, and yet it was not the only case in which similar ignorance had been shown of Queensland conditions. In the past he had said that he thought election day was the best time to take a local option poll, and he failed to see how it could possibly interfere with a Federal election. There was one thing that required explanation. In the original Bill it was proposed that a poll should only be taken by request, and he would like to know why the Government had circulated an amendment wiping that out, and then retreated from the position and put it in again.

The HOME SECRETARY: We will deal with that when we come to it.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That affected the situation considerably. At the same time, his vote would be given for the amendment.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Whenever they asked the people for their opinion on any public question, they should try to suit the convenience of the public as much as possible. They should not consider the interests of politicians at all. They should so frame the resolutions that the people would be put to as little trouble as possible in recording their votes. At the Federal elections, in 1910, when the people were asked to vote on the question of the Bible in State schools, they had the biggest vote for the senatorial candidates they had had, 61.15 per cent. of the electors on the Queensland rolls voting. At the Federal referenda of this year they did not get within 5 per cent. of that number of votes.

The PREMIER: And that was actively worked.

Mr. D. HUNTER: That showed that many who were interested in the senatorial election came out and voted on the Bible in State schools question, and probably many who would not have voted for senatorial candidates did so because they came to vote on the Bible in State schools question.

The PREMIER: This will secure a big vote for the Senate.

Mr. D. HUNTER: That was what he maintained. They were anxious to get at the true mind of the people. Which hon. member was afraid to trust the people?

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Gympie.

Mr. D. HUNTER: If they were afraid to trust the people, they should not submit the question to them at all. If the people were against them, they would require to abide by their decision, but they should endeavour to get the largest vote possible. He did not see why they should fight about this. It was perfectly true that they got a larger vote at State elections than they got at even the last Federal elections; but it was impossible to compare the two things, because everyone knew that there were thousands of names on the Federal rolls at the time of the last election which should not have been on. After all the cleaning of the rolls that had just taken place, however, they should have a very big percentage vote next time. He did not see why the hon. member for Gympie was afraid of a local option poll. For his own part, he was quite prepared to abide by the result, and, if he went down, he would say that he went down because the people put him down.

The PREMIER: This will help both polls.

Mr. D. HUNTER: He wanted to get a true vote, and they were most likely to get that by taking the poll at the time when people would be put to the least inconvenience to go and vote.

Mr. FOLEY: On State election day.

Mr. D. HUNTER: No. The State election might fall on any day in the year. Since he entered Parliament there had been two State elections in one year. The Senate

election, on the other hand, was almost certain to occur regularly every three years. There was very little chance of the Senate having to go to the country before the end of the three years because of a difference with the House of Representatives. It was the wish of the electors that the poll should be taken as near as possible every three years, and a special day would not have the effect desired. As a matter of fact, hon. members who were against
[7 p.m.] the Bible in State schools voted to have a special day fixed for the referendum, because they wanted it defeated through only a small vote being recorded. In many cases they admitted that to be so by their vote afterwards on the question that there should be a 50 per cent. vote before it could be carried. They had the proof that when there were the most questions to decide they had the biggest poll. When they had a 61.15 per cent. vote there were five different issues to decide. As far as he was concerned, he was willing to accept whatever decision the people came to, and hon. members should put no obstacle in the way of allowing the people to go to the poll.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. member for Woolloongabba said his intention was to do what he could to suit the people. By voting for the poll to be taken on a Senate election day the hon. member was not going to suit the people, because on that particular day there might be some of the biggest questions to decide that had ever been put before the people of Australia. There was a lot of international squabbling going on all over the world, and just imagine Australia being brought into one of those squabbles and the question of defence was submitted to the people, or the party in power went to the country on the question of defence. That should be the paramount question on that particular day, and the minds of the people should not be interfered with in any way in giving a decision on that question, because upon the decision of the people might depend the ultimate safety of Australia. Why should they bring in the local option question, which would only affect half a dozen electorates in Queensland, and which would divert the people altogether from the great national question of defence? It was an evidence of cowardice on their part when they wanted to put on the shoulders of the Commonwealth something that they were evidently ashamed of.

The HOME SECRETARY: How are you going to get the triennial intervals with State elections?

Mr. COYNE: He was coming to that. It had been said that they had had two elections in one year, and that they might have an election every year. That was quite possible, and it was a very good reason why the local option poll should not be held on a State election day, but under certain circumstances there might be two Senate elections in two years also.

Mr. FORSYTH: No, no!

Mr. COYNE: It was quite possible to have two Senate elections in two years. If the local option poll was to be effective at all, it should be held at stated intervals, because the people would then look forward to the time, and they would make up their minds that on that particular day they would be called upon to do a certain thing.

Mr. RYLAND: The same as it was when the Bill was introduced.

The PREMIER: Then you will have a very poor vote.

Mr. COYNE: They were told that the people would not take much interest in it, and that it would not interfere with Federal matters. If there was not much interest in the question, and 20 per cent. of the voters of Queensland could decide the question, then what difference would it make? If the people wished to vote one way or another they could do so, and if they did not vote they would have to take the consequences.

Mr. CORSER: It is not they who take the consequences.

Mr. COYNE: They were all interested, and if they did not go to the poll they had to pay for it.

Mr. CORSER: It is the man who loses his business who suffers.

Mr. COYNE: If the man who would lose his business took so little interest in the question as not to organise the people and get them to vote, then he deserved to go down.

Mr. CORSER: They won't leave their work to go to vote.

Mr. COYNE: It could not be of such great importance, then.

Mr. CORSER: Not to them.

Mr. COYNE: The people would not leave their work to vote against the thing for the same reason. The Home Secretary, in the first place, made provision that the vote would only be taken by request, then he brought down another amendment which provided for no request at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then your side pointed out if that were done the Bill would require another message because it would involve additional expense.

Mr. COYNE: There was evidence of the "Jump, Jim Crow" business about the whole thing. First it was by request, and then it was with no request, and now they had a request with a percentage.

The PREMIER: We will deal with that later on. Why not deal with the amendment; otherwise we shall be here all night?

Mr. COYNE: It was an undesirable thing to hold the poll on a Senate election day, as they should not interfere with the great Australian questions which would have to be decided on those days; and they had no conception at the present time of the magnitude of the questions which would be submitted to the people in the very near future, because they were only beginning to build a nation. As time went on the questions would be of greater importance from election to election, and why should they bring in something like this that, according to the hon. member for Maryborough, was of such a pettifogging nature that people would not leave their work to vote one way or the other? Surely they should not let a little matter of this sort interfere with those big Federal questions, if the hon. member for Maryborough was right! But if they were going to have it on any election day at all in order to get a big vote, let them take it on their own shoulders.

The HOME SECRETARY: How are you going to take it at triennial intervals?

Mr. COYNE: In the very same way as if they had it on election day. There was no more certainty about having triennial Senate elections than having State elections. The chances were in favour of the Senate elections being more regular, but it was only a matter of degree. He was sorry this new departure had been made from the way the Bill was introduced originally.

The PREMIER: Your leader, on the second reading, protested against a special day—he wanted it either on a State or Federal election.

Mr. LENNON: A State day.

Mr. COYNE: It was an evidence of cowardice on their part to say that they would not take the burden of their own sin. They just wanted to put it on to the shoulders of the Federal Parliament on the day, and it showed that the Government of Queensland had very little concern for the big Australian questions that were to be submitted to the people, and on which they expected to get an intelligent decision on that day. If something were submitted to the electors next time to try and do away with industrial disputes, it was of great importance that nothing should be dragged in to divert the people's attention from that subject, and let it be threshed out on its merits; whereas if this was passed, somebody would get up in the middle of a speech and ask a candidate what he thought about the local option vote, or whether hotels should be closed. The same thing occurred in connection with the referendum on religious instruction in State schools, which was held on a Federal election day. During that campaign he spoke throughout the whole of Southern and Western Queensland, and never missed dealing with that subject except at one meeting. He believed the same difficulty would crop up at Senate elections if this clause was allowed to pass as proposed, besides which they would be coming into conflict with the Commonwealth Government, which would resent any interference with their business on that day.

Mr. ADAMSON: The Premier had made a strong point that this clause was introduced to satisfy both the temperance side and the other side. He wanted to read what were the decisions of the Queensland Temperance Alliance in relation to this matter originally—

"Local option.—

"We urge the following:—

"A vote of electors shall be taken in every electorate at the places and on the day fixed for the poll thereon at each general election."

The next thing was—

"We therefore urge that the Bill be amended as follows:—

"That the first poll be taken in every electorate within twelve months after the election of the next Parliament, and triennially thereafter without requests."

This was what the Good Templars asked—

"The placing in the hands of the people of full electoral local option (with triennial polls concurrent with the general parliamentary elections) to decide as to the continuation, reduction, or discontinuance of liquor licenses of all kinds."

He held that the best way to deal with this question was to have a separate day, and let each party work earnestly for what they believed. To say that the temperance party asked for this to be taken on a Federal election day was not to speak according to their printed documents.

The PREMIER: It said the State election day—it did not say Federal.

Mr. ADAMSON: It was not right for the Premier to say that the temperance people asked for it to be taken on the Federal election day.

