

Park. The Adelaide University stands on five acres, and recreation grounds are provided outside.

Hon. F. Connor: Why not resume Parliament House?

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: If the 17 acres are not sufficient, it would be possible to resume a further area of land down to Hay-street, the cost of which would not be so very great. The cost of Crawley, I believe, amounts to £46,000.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: It costs more than that, and they are going to include other land.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I venture to say the money they are expending on the exchange of the properties would be very much better expended on the Observatory site which, as far as appearance and position are concerned, would be an ideal spot. I think one important consideration in connection with a University should be the architectural beauty of its buildings. It will last for many generations and will be added to considerably, and for a long time to come should be a noble pile of buildings; but it will be thrown away on any but a commanding site. It is not necessary to touch upon the question of free education, but I would like to say that I do not go to the extent that some members do in regard to free education. I think it is liable to be more a burden to the State than an advantage. If we over-educate the people, we make education cheap and nasty, and there is no value in it. However, I will not touch on that question further, but with regard to the question before the House I hope I have made it clear that I personally cannot support Crawley, and for the reasons I have explained, I cannot support the motion.

On motion by Hon. J. D. Connolly, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.16 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 10th September, 1912.*

	PAGE
Questions: Meat Supply, State retail shop, Kalgoorlie	1547
Public Service Appeal Board	1547
Papers presented	1548
Government Business, Precedence	1548
Bills: Unclaimed Moneys, 3R.	1548
Election of Senators Amendment, 3R.	1548
High School Act Amendment, 3R.	1548
State Hotels, 2R.	1548
Game, 1R.	1591
Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Returned	1591

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTION—MEAT SUPPLY, STATE RETAIL SHOP, KALGOORLIE.

Mr. MUNSIE (for Mr. Green) asked the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin): 1, Is the Minister aware that the sales of Government cattle in the open market at Kalgoorlie have not reduced the price of meat to the public? 2, In view of the foregoing will the Minister take into consideration the establishment of a Government retail shop at Kalgoorlie, so as to have the same satisfactory effect as has been achieved in Perth?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) replied: 1, The prices have been reduced. 2, In view of the foregoing it is not considered necessary at present.

### QUESTION — PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD.

Mr. GILL asked the Premier: 1, Will he give all officers of the clerical division who are now on the permanent staff under "The Public Service Act, 1904," an opportunity of voting at the forthcoming election, if any, of a representative and a deputy representative of their division on the Public Service Appeal Board? 2, Will a list of those who have been placed on the permanent staff since June, 1911, be supplied to the returning officer? If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The regulations provide for this being done. 2, Yes.

## PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Premier: Amendment of form of application under Part III. of "The Workers' Homes Act, 1911."

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS,  
PRECEDENCE.

On motion by the PREMIER ordered: "That, in addition to Tuesdays and Thursdays as already provided, Government business take precedence of all other Motions and Orders of the Day on Wednesday, 11th September, and each alternate Wednesday thereafter."

## BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1. Unclaimed Moneys (transmitted to the Legislative Council).

2. Election of Senators Amendment (*passed*).

3. High School Act Amendment (transmitted to the Legislative Council).

## BILL—STATE HOTELS.

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 5th September.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): I recognise that the Bill is the outcome of the general policy of my friends opposite. The Premier has stated, with apparent confidence, that he has a mandate to some extent from the people to establish hotels; yet I am hardly in accordance with him when he says that his mandate extended to the establishment of State hotels as provided in the Bill. The Licensing Act, passed in the early portion of 1911, gives very full powers for the establishment of State hotels under certain conditions. It provides that when a State hotel is established the manager must obtain his license in the ordinary way, as other people who are applying for licenses do, before the licensing court; and, moreover, it does not authorise the Government to establish a hotel simply because certain people in a certain district have voted in favour of State management as against the private manage-

ment of hotels. Here we have a measure, very small in extent, with very few clauses, but which gives a very vital power to the Government, even to defy the opinions of the people of a district, expressed in accordance with the provisions of the Licensing Act, which holds good to-day. In the Bill it is provided that the licenses can only be conferred when the people have voted in the affirmative on the question "