Mr. MCLACHLAN (*Fortitude Valley*) was opposed to the holding of this referendum on the day of the Senate election. If this local option poll was to be taken on any election day, it should be taken on the State election day. He recognised that there would be some difficulty in fixing triennial polls in connection with State elections, and the same difficulty might arise, although not so likely, in connection with Federal or senatorial elections, but that difficulty might be obviated by taking the local option poll on a day other than that for any of those elections. He had been looking up the debate which took place on the occasion of the introduction of the Religious Instruction in State Schools Referendum Bill, and it went to show that there was a desire on the part of a great number of members that the vote should not be shouldered on to a Federal election, but should be held on a State election day, but it was decided that the poll should be taken on the first general election which took place after the commencement of the Act, which happened to be a Federal election. The hon. member for Leichhardt moved an amendment on the motion for the introduction of that Bill to widen its scope, and he (Mr. McLachlan) made a speech in favour of the amendment, his desire being to have the whole measure reopened for discussion. He was opposed to the whole business. During the debate the Premier, who was then Secretary for Public Lands, made a speech, in which he said—

"I think it is manifestly in the public interests that the day should be altered."

The date that was proposed to be altered was the date of the Federal election. If it was in the public interests that a question of that kind should be decided separately from the Federal election, surely it was equally in the public interests that a question of this kind should be separated from a Federal election. It would surely be infinitely better not to have the vote taken on a State or Federal election day at all, but if it was to be held on an election day, then it should be taken on the State election day.

The PREMIER: The junior member for Rockhampton had quoted from *The Alliance News* to refute a statement which he (Mr. Denham) had made that the temperance organisation wished the vote to be taken on the senatorial election day. He still adhered to that statement. He could assure the hon. gentleman that the temperance organisation asked that the Bill be amended in the direction of having the vote taken on a State or Federal election day. Since the junior member for Rockhampton made the statement the Home Secretary confirmed the statement he previously made as to the temperance people wishing the Bill to be amended in the direction he had mentioned.

Mr. ADAMSON: I accept your statement.

The PREMIER: With regard to the statement of the hon. member for Fortitude

Valley that it should be on a day which was not an election day, it was not right that they should have a local option poll taken on such a big question as that on an off day. He, personally, preferred the vote to be taken on the State election day, but it did not find favour with their friends. If the State elections occurred with anything like the regularity of Federal elections, then the reason for not having it on a State election day would disappear. The Federal Parliament passed an Act to postpone the Federal elections for six months so as to bring them into March or April, which was the most convenient period of the year for holding elections, and as they would be held regularly at that time, that was the proper time for taking the local option vote. Then, again, a State election, by reason of no contest, might not be held all over the State, whereas it must be held all over the State in a Senate election, which constitutes another reason for holding it at that time. At the last Federal election the question of the Bible instruction in State schools was considered, and the figures quoted by the hon. member for Woolloongabba showed that on that occasion there was a bigger poll at the Senate and House of Representatives' elections than ever before, which showed that it was a good thing to submit such a question as local option. The probabilities were that with a big momentous question like the one they were dealing with, if they took the vote on Federal election day there would be more votes polled on that day for the Senate and House of Representatives. If they had it on an off day, public interest would not be aroused so much, and they would only have a qualifying vote, which would not be the case if they had it on Federal election day. He was opposed to that, as he wanted to see fair play, and as the temperance party and those in the liquor trade wished it to be on Federal election day, he would support it, although, personally, he preferred to hold it on State election day.

Amendment (*Mr. Appel's*) agreed to.

Clause 162, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 163—"Local option areas"—

Mr. FORSYTH: The clause read—

"The provisions of this Part may be applied in a local option area consisting of—

"(*a*) An electoral district; or

"(*b*) An electoral division of an electoral district; or

"(*c*) A group of two or more of such divisions of the same electoral district."

Some of the divisions were very large, especially in the Western districts, and also in some of the coastal districts, and it might happen that a local option vote would be taken in one portion of the electorate, and the people 50 miles away, who would be in the same division, would be called on to vote on it. He asked the Home Secretary if some scheme could be devised by which the local option areas could be limited to smaller areas than was provided for in the Bill?

The HOME SECRETARY: They quite recognised that it would be necessary to recast the divisions of the electorate in many instances, and they proposed to do that. It would be a matter of consideration to be dealt with after the Bill became law, and he gave the Committee the assurance that he realised that alterations should be made to the electoral divisions where necessary.

Mr. RYLAND: The proviso to the clause read—

"Provided that the whole of such local option area shall be wholly comprised within one and the same licensing district."

Was it necessary to have that proviso?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, it is necessary.

Mr. RYLAND: Take Charters Towers: There were three electorates in one licensing district, and how would that work out?

The HOME SECRETARY: It will work under paragraph (*b*). This has been carefully considered by the Parliamentary Draftsman and the Assistant Under Secretary, Mr. Gall, who is well acquainted with these matters. That will all be arranged.

Clause 163 put and passed.

On clause 164—"When first local option vote may be taken"—

The HOME SECRETARY moved the omission of the words from lines 45 to 50 inclusive, with the view of inserting the following words:—

"The earliest year in which the first local option vote may be taken under this Part in any local option area shall be at the Senate election in the year one thousand nine hundred and sixteen; but such vote may be requested on or before the thirtieth day of November, one thousand nine hundred and fifteen."

This was a consequential amendment which was rendered necessary owing to the amendment which was accepted in clause 162, making the vote to be taken at a Senate election. The Senate election would take place in 1916, and therefore they had to bring forward the time for the first local option vote to be taken to the date on which the Senate election would be held.

Mr. THEODORE noticed that the Home Secretary had changed his policy again in regard to this clause. In the Bill, as originally introduced, it was provided that a poll could not be taken, except at the request of one-tenth of the persons entitled [7.30 p.m.] to vote. An amendment was subsequently circulated in which the Government went back on that proposal, and indicated that they were prepared to amend the provision in such a way as to allow of the poll being taken without any request.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; but members opposite objected that that was outside the scope of the Bill, and it would involve additional expenditure.

Mr. THEODORE: It was a pity that the hon. gentleman had misled the House by circulating that amendment. The present amendment provided that a poll might be requested on or before the 1st November, 1915. Personally, he thought it would be much better if these polls were taken every three years without request. That would be something more nearly approaching a State option than the system now proposed, because the vote would then be taken in every part of the State at precisely the same time, and would thus give a general indication of public feeling on the subject. The weakness of the system proposed in the Bill was that though a poll might be taken in all districts at the same time, it was probable that the resolutions would only be carried in some, so that they would have all the shortcomings

of local option as compared with State option. The Premier could not claim to be a reformer in this matter when he proposed local option of that kind.

The PREMIER: The best way to accomplish reform is to copy reform.

Mr. THEODORE: It would be much better if they permitted the electors of the whole of the State to vote on the question, and carry reform right throughout the State. The Premier and the Home Secretary must know that the breakdown in New Zealand had been caused by the fact that there were "dry" areas and "wet" areas.

The PREMIER: The New Zealand system has not failed.

Mr. THEODORE: It had failed, and the New Zealand people were now preparing to take a national vote on this question.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: They don't know what they want.

Mr. THEODORE: Well, they certainly did not want local option.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: No; it has broken down, and they know it.

Mr. THEODORE: There was no reason to believe that the national vote would fail.

The PREMIER: The next vote is on both questions—local option and State option.

Mr. THEODORE: According to authorities who had investigated the system in America, the local option system had failed there for precisely the same reason as it had failed in New Zealand—the districts surrounding an area in which local option had been carried had been "wet," and this allowed of the surreptitious introduction of liquor into the "dry" area. Districts in Queensland that needed regulation would probably not get regulation under this proposal; the worst districts in the State would probably not carry local option.

The HOME SECRETARY: Because the people there are opposed to it.

Mr. THEODORE: It really seemed as if the Government wished to defeat the reform they were proposing, because here they had an opportunity of allowing a vote to be taken throughout the State, which contained only 600,000 people, and they did not accept it.

Mr. RYLAND: The amendment of the Home Secretary which was first circulated practically allowed of the taking of a vote right throughout the State every three years, and he was surprised when he read the present amendment to find that the Government had backed down on that proposal, and introduced another scheme.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; left it as it was.

Mr. RYLAND: The Government had backed down from the amendment they had previously circulated. He agreed with the hon. member for Woothakata that it would be better to have a poll right throughout the State than the poll proposed in the Bill. New Zealand was to take a vote of the whole of the electors of the State in December next, and it would have been well if we had made a similar arrangement as far as the extent of the voting was concerned.

Amendment (*Mr. Appel's*) agreed to.

The HOME SECRETARY moved the insertion, at the beginning of line 51, of the words, "Save and except as to the taking of a poll upon the third resolution." This referred to the re-enactment of Part VI. of the Licensing Act of 1885—the local option clauses—and referred to the resolution that no new licenses be granted. As the Committee had accepted a new clause after clause 21, providing that no new license should be granted after the Bill became law until a poll of the electors had been taken affirming that new licenses be granted, it was not necessary that this should be continued in the local option clauses referred to on the ratepayers' roll. Under the wider franchise a poll must be taken automatically on the application for a provisional certificate or for a new license; and if this was allowed to remain, a request could be made for a second poll on the ratepayers' roll on the same subject. As the poll to be taken under the new clause was on the more extended franchise, which covered the restricted franchise, he was asking the Committee to accept the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

The HOME SECRETARY moved the insertion after line 6, page 60, of the following:—

> "(*c*) Any area in which a poll has been taken under the said Part VI. of the said Act, before the commencement of this Act, shall be and remain an area without any change of boundaries for the purpose of any further poll under the said Part and under this subsection, until the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen;
>
> "(*d*) No poll shall be taken in a newly constituted area under the said Part VI. of the said Act unless such area is either a whole area of a local authority or a division or divisions thereof;
>
> "(*e*) The roll to be used at any local option poll under this section shall be the voters' roll of the local authority comprising the names of the ratepayers in the local option area and prepared as for an extraordinary election under the Local Authorities Acts, 1902-1911."

This was to obviate the practice whereby persons interested had selected a small portion of a local authority area where they knew they would be able to carry the poll in their favour. The last paragraph made clear the question as to which roll should be used. Under the Local Authorities Act the local authority was required to prepare a ratepayers' roll on the 1st day of January, comprising the names of all persons who had paid their rates prior to the 31st day of the preceding month. It had happened that a claim had been made that persons on that roll who had not paid their rates for the current year when a poll was taken during that current year should be entitled to vote. This made it clear that the roll must be the same as would have to be used in the case of an extraordinary election; that was to say, all the persons on the roll must have paid their rates fourteen days before the day of nomination.

Mr. ADAMSON asked whether the amendment would interfere with the new clause passed the other night by the Committee?

The HOME SECRETARY: It would not interfere with the new clause following clause 21, which provided for a poll being taken automatically upon application being made for a provisional certificate or a new license. This would merely affect the two other resolutions—reduction and total prohibition—under the local option clauses of the present Act.

Mr. RYLAND moved the omission of all the words after "area" in paragraph (*c*).

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member does not know what he is moving.

Mr. RYLAND: He would tell the hon. gentleman what he thought he was moving. According to this, the ratepayers entitled to vote would be those who had paid their rates up to a certain date—the same as for an extraordinary election of a local authority.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. RYLAND: He moved the omission of all the words after "area," because he wanted all the ratepayers to be allowed to take part in the poll. There was a lot of difference between the ratepayers in an area and those on the voters' roll. As a rule, taking the various districts throughout Queensland by and large, there were 33 per cent. of the ratepayers not on the voters' roll of the local authorities. Every ratepayer should be given a vote. Under the present Act he believed that every ratepayer could vote whether his rates were paid or unpaid. That was the case in connection with a poll on a loan, because every ratepayer was liable to be rated in connection with the loan, and in this instance every ratepayer was interested in voting in a local option poll.

Mr. THEODORE was not too sure that the hon. member for Gympie was going to improve the clause by omittting those words. The hon. member claimed that, if the amendment were agreed to, the vote would be taken on the ordinary annual roll, but the Local Authorities Act of last session was quite clear on the point. Section 8 read—

"Provided that no person shall be entitled to vote—

"(*a*) At the annual election of members in the month of February unless on or before the thirty-first day of December previously; or

"(*b*) At any extraordinary election of a member or members, unless fourteen clear days before day of nomination;

"all sums then due to the local authority in respect of rates (including interest thereon, if any), for the payment of which he is liable have been paid."

The disability in regard to unpaid rates applied, unfortunately, in both cases. It was a pity that they could not limit each ratepayer to one vote, because under the Local Authorities Act one person might be entitled to three votes, and he supposed a number of those who were interested in the liquor trade would give three votes.

Mr. CORSER: Just as many on the other side may have three votes.

Mr. THEODORE: That was true, but it was not fair that some people should have three votes when a large percentage of the community would not have a vote at all.

Mr. RYLAND: It was necessary to move the omission, earlier in the subclause, of the words "voters' roll of the local authority comprising the name of," and he accordingly moved their omission. The subclause would then read—

"The roll to be used in any local option poll under this section shall be the ratepayers in the local option area."

The HOME SECRETARY: You will only mess things up completely. You are thrown back on the Local Authorities Act for your definition of "ratepayer."

Hon. R. PHILP: Who will make up the roll for you?

Mr. RYLAND: The local authorities.

The HOME SECRETARY: How can they? The local authority has to compile the roll on the basis of the definition of "ratepayer" in the Local Authorities Act.

Mr. RYLAND: All ratepayers could vote at present in a local option poll whether their rates were paid or not.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot go back before the word "area" unless he withdraws the amendment now before the Committee.

Mr. RYLAND asked leave to withdraw the amendment now before the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the amendment be withdrawn?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No.

Amendment (*Mr. Ryland's*) put and negatived.

Mr. RYLAND moved the addition to the clause of the words—

"Provided that all ratepayers, whose names appear on the ratebook shall be entitled to vote."

The HOME SECRETARY: You cannot move that, because the Committee have already accepted the roll that is to be used, and that would negative what had already been done.

Amendment (*Mr. Appel's*) agreed to.

Mr. ADAMSON said he would like to see a proviso that only one ratepayer could have one vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: We would have to amend the Local Authorities Act to do that.

Mr. ADAMSON: He was very sorry they had not the parliamentary franchise in this matter, and that they could not get one ratepayer one vote.

Mr. MULLAN: If the Home Secretary was really sincere, notwithstanding the Local Authorities Act, they could add a provision to the clause.

The HOME SECRETARY: I can assure the hon. member you cannot.

Mr. MULLAN: In previous Bills they had altered other Acts, and he could see no difficulty whatever in this. He was sure if the Home Secretary would consult the draftsman he would find a way
[8 p.m.] out of the difficulty. He (Mr. Mullan) was prepared to abide by it if the draftsman said it could not be done.

After a pause,

Mr. MULLAN: Did he understand from the Home Secretary that it could be done if the Committee desired it? As there was no answer, he took it that it could be done. It was a reasonable thing that each ratepayer should have one vote and one vote only. The Home Secretary had often stated he was a democrat, and he (Mr. Mullan) hoped the hon. member would accept the amendment he proposed to move.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have made my position clear so far as the ratepayers are concerned. After consultation with the draftsman, I find that it would be possible that an amendment could be made to limit the vote to one ratepayer one vote.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: Well, we had better prepare an amendment.

Mr. ADAMSON: Do I understand that the Home Secretary will accept an amendment?

The HOME SECRETARY: I have on different occasions made my position clear so far as local authorities and the ratepayers' roll is concerned.

The PREMIER: While the amendment was being prepared he might call attention to the fact that this clause would not affect new licenses. Hereafter, any new licenses proposed would be subjected to the vote of everybody on the parliamentary roll. This clause would apply to votes taken on—

"First—that the sale of intoxicating liquors shall be prohibited; second—that the number of licenses shall be reduced to a certain number, specified in the notice, not being less than two-thirds of the existing number."

So far as new licenses were concerned, the parliamentary roll would apply.

Mr. MULLAN moved that the words—

"No ratepayer shall be entitled to more than one vote at any such local option poll"

be added to subclause (*e*). The object of the amendment was to have one vote and one vote only for each ratepayer. That was a very equitable arrangement, seeing that they had one adult one vote for Commonwealth affairs—the supreme affairs of the nation—and surely they should be content to settle a mere matter of a local option poll on the same basis! He did not want to labour the question.

Mr. CORSER: Everybody understands your argument.

Mr. MULLAN did not think the hon. member for Maryborough did.

Mr. CORSER: I can assure you I do.

Mr. MULLAN: Then if the hon. member understood the argument, it was all the more discreditable to him to oppose the amendment. The amendment involved the principle of adult sufferage, and what was good for a State election or a Commonwealth election was certainly good for such a subordinate matter as a local option poll.

Mr. LENNON did not propose to discuss the amendment if the Home Secretary would accept it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I cannot accept it.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: It is too democratic.

Mr. LENNON: Then all the hon. gentleman's democracy was a mere profession. He would like to see less profession and more performance, and then they might be able later on to believe some of the rash professions which the hon. gentleman might be tempted to make. Surely it did not require any argument in favour of the amendment! The hon. gentleman came with a new Bill, and acknowledged that this was a question which should be settled by the whole of the people, and why make a reservation that in the case of existing licenses the poll should only be taken according to the restricted franchise under the Local Authorities Act? It was too ridiculous altogether. Surely, if any man in a community, whether he owned property or not, was a strong believer in local option, and desired to bring about the realisation of his ideas, why should he not have a vote? Then, to come to the property-owners; they actually would not allow the man with one vote to have an equal say with the publican or the brewer or the wine and spirit merchant, who might be a large ratepayer. This was practically a public-house franchise, reserved particularly for the public-house vote, and would allow the public-house vote, the brewery vote, and all the hangers-on of the grog-trade to defeat the desires of the people. (Government laughter.)

Mr. ADAMSON said he was surprised, after what the Home Secretary said, that he was not going to accept this amendment. The hon. gentleman told them that he had made his position plain in relation to the principle of one man one vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; I said my position on the franchise as regards local authorities; I have done that on different occasions.

Mr. ADAMSON: It seemed to him that the hon. gentleman almost gave them an assurance that he would accept this amendment.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; it was a pure misunderstanding, if that is the opinion.

Mr. ADAMSON: Then members on this side were very dense about the matter. This was a principle worth fighting for, and he hoped they would now come to a division upon it. (Hear, hear!) This was a perfectly democratic principle. He did not think the hon. member for Maryborough should have three votes, and he (Mr. Adamson) only one in a question like this. He remembered once going to a local authority poll in Maryborough, where the hon. member for Maryborough had three votes, and he (Mr. Adamson) had one, and he remembered saying that he did not think the hon. member was three times better than he (Mr. Adamson) was. Seeing that this question affected the welfare of human beings—and he had humanitarian principles, and some of the members on the other side had got strongly individualistic principles in relation to matters of property—he thought every man should have equal voting power.

The PREMIER: The vote on No. 1 and No. 2 resolutions was to be on the ratepayers' roll. His impression was that the owners of large properties entitling them to plural votes would be a distinctly conservative vote. A man who had property would object to hotels coming into a suburban area where he resided. (Hear, hear!) He had observed the operation of it in regard to "no license;" it had been those who had property there—and the best of properties, too; if there was any best about them—who had been opposed to them. He wanted to see reform, and he believed that on the restricted municipal vote they were more likely to accomplish a reduction or prohibition by admitting the plural vote. There were very few who had three votes.

Mr. MANN: A great number have two, and some three votes.

The PREMIER: He believed that those who had valuable property were far more likely to vote for reduction or prohibition than otherwise would be the case.

Mr. LENNON admitted that in places like New Farm, which might be regarded as aristocratic, they had kept out hotels, and in other suburbs of Brisbane they had done likewise; but the very people who kept public-houses from coming into their own residential area might be interested in places like Paddington and Albion, where people

like himself lived, and they would cast their vote for more public-houses there while keeping them out of their own select circle.

Mr. TROUT: They have tried for years to get one at Paddington, and they can't get it.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Mullan's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 26.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. McLachlan
„ Allen	„ Mann
„ Breslin	„ Maughan
„ Collins	„ May
„ Coyne	„ Mulcahy
„ Crawford	„ Mullan
„ Ferricks	„ Murphy
„ Foley	„ O'Sullivan
„ Hamilton	„ Payne
„ Hardacre	„ Ryan
„ Hunter, D.	„ Ryland
„ Land	„ Theodore
„ Lennon	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Ferricks and Mr. Theodore.

NOES, 35.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
„ Appel	„ Lesina
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Macartney
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Paget
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bouchard	„ Philp
„ Brennan	„ Rankin
„ Bridges	„ Roberts
„ Corser	„ Somerset
„ Cribb	„ Stevens
„ Denham	„ Swayne
„ Douglas	„ Thorn
„ Forrest	„ Trout
„ Forsyth	„ Vowles
„ Fox	„ Walker
„ Grant	„ Welsby
„ Grayson	„ Wienholt
„ Gunn	

Tellers: Mr. Vowles and Mr. Welsby.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Blair. No—Mr. Morgan.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN moved that the following proviso be added after the end of subsection (*e*):—

"Provided that, notwithstanding anything contained in this section, on any such poll all ratepayers rated with respect to property within the area shall be entitled to vote for or against each resolution upon which a poll is taken."

That would ensure that every ratepayer in that district would have a voice in the question.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is the law now.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Yes, it was the law now. As was stated by the hon. member for Gympie, fully 33 per cent. of the people were disfranchised, from one cause and another, when a poll of the ratepayers was taken on any question. As this was a question on which they should get as many people to vote as possible, they should take the names of those on the ratebook, and it was reasonable for the Home Secretary to accept the amendment. There were many people who, through errors, could not take part in a local option vote, and if it were only a question of loans, there might be some excuse for that, but under this Bill no such errors should debar any ratepayer from taking part in the vote.

The HOME SECRETARY: He could not possibly accept the amendment, and that must be apparent to the hon. member who moved it, because it was in direct contradiction to what they had already laid down should be the roll on which the poll should be taken. They had already decided that the local option vote should be taken by the ratepayers on the same roll as that which was prepared for an extraordinary election under the Local Authorities Acts of 1902 to 1911. The amendment was a direct contradiction to what was accepted, and was out of order. He could not possibly accept it in view of the fact that the Committee had already accepted the roll on which the vote should be taken.

Mr. RYLAND: The proviso they were asking should be inserted was practically the same as that which was in the Licensing Act of 1885. It was laid down there that those whose names were on the ratebook should be entitled to vote at a local option poll. It was not taking any names from the roll, but was merely making an additional roll. (Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: You might as well add the names of those who are on the roll for a parliamentary election.

Mr. RYLAND: No; he only proposed to add those names which were on the ratebook. At the present time when there was an election fully 30 per cent. were disfranchised from one cause and another, and if they allowed those who were on the ratebook to vote they would get the full vote of all those who were entitled to vote on such a question.

Mr. FOLEY was sorry that the Home Secretary did not see his way clear to accept the amendment, because what it really meant was that instead of compiling the roll from the ratepayers' roll it would be compiled from the ratebook.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Committee have already decided what the roll shall be.

Mr. FOLEY: There were a number of ratepayers who were unable to pay their rates by the 31st December, and possibly not within seven days of a poll being taken. The result would be that a large [8.30 p.m.] number of people who were vitally interested in a locality where it was proposed to establish a public-house would be debarred from voting at the local option poll, unless the amendment now submitted was adopted. There was no reason why a ratepayer who, through no fault of his own, probably in consequence of bad times or through being out of work, was unable to pay his rates, should not be allowed to have a voice in the question as to whether he would have a public-house in his midst or not.

The HOME SECRETARY: The elector has that right.

Mr. FOLEY: Yes, after 1916.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; immediately after the passing of this Bill every elector will have a right to vote.

Mr. FOLEY: He would have a right to vote on the question as to whether a license should be granted for a new hotel, but he could not vote at a poll on the question of the reduction of the number of public-houses in the district.

The HOME SECRETARY: If his rates are paid within fourteen days of the poll being taken he can vote.

Mr. FOLEY: There were many men who could not pay their rates in "the nick of time," as the saying had it, and though they were deeply interested in the question at issue they would be debarred from voting.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The Premier, when speaking on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Charters Towers, said he objected to that amendment because the vote as it stood would be a conservative vote, and he believed that the conservative vote was the only effective vote for keeping "pubs" out of a district. They would remember that against the hon. gentleman at some future time.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. O'Sullivan's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 26.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. McLachlan
,, Allen	,, Mann
,, Breslin	,, Maughan
,, Collins	,, May
,, Coyne	,, Mulcahy
,, Crawford	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, O'Sullivan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hardacre	,, Ryan
,, Hunter, D.	,, Ryland
,, Land	,, Theodore
,, Lennon	,, Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. O'Sullivan.

NOES, 37.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Lesina
,, Appel	,, Macartney
,, Barnes, G. P.	,, Mackintosh
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Paget
,, Booker	,, Petrie
,, Bouchard	,, Philp
,, Brennan	,, Rankin
,, Bridges	,, Roberts
,, Corser	,, Somerset
,, Cribb	,, Stevens
,, Denham	,, Swayne
,, Douglas	,, Thorn
,, Forrest	,, Tolmie
,, Forsyth	,, Trout
,, Fox	,, Vowles
,, Grant	,, Walker
,, Grayson	,, Welsby
,, Gunn	,, Wienholt
,, Hodge	

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Wienholt.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Blair. No—Mr. Morgan.

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 164, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 165—"Resolutions"—

Mr. THEODORE said he had a very important amendment to propose. He moved the omission of lines 19 to 29 inclusive, being the three resolutions—A, B, and C. If this was carried, he proposed later on to alter certain other clauses so as to provide for the taking of a poll on two questions only—prohibition and the granting of new licenses. If this was carried, and the subsequent amendments, he would also make provision for the granting of five years' grace to the licensees in the districts where prohibition was carried. If they omitted the three resolutions, A, B, and C, the poll for prohibition could be taken in 1916; and there would be no poll on the question of reduction. He thought the question of reduction had proved a failure in most places where it had been tried. The temperance people advocated reduction in the number of licenses for the purpose of reducing the consumption of liquor, but that this had not been accomplished had been proved in New Zealand. In that country in 1896 there were 94,555 votes in favour of reduction, and the liquor expenditure was £2,265,000; in 1899 there were 107,751 votes, and the amount spent in liquor was £2,557,968; in 1902 the number of votes increased to 132,240, and the amount expended on liquor increased to £2,953,298; in 1905 there were 151,057 votes in favour of reduction, and the expenditure was £3,120,705; and in 1908 the reduction votes went up to 162,562, while the expenditure on liquor increased to £3,751,968. So it would be seen that though the vote in favour of reducing the number of hotels was constantly increasing, the expenditure on liquor was also increasing constantly. In twelve years the expenditure went up by over £1,500,000, while the vote in favour of reduction increased by nearly 100,000. Not only did reduction not bring about the result anticipated, but it created monopoly; and they had the unedifying spectacle, when there was a local option poll, of the liquor interest and the temperance interest working hand-in-glove.

Mr. LENNON rose for the purpose of supporting the amendment, assuming that the Home Secretary was not going to accept it. But perhaps he was wrong in assuming that; he hoped it might be so. The hon. member for Woothakata had shown that in New Zealand those frequent votes for reduction had not resulted in decreased consumption of grog. If the hon. member had quoted the average consumption, perhaps that would have more fairly represented the position than quoting the gross consumption. The experience of New South Wales and of New Zealand proved that where there were too many hotels you could not effect any reduction at all, but where there were only a few hotels it was not difficult to reduce the number. He felt satisfied that at Nundah, where there was only one hotel, it could be wiped out; but when they came to the city of Brisbane, a hotbed of vice—if drinking was a vice—you could not reduce a single hotel on any vote.

Hon. R. PHILP: I am sure you could.

Mr. LENNON: Some people voted for a 25 per cent. reduction, and, having effected that, they got frightened, and afterwards voted in a directly opposite way. That also was proved by statistics. If the reduction clauses were retained, the result would be the same here as it had been in New South Wales—reductions would be effected where they were not needed, and where they were pressingly necessary there would be no reduction at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: The amendment was a serious mutilation of the Bill. It practically altered the policy that was laid down in the Bill, and, that being so, he could give the hon. member for Herbert an assurance that he was absolutely correct in his surmise. He did not propose to accept the amendment.

Mr. RYLAND: The amendment made a definite proposal.

The HOME SECRETARY: He is trying to whitewash himself now. (Laughter.)

Mr. RYLAND: As the hon. member for Herbert pointed out, the experience in New Zealand and New South Wales was that the people would make one reduction and then

they got tired, as there was no business in it. Supposing there were four hotels at a street crossing, what sort of temperance reform was it to close one of them and leave the other three? There would have been no reduction in New Zealand at all had it not been that the Act provided that all votes for prohibition should count as votes for reduction, and they were thereby able to carry a reduction in some districts. There was no such provision in this Bill. It was nothing but a waste of time to have to wait three years between each two polls. There was business in the amendment. It was long enough to wait until 1916 for a vote upon prohibition, and, if that was carried, then those engaged in the trade would have five years afterwards to set their houses in order and get out of the business. It would also make provision for those who had paid large premiums for goodwills. Some people had paid as much as £5,000, and even £10,000, for a six or seven years' lease.

Mr. MURPHY: A hotel changed hands the other day with a twenty years' lease. How would that come in?

Mr. RYLAND: He would be prepared to make provision with regard to any lease which was in existence at the time of the passing of the Act, that the landlord should make a proportionate return to the lessee. Under the amendment they would be able to secure prohibition in the year 1921, whereas, under the Government proposal, a vote could not be taken until 1925, or four years later. The amendment would treat those engaged in the liquor trade fairly, as it would give them practically ten years from the present time in which to get out. Instead of giving a licensed victualler six, eight, or twelve months after a vote was taken, the amendment would give him five years to make his arrangements.

The HOME SECRETARY: And you call yourself a liquor reformer, and want to give him five years.

Mr. RYLAND: He was a genuine reformer. He would let the hotel-keepers know their destiny. In New Zealand they were given four years.

The HOME SECRETARY: I see whom you are catering for. (Laughter.)

Mr. RYLAND: He was catering to do the right thing between man and man. He did not believe there was any vested interest in a license; but when they asked men to fulfil the conditions of the Act and provide a large amount of accommodation, they must allow them something for that.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are going the whole hog.

Mr. RYLAND: They had been put to a lot of expense, and that was why he did not object.

The HOME SECRETARY: You attack us for giving them one year, and you want to give them five years.

Mr. RYLAND: He would put the money down on the nail, but there was no hope of getting that. If he moved an amendment to that effect, the Chairman would rule him out of order, and tell him that it required a message from the Governor, and that it was outside the scope of the Bill, and this was the only way in which they could do it. He believed in doing justice to all. The amendment would allow those in the trade nine years, instead of the fifteen years proposed by the Government. The proposal of the Government was not going to act fairly. It would take away 25 per cent. of the licenses after five years, and give a monopoly to the remainder. The Opposition said that [9 p.m.] the whole 100 per cent. of the trade should be put on the same level. The temperance people wanted a good fight over something worth fighting for. They were fighting for prohibition, but what inducement was there to vote to wipe out one hotel and leave three others at the opposite corners? The amendment was a real fighting proposal, and one that would do the right thing between man and man. He claimed the vote of temperance men on the other side of the House. He claimed the vote of the hon. member for Warwick, of the hon. member for Toowoomba, and of the hon. member for Brisbane South, to assist to carry out the proposal of the hon. member for Woothakata.

Mr. FOLEY was going to support the amendment, and he could safely claim the votes of the so-called temperance men on the Government side. A good deal had been said about the abolition of the drink traffic, and some members on the other side of the House had proclaimed against the evils of the drink traffic louder than members of the Opposition. Under the Bill the first vote that could be taken on reduction was in 1916, and three years after that another vote on reduction could be taken, and three years after that a third vote on reduction, and another three years would elapse before they could take a vote on prohibition. In 1925 was the first time a vote could be taken on prohibition, but under the amendment the traffic could be abolished in ten years' time.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We are giving time to educate the people.

Mr. FOLEY: If the Secretary for Railways would take his tip, the electors were already educated, and they only wanted an opportunity to put their views into force. The people were ripe for a vote on prohibition now, with the experience they had of the votes on reduction in the other States and the evidence produced by the hon. member for Woothakata, that notwithstanding reduction in New Zealand and the several "dry" districts in that Dominion, the consumption of drink was on the increase.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not per capita.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member for Woothakata showed that the consumption of drink in New Zealand was £1,500,000 more than it was five years ago.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What is the increase in population?

Mr. FOLEY: He did not know what the increase in population was. One would reasonably expect that where prohibition had been carried in so many of the States of New Zealand there would be a reduction in the consumption of liquor, but instead of that it was increasing, which proved that notwithstanding they might reduce the number of hotels in Queensland, the consumption would not be reduced, but increased. In order to get to the prohibition clauses as quickly as possible, they should do away with the reduction clauses altogether, and bring Resolution D—"That the sale of intoxicating liquors in this local option area shall be prohibited"—into force in 1916.

Then it could be argued that that would be too sudden on the people in the trade to compensate themselves for any loss they might suffer, but under the amendment, if prohibition was carried, they would have five years in which to put their house in order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The amendment is merely to omit line 29, and I trust the hon. member will keep to the amendment.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member said he intended to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member said he was going to do something else, but I had not got that amendment.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. member for Woothakata foreshadowed that it was intended to allow five years after prohibition was carried, to enable those deprived of their license to make good their losses.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Why?

Mr. FOLEY: On the grounds of justice and fair play. Much as he was against the drink traffic, he did not believe in going into an hotel and saying to the licensee, "Get out of this," and clear him out suddenly. He knew several good men in that trade, and they entered the business because there was money in it, and on the distinct understanding that so long as they conducted their house in a proper manner and remained good citizens, they could keep their license. It was only tinkering with the matter to say they should have all those reduction polls. As had been pointed out, if the number of hotels in any given area was reduced, it was only giving a monopoly to those that were left, so that they would be only too glad to see a reduction carried every time, provided that they were left. Do away with the reduction clauses altogether, and go in straight for prohibition in 1916, would be the best means of settling the question.

Mr. ADAMSON was not going to say a great deal on that matter, but he wished to read a letter which he received a few weeks ago from a staunch supporter of the Government in Ipswich, giving the history of reduction in that place, which was very clear how it was—notwithstanding the fact that the number of hotels could be reduced in Queensland or New Zealand or elsewhere—as long as there were others left in the same place it created a monopoly, and did not prevent the sale of liquor or the spread of drunkenness to any great extent. He was not going to give the name of the gentleman in question, but he was a very prominent man in Ipswich, and a man who had had a good deal of influence in relation to Parliament from time to time. He wrote as follows:—

"On 28th September, 1888, a poll was taken in North and East Wards on the second resolution, "That licensed houses be reduced to ten," a reduction of three. Result was 250 for, 175 against; majority for, 75.

"On 22nd October, 1890, another poll on second resolution was taken in the same wards, and a majority secured for the resolution of 53 votes.

"A private canvass was made in the West Ward, but it was found that a resolution could not be carried, so that a poll was not attempted. As time rolled on, and remaining publicans flourished and fattened on increased business, people became dissatisfied with the result of the polling, many stating that a monopoly was being established, others that the fat pig was being greased.

"On 15th October, 1895, a poll was taken in North Ward on the third resolution, "That no new licenses be granted." The voting was 17 for, and 40 against. A triumph for the liquor party. Later another poll was taken in the East Ward, when there was a decided majority against the resolution.

"You know how the "pubs" have since increased in all the wards.

"I mention these facts to let you know that the electors of Queensland, judging by the experiment in Ipswich, will not go for reductions.

"Between the years 1886-90 I, with others, worked strenuously for the reductions. The result being so disappointing, all temperance workers and ratepayers were convinced that it was useless to try further in the same direction.

"The provision by the Government, that three reduction votes, extending over a period of nine years, must be taken before prohibition can be talked of, is simply playing into the hands of the licensed victuallers, who know perfectly well that the trade is absolutely safe behind the barrier being raised."

That was a letter from one of the staunchest supporters of the party that had been in power for many years in the past.

Mr. LESINA: What is his name?

Mr. ADAMSON: He was not going to tell; it was a private letter. They had been twitted in relation to the fact that notwithstanding the votes which had been carried in America and New Zealand and in this State, the volume of drink had not decreased, and was going on. Reduction was practically useless so long as they left hotels in the same vicinity to increase their business and to fatten on the increased chance of trade created by monopoly. The amendment had a good object in view, and he was going to vote for it.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Whatever might be said for or against the amendment, the conditions as they existed at present would be ridiculous. It had been stated that under the existing conditions of the ratepayers' roll licenses could be reduced or practically wiped out throughout Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: This is a different franchise.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: It had been said to-night that there was a better chance with a ratepayers' franchise of reducing or wiping out licenses than there would be on a broader franchise, and the grounds given were that property-owners would take good care that they did not have "pubs" near themselves.

The PREMIER: That is on the limited franchise.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: And the argument was that a limited franchise was the best. If that was so, why should people be in favour of a wider franchise? It seemed to him that what the Government were giving with one hand in 1926—prohibition—in the first place, they practically took back with the other hand. If the other resolutions had remained in force till 1926, and these had been struck out, it would have been infinitely better. The Home Secretary plainly and distinctly laid down as a vital principle that no compensation was being given; that the principle of compensation was not recognised in the 1885 Act, and was not being recognised in this Bill. And yet, at the same time, there was practically sixteen years given, and then there was no statement made as to what time compensation they would

give after that. It would be better from the trade point of view that the time should be given after the poll rather than before. While there was no sound claim for compensation—either time or anything else—he preferred to give time rather than cash compensation. Then, in 1926, when they had all been presuming that they would be able to go on, they would be quite upset if prohibition took place, and none of them would be prepared for it.

Mr. MURPHY: They would all have to go out whether they were prepared or not.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Would it not be better, from their point of view, if they knew they had to go out? They would be better able to make preparations.

Mr. MURPHY: The trouble is that during the last period they would get up another agitation for an extension.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: It was no use forestalling these things, but the resolutions in the clause as at present were not satisfactory to anybody, and the amendment as foreshadowed by the hon. member for Woothakata would be a great improvement on the Bill as it stood.

The PREMIER said that hon. members had distorted the argument he had used just now. If there were 100 voters on the roll, twenty-five of whom were entitled to three votes, the strong probability was that the possessors of the larger vote—the twenty-five each with three votes—would be likely to vote either for prohibition in the district or reduction or no licenses.

Mr. MULLAN: Why are you giving a State franchise?

The PREMIER: Because he thought that was the proper franchise to have. Now, they were discussing the matter on the broader franchise of the electoral roll. Provision was made showing bonâ fide that no new licenses could be given until there had been a vote taken on the electoral roll. Then, in regard to reduction, it was provided that in a certain area there might be a poll taken for a reduction of 25 per cent. That was a matter of opinion. The hon. gentleman said that there was no hope for reduction. There was a greater hope of obtaining prohibition eventually by reducing 25 per cent. at a time than there was by taking a vote for total prohibition. The other States were following on the same lines. Western Australia and also the other States all followed the same practice.

Mr. RYLAND: No.

The PREMIER: Which other State did not do so?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Victoria.

The PREMIER: Victoria had the principle of reduction by compensation. They had reduction boards who reduced the number of licenses. In all big reforms, wherever there was an attempt to reach the ultimate goal at one act, failure is inevitable. By education in the schools and elsewhere in society, it was possible to educate the public mind to such an extent as to lead the public in five years' time to reduce the number of hotels by 25 per cent. The hon. member for Woothakata said that it had been a failure in New Zealand, but they knew, as a matter of fact, that there were areas there which were absolutely "dry."

Mr. LESINA: What are the names of those areas?

The PREMIER: They were in the Southern part of the State.

Mr. LENNON: But there are "wet" areas adjoining the "dry" areas which are worse than ever, and they enter the "dry" areas.

The PREMIER: It was made possible to abolish hotel licenses altogether by adopting the provision before them. They would first vote for 25 per cent. reduction, then a subsequent 25 per cent. reduction, then another 25 per cent., and then prohibition straight out.

Mr. COLLINS: If it was a good thing to have prohibition in 1925, it would be a fair thing to have it in 1916. He recognised that they were up against a big proposition when they were up against the vested interests in the liquor trade. He understood from the hon. member for South Brisbane that there were £3,000,000 invested in the liquor trade throughout Queensland, and he wanted to deal with that traffic as quickly as possible. The measure went a long way round about in showing how not to do it, and it seemed to be more for the vested interests than for the masses of the people.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was what caused the disinclination of members on your side to deal with the clause relating to sly grog-selling.

Mr. COLLINS: So far as he was personally concerned, he would wipe the liquor traffic out in 1916, or even at the present time. If one vote would do it, he would wipe it out at once. The figures quoted by the hon. member for Woothakata showed the growth of the trade in New Zealand when they had reduction of licenses. That meant that the traffic seemed to get greater influence. The vested interests in the traffic wanted to be fought before they got too big a hold, and the sooner they did it the better. The sooner they gave the people the opportunity of voting on prohibition the better it would be. There were eleven members who professed temperance on the Government side, and he would claim their votes on the amendment. Why should they wait for nine years to get a vote on prohibition? The hon. member for South Brisbane was a leader in the temperance movement, and they claimed his vote. The Minister for Railways was also a teetotal advocate.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not so good as you.

Mr. COLLINS: He was not a teetotaller, yet he wanted to do away with the liquor traffic altogether. It was a question of whether the people would control the liquor traffic or whether the liquor traffic would control the people.

Mr. RYLAND: The Premier said that by educating the people they would get the hotels reduced. Surely they had got beyond the A B C of the temperance movement! He had been preaching temperance in the House for a long time, and why should they have to start at A B C now? The time had arrived when A B C should go by the board and let them deal with D. (Laughter.) There were 400 hotels in Great Britain which were owned by members of the House

of Lords. Lord Derby owned seventy-two hotels; the Duke of Bedford, fifty; the Duke of Devonshire, forty-seven; the Duke of Rutland thirty-seven; the Duke of Northumberland, thirty-six; Lord Dudley, thirty-three. No wonder Lord Dudley talked about professional politicians, as he did not want any salary himself when he had thirty-three hotels. (Laughter.) Lord Cowper owned twenty-two hotels; Lord Dunraven, eleven; and Lord Salisbury, eleven. Vested interest was the rock they were up against in connection with the liquor question. The Opposition were prepared to give the people an opportunity of voting for prohibition in 1916. Do away with the A B C and get to business. He would support the amendment. They saw the vested interests they had to contend with in Great Britain, and it would be the same in Queensland in the future.

Mr. LESINA wished to reply to a statement made by the Hon. the Premier. The hon. gentleman made some characteristic remarks occasionally when dealing with public questions, and indulged in generalisations which were taken by the public with a grain of salt. When the hon. gentleman was [9.30 p.m.] speaking just now he challenged him to mention one district in New Zealand which was absolutely water-tight or liquor-tight, and the hon. gentleman could not mention one solitary district. Therefore, they might honestly say that the statement should be taken by the public with a large grain of salt. There was no truth in it. He did not say that the hon. gentleman deliberately made a statement which was not true, but the statement he was referring to was not true. Possibly their so-called "dry" areas were not worse than they used to be, but it was well known that liquor was surreptitiously taken from the "wet" areas into the "dry" areas. Certainly they drove drunks out of the "dry" districts into "wet" districts, which became swampy, so to speak; but what advantage was there to the State in getting drunkards concentrated in the swampy districts? He had a quotation from the New Zealand correspondent of the London *Times* of 11th January, 1907, in which he gave five reasons for condemning the local-option system which was in force in New Zealand. Those five reasons were as follow:—

"(1) The intense bitterness of the feeling which the local option propaganda has spread throughout New Zealand, dividing it into two great hostile camps, and setting neighbour against neighbour; (2) the disadvantages of local option laws which fail to appeal to the moral sense of the community, excite animosity rather than secure support, and can be carried out, even in part, only by the organisation of a spy system which brings the administration of justice into contempt with all honest and honourable men; (3) the inexcusable interference with personal liberty; (4) the sense of injustice inflicted on working-class and middle-class people in depriving them of the opportunity of getting reasonable refreshment when they want it, while the well-to-do citizen can store as much liquor as he pleases in his cellars; and (5) the effect which the whole controversy has in diverting the attention of the electorate from the real problems, Colonial or Imperial, a general election should involve, and concentrating it, rather upon side issues which had much better be left to the conscience and the practical common sense of the people."

Those five reasons, distinctly, soberly, and sanely stated, should appeal to every reasonable citizen, as they put very clearly the whole case against this accursed system of dealing with the liquor traffic. What he objected to in these proposals was that they interfered with his personal liberty. First the Government passed a law in which they proposed to teach his children a certain creed, and now they proposed that other persons should have the right to tell him what he should drink. He was astonished at the amazing inconsistency of the hon. member for Rockhampton and the hon. member for Gympie, both stern teetotallers, both crying out against the evils committed by the remorseless and devouring Minotaur of the drink traffic, and yet both supporting a proposal to give this Minotaur an extra five years to devour the children of the poor. It was really a question of compromising with sin. (Laughter.) He was not a Pharisee in this matter, like those hon. members, for he confessed that he took a drink when he wished.

Mr. ADAMSON rose to a point of order, and asked if the hon. member was in order in referring to members on that side of the House as Pharisees?

Mr. LESINA: The word slipped out, and he took it back. He did not really mean it in any offensive sense, and he would substitute the more common term "wowser," which was a bigger mouthful and carried the meaning perhaps better than a played-out term like Pharisee. But he would say to those hon. members—

"List to the ominous stern whisper from the Delphic cave within,
"They enslave their children's children who make compromise with sin."

Hon. members saw the havoc resulting from this traffic. A Golgotha of the skulls of the victims was heaped up before them, and when an opportunity came to abolish the liquor traffic, what did they propose to do? To give the cursed purveyor of this poison another five years to do more poisoning. The hon. member for Woothakata had proposed that the provisions dealing with the reduction of the number of public-houses should be cut out, and he gave excellent reasons for his proposal. The hon. member pointed out that reduction had been a failure in New Zealand, and that prohibition had been a failure. By reduction and prohibition they simply drove the drinking system underground. It could be shown conclusively that in twelve liquor-tight compartments in New Zealand the consumption of drink during the last ten or twelve years had been more than it had ever been previously. About 52 per cent. of the voting population voted on this question, and they had a bigger liquor bill per head of the population, a bigger gaol record, and a bigger expenditure in police administration than they had previously. Those facts condemned the system lock, stock, and barrel, and yet members were now asked to consider the advisability of eliminating paragraphs A, B, and C, of that clause, dealing with reductions. It had been pointed out that the chances were that for many years to come there would be no reduction in the number of public-houses in North Brisbane. But we never could tell what would happen. A wave of "wowserism" might come over the people. In the twinkling of an eye they might have evangelists holding meetings at street corners, hurling jeremiads at the drink traffic, and rousing public enthusiasm on the subject. In New Zealand they had pressed

into their service every kind of religious organisation they could, and had made the war against the public-house a holy war, and had inspired the people with an enthusiasm before which reason gave in. Hotels were closed, and yet in that country they had an increasing liquor bill and an increasing crime bill, as statistics proved most conclusively. An ominous fact! During the last twelve months sly grog-selling had increased there by over 50 per cent. And yet men talked about the people being influenced by moral suasion. The man who believed that people could be made sober by Act of Parliament should face that significant fact. Let the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Adamson, who took a sincere and earnest interest in this matter, get hold of these facts, and then as a sensible citizen he would see that there was a great deal in the contention that any effort to suppress the drinking habits of the people by the policeman's baton would be a failure.

Mr. ADAMSON was sorry he had not got with him facts and figures which would have refuted everything the hon. gentleman had just said. He had left them at home, but he hoped before the Bill went through to produce, from the statistical records of New Zealand, facts which would show the untruthfulness of much of what the hon. member had said. He might say that Mr. Toombs, the organiser of the Good Templars, challenged the hon. member to a debate on the question, but the hon. member was afraid to meet him.

Mr. LESINA said that Mr. Toombs did challenge him to a debate, and he made arrangements with Mr. Toombs as to time, place, and a chairman, but Mr. Toombs failed to come up to the scratch. (Laughter.) The hon. member said he had facts and figures at home which would disprove what he had said about New Zealand. When he was speaking before, he overlooked this extract from the *Otago Daily Times* of 12th November, 1908—

"The question then arises whether the adoption of no-license is the effectual and only cure for the evils of drunkenness. The answer is that no-license is not a cure; it is a palliative at best, and a palliative of somewhat doubtful value. We are quite prepared to be informed that the scenes of debauchery that have occurred in no-license areas have been grossly exaggerated. But it is impossible to disregard all the evidence which is tendered to us concerning the prevalence of drinking, both secretly and openly, in these districts."

That was a reply to what the hon. member for Rockhampton said, and also what the Premier said about these particular districts. There was also this, which came from the New Zealand correspondent of the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*—

"If, when you shut the hotels and reduce the public view of "drunks" to a minimum, you at the same time have a cataract of liquor flowing into the district to be consumed in the homes of the people, and at carousals in secluded places, it is a monstrous misuse of the language to call that prohibition. It is no-license, certainly."

It was evident that no-license did not mean no liquor.

Mr. RYLAND: Of course not. We are going in for prohibition.

Mr. LESINA: Was that why the hon. member wanted to give them five years more? (Laughter.)

Mr. ADAMSON: If some hon. members on the other side who laughed when he went out of the Chamber to speak to his friend thought he was afraid of the hon. member for Clermont in relation to this debate, they were mistaken.

Mr. TROUT: What right have you to suppose we thought any such thing?

Mr. ADAMSON: Some of his friends on this side seemed to think so. Some statistics had just been placed in his hands in regard to crime since no-license came into vogue in New Zealand, and he would give them to the Committee—

"LOOK ON THIS PICTURE.

"According to a return laid before Parliament recently, the following is the number of convictions for drunkenness in the various no-license districts from 1st January to 30th June, 1911:—

"UNDER NO-LICENSE.

Ohinemuri	5
Masterton	16
Ashburton	24
Oamaru	27
Bruce	3
Clutha	nil
Mataura	26
Invercargill	62
Total	163

"These are the convictions for drunkenness in eight no-license electorates, embracing a total population of about 114,000.

"AND ON THIS—

"The following are the convictions for drunkenness for the same period, 1st January to 30th June, 1911, in one town under license:—

"UNDER LICENSE.

Taihape	143

"The total population of Taihape is 1,557. Compare these totals. Among 114,000 people under no-license there were in six months 165 convictions for drunkenness. Among 1,557 people in one town under license there were in six months 143 convictions for drunkenness. And yet there are wiseacres going about, with owl-like eyes, and a long face, whining, "What's the good of no-license?" No-license wins all along the line."

If he had brought with him other figures, he could have confuted the hon. gentleman's statements in more cases than one in relation to what took place in New Zealand when he was there.

Mr. LESINA said the annual report of the New Zealand Police Department showed the extraordinary increase of 1,061 in the number of convictions during the year. There were 154 convictions for sly grog-selling against 117 in the previous year. But there was another aspect to this matter. The number of convictions or arrests largely depended on the activity of the local police. In one district—Invercargill—the police sergeant was a bigoted prohibitionist, and never arrested anyone for drunkenness, because it would be evidence that prohibition was a failure. (Loud laughter.) In the town of Ashburton there were five police under one sergeant before no-license, and there were five police under one sergeant after no-license; yet it was said that by having no-license crime was reduced and there was no necessity for so much police supervision. The hon. member for Bundaberg moved for a return of the amount expended in connection with old-age pensions, lunatic asylums, gaols, and other matters, as if there was any necessary connection between the sale of

liquor and all those things. He took the broad statement in the report of the New Zealand Police Department as to the increase in the number of convictions. The hon. member for Rockhampton got his figures from the hydropathic establishments—(laughter)—and those figures dealt with no-license areas. Had the hon. gentleman ever reflected that if the people in a no-license district were pre-eminently sober, honest, and virtuous, it would be regarded as a more desirable place to live in than any other district, and people would flock to that place and settle there? But they did not do that. They flocked away and settled somewhere else. (Laughter.)

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Theodore's amendment*) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 38.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
,, Appel	,, Lesina
,, Barnes, G. P.	,, Macartney
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Mackintosh
,, Booker	,, Paget
,, Bouchard	,, Petrie
,, Brennan	,, Philp
,, Bridges	,, Rankin
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Cribb	,, Somerset
,, Denham	,, Stevens
,, Douglas	,, Swayne
,, Forrest	,, Thorn
,, Forsyth	,, Tolmie
,, Fox	,, Trout
,, Grant	,, Vowles
,, Grayson	,, Walker
,, Gunn	,, Welsby
,, Hodge	,, Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Allan and Mr. Douglas.

NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
,, Allen	,, Maughan
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mulcahy
,, Coyne	,, Mullan
,, Crawford	,, Murphy
,, Ferricks	,, O'Sullivan
,, Foley	,, Payne
,, Hamilton	,, Ryan
,, Hardacre	,, Ryland
,, Land	,, Theodore
,, Lennon	,, Winstanley
,, McLachlan	

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Winstanley.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Morgan. No—Mr. Blair.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 165 put and passed.

On clause 166—"Vote, how requested"—

The HOME SECRETARY moved the omission, in lines 51 and 52, of the words—

"thirty-first day of March in the year in which the local option vote is to be taken."

with the view of inserting the words—

"thirtieth day of November in the year next preceding the year in which the Senate election will be held at which the local option vote is to be taken."

The amendment was consequential on the Committee having resolved that the Senate election was to be substituted for the day originally proposed in the Bill.

Mr. ADAMSON said that he wanted to move an amendment in clause 165.

The HOME SECRETARY: Clause 165 is passed.

Mr. ADAMSON: His attention was taken up, and he was not aware that it had been passed.

Mr. LENNON: Earlier in the day he made some remarks which apparently gave offence to the other side, but that, of course, could not be helped. When one did not mean offence, he was hardly called upon to apologise. He wished to say at that particular stage of the Bill, that they
[10 p.m.] were face to face with what was really a new Bill altogether, dealing with Part VIII. There were a number of alterations made at the last moment.

Mr. THEODORE: It is practically a new Bill. There are twenty-two amendments circulated this afternoon.

The HOME SECRETARY: Practically all consequential.

Mr. LENNON: All changes; and when an amendment was before the Committee he was perfectly within his right in pointing out the number of changes made in regard to that particular part of the Bill. They had a new Bill added on to the Bill itself. In the first instance, the Government proposed to omit certain words in clause 166. That was the first change. Then they proposed to omit the whole of clause 166. That was the change No. 2. Then change No. 3 occurred—to omit the words as proposed in the amendment before the Committee. That sort of thing must strike members of the Committee as very strange indeed on the part of the Government. It showed an amount of faction that was really staggering. As he had stated early in the day, they were first pulled by one faction, the next day they were pulled by another faction.

The HOME SECRETARY: What about the Opposition?

Mr. LENNON said they were not pulled by any faction.

The HOME SECRETARY: Pulled round the ring.

Mr. LENNON said the Opposition were simply standing resolute all the time to their platform, although they had received telegrams and petitions the same as the hon. member who guffawed so loudly.

The HOME SECRETARY: I cannot help it.

Mr. LENNON: It was a very well-known axiom that "the loud laugh proclaimed the vacant mind."

The HOME SECRETARY: The exception proves the rule this time.

Mr. LENNON: That was the reason why they had so many guffaws from the front Treasury bench.

The HOME SECRETARY: What about your own?

Mr. LENNON: Were hon. members on the Treasury bench allowed to interrupt a speaker according to their own sweet will without being called to order, or was he to sit down and allow them to take charge?

The HOME SECRETARY: Question! Rambling, as usual.

Mr. LENNON said he had already spoken about the rambling on the Government side of the House.

The HOME SECRETARY: You started first.

Mr. Lennon.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. THEODORE: Pass him out.

Mr. LENNON said the Home Secretary wanted passing out, and some hon. members were prepared to do it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Try.

Mr. CORSER: Question!

Mr. LENNON: The way the Government were trimming their sails every day in order to catch the prevailing breeze was beyond experience in the Chamber.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Is that the question?

Mr. LENNON: The question was the lightning changes in that particular measure. No less than three changes. First change one part, then omit the clause altogether, and then revert to the original proposal simply at the dictation of some outside influence. There was no doubt about it there was influence at work, and the lightning changes in the proposals of the Government, as instanced by the number of their amendments, proved it right up to the hilt.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Question!

Mr. LENNON said he did not expect the bland Minister for Lands to accept that as true, and he (Mr. Lennon) would like the hon. member to get up and disprove it. He was quite sure that not many hon. members on the Government side of the House had taken the trouble to peruse the amendments.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You have not touched the question yet.

Mr. LENNON wanted to stand by the original proposal—local option without request. That was what the Government proposed in their second amendment, and they had abandoned without request simply at the dictation of the liquor party, and now they came in with some proposal which stamped the Government as pusillanimous in the extreme.

Amendment (*Mr. Appel's*) agreed to.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 167—"Resolution A to be first submitted"—

The HOME SECRETARY moved that the word "hereafter," on line 53, be deleted, with the view of inserting the words "by this Act is otherwise." That was necessary because of the new clause to follow that clause.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

The HOME SECRETARY moved the insertion of the following new clause, to follow clause 167:—

"Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, a local option vote may be taken in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five in any local option area on Resolution D, and no other resolution shall be submitted with Resolution D at that vote. Such vote may be taken in that year, whether or not any of the resolutions hereinbefore mentioned has or have been previously submitted to a local option vote in such area, and whatever may have been the result of any such vote."

The new clause spoke for itself. It was intended, whatever resolution might or might not have been carried, that in the year 1925 a vote might be taken on total prohibition.

Mr. RYLAND asked the Home Secretary if there was any provision at all for the taking of a vote on a new license resolution.

The HOME SECRETARY: This clause provided that a vote on total prohibition, whatever resolutions might have been carried, must be submitted to the electors in 1925.

New clause put and passed.

On clause 168—"New licenses may be granted until a resolution carried"—

The HOME SECRETARY: Consequential on the amendments which had already been made, he moved the omission, on lines 1 and 2, of "Subject to section one hundred and sixty-four," with the view of inserting—

"Subject to the provisions of this Act relating to the continuance of subsisting resolutions under Part VI. of the Licensing Act of 1885, and relating to the taking of a local option vote on Resolution D in the year one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, after the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen, unless or"

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. RYLAND: This was a part he wanted information on. After the words which had been inserted, it said—

"nothing in this Part shall be construed to prevent the grant under this Act of any new license or provisional certificate in such area."

That practically meant that new licenses should be granted so long as they did not carry a reduction.

The HOME SECRETARY: Unless there is a vote to the contrary. Until a resolution for reduction is carried, as soon as local option comes into force, new licenses may be continued to be granted.

Mr. RYLAND: Local option arose as soon as they took a vote for reduction; then, unless they carried reduction, a man could come along and get an additional license. That was not fair.

Mr. D. HUNTER: That is local option.

Mr. RYLAND: No, it was not; because a good many people would vote that no new licenses should be granted, if there was a vote on that resolution.

The HOME SECRETARY explained that, until the first poll was to be taken under the local option clauses in 1916, there were two local options in force, the one being the re-enactment of the local option clauses in the present Bill with reference to the first and second resolution, and a local option which had for its franchise the parliamentary electoral roll for new licenses. Immediately the new provision came into operation, in 1916, the two new methods ceased; then they would have the method under this Bill, and where reduction was carried there would be no granting of fresh licenses.

Mr. RYLAND: And when reduction is not carried, you can issue new licenses?

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so.

Mr. RYLAND: I do not think it is fair.

The HOME SECRETARY: If they carried reduction there could be no issue of new licenses; but until they carried reduction, perforce new licenses might issue, because it was the will of the people that there should be no reduction.

Mr. RYLAND: There was a lot of difference between carrying no new licenses and

reduction. In carrying reduction they gave a monopoly, and a good many people would vote against new licenses when they would not vote against reduction. They were opening the door if they said they could have new licenses from 1916. The Minister knew that he could only take a vote upon no more new licenses under the clause they had passed when there was an application to get a new license. It was far harder to carry reduction than it would be to carry no new licenses. He thought that after the vote for reduction they should also have a vote right along the line for no more new licenses. They could not carry reduction under the present method, but they could carry no new licenses. They were then not interfering with anybody's present business. A man could not ask for compensation for something he never had. It was something that ought to be provided for. At the first time a vote was taken there ought to be a vote taken simultaneously that no more new licenses be granted and also a vote for reduction.

Mr. D. HUNTER: He did not understand the clause until the Home Secretary spoke on the matter. They could not have a vote on new licenses. The only thing they would have a vote on would be reduction, and the publican would vote to protect himself; but if they had a chance of voting on no new licenses the publican would vote for it. If the clause provided that new licenses could be granted on the vote for reduction being defeated, then he would vote against the clause.

Mr. WIENHOLT: There was something in what was said by hon. members. Personally, he might not feel inclined to vote against a reduction of licenses in his district, but he would certainly vote against any new licenses being granted.

Mr. RYLAND: There was a weakness in the clause. They should be able to vote for no new license, and for reduction as well, in 1916.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Subclause (*c*) of clause 165 provided for a vote being taken on the question "that new licenses shall be granted in this local option area."

The HOME SECRETARY pointed out that they had passed clause 167, which read—

> "(*a*) The first local option vote that may be taken in any local option area shall be taken on Resolution A, and no other resolution shall be submitted with Resolution A at that vote;
>
> "(*b*) A local option vote shall not be taken in any local option area on any resolution except Resolution A until Resolution A has been carried."

The Committee accepted that, and the clause now proposed was consequential on the acceptance of 167.

Mr. D. HUNTER: We did not know that new licenses could be granted.

Mr. RYLAND: We have not accepted it yet.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why did the hon. gentleman say that they had not accepted it when they accepted the principle in clause 167? Clause 168 simply followed on what they had already accepted. If Resolution A was not carried, nothing could prevent the bench from granting new licenses in the local option area.

Mr. LESINA: If they carry A, they can vote on B next time.

Mr. RYLAND: And they will have no chance of voting for no new licenses.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had already pointed out that they could take a vote on prohibition in 1925, even if Resolution E was carried providing for the granting of more new licenses.

Mr. RYLAND asked if reduction was not carried in 1917, could new licenses be granted?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; if the electors were of that opinion. They had already accepted that principle.

Mr. D. HUNTER: No fear!

The HOME SECRETARY: If they were going to accept a principle and then turn round and want to recast the whole measure, when were they going to get the measure through? When were they going to make up their minds? They had accepted the principle that if reduction was defeated, new licenses could be granted; and if they were going back on that, when would they get to the end of the Bill? If members would only take the trouble to see the effect of the clause they were voting on, it would save any chopping, twisting, and turning round. The hon. member for Gympie talked about the Government chopping and twisting and making amendments, whereas the hon. member was continually asking for that to be done himself.

Mr. D. HUNTER said members had not had an opportunity of considering the effect of the amendments. No one in the House thought, he was sure, that they were going to be tied down in that way for a long time before they could stop the granting of new licenses; no one imagined that [10.30 p.m.] they must carry a resolution for the reduction of licenses before they could stop the issue of new licenses. Members had been deceived to a certain extent. He did not believe the deception was intended, but they had been deceived, and he would rather see the Bill thrown out than be tied down in the way proposed with regard to new licenses.

Mr. RYLAND contended that the people should have an opportunity to vote for no new licenses every time. He was under the impression that the amendment brought in by the Minister was to cover the whole time up to 1925, but now he found that they could not take a vote on the question of no new licenses until 1925, unless they had previously carried a resolution for the reduction of the number of licenses. That was not giving the Committee a fair deal, and he suggested that the Minister should recommit the clause for the purpose of providing that a poll might be taken on the question of no new licenses at the same time as reduction.

Mr. WINSTANLEY was sure the Minister would recognise the reasonableness of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Gympie. While people might not be prepared to vote for a reduction in the number of licenses, on the simple ground that to do so would create a monopoly, they might be willing, and publicans themselves might be willing, to prohibit the granting of new licenses. As a matter of fact, that should be the first resolution, and to tie the people down in the way proposed was simply to make a farce of the Bill. He trusted that the Minister would recommit the Bill, or find some way to give the people an opportunity to vote on the question of no new licenses before the other resolutions were carried.

Mr. WIENHOLT was not a lawyer, but it seemed to him that, having passed clause 165, if they did not pass clause 168 no new license could be granted, and if they passed clause 168 they would put themselves in the worst position possible. He felt confident that many members did not know what would be the effect of clause 165 when they voted for it, and thought the people should not be tied down in respect to the prohibition of new licenses, as it appeared they would be.

Mr. LESINA understood that the first vote could be taken in 1916, and that if it was carried, three years later they could take a vote on Resolutions D and E. But he thought that Resolutions A, B, and C must be carried before Resolutions D or E could be put. It appeared to him that under the new amendment, in 1916 a request might be made for a vote on Resolution A for the reduction of the number of licenses by one-fourth. If a reduction was carried, then three years later they might take a vote on B and C, and that unless that was done Resolution D could not be put to the vote. If A, B, and C were not carried, then in 1925—that was fourteen years from now—Resolution D or Resolution E could be put. If it was a fact that three years after Resolution A was carried in 1916 they could have prohibition, he was going to oppose the clause very strongly. He thought the clause wanted recommitting and reconsidering. In 1925 a general vote might be taken on prohibition, though none had been taken on Resolutions A, B, and C, which was rather extraordinary. Then there was the question as to whether it was possible for a vote on D or E to be taken eight years from the 1st January, 1912. The provisions seemed to be contradictory; and if the clause passed as it stood he hoped that when the Bill went to the Council a sub-committee would be appointed to carefully analyse the clause. He wanted fair play to the hotelkeeper and to the other people interested in the Bill.

Mr. McLACHLAN said it appeared that the inconsistency discovered by the hon. member for Gympie—who deserved great credit for the active interest he had taken in the Bill—in connection with the framing of the clause was engaging the attention of Ministers and the Parliamentary Draftsman; and it might be as well to adjourn and take time to consider the matter.

The HOME SECRETARY said there was a way out of the difficulty; but it would take a little more time than was available at the moment. There was a way out of the difficulty whereby the policy of the Bill and the wishes of hon. members could be carried into effect—(hear, hear!)—and with the view of giving the necessary time, he moved that the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn. The business to-morrow will be Supply.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 11 o'clock.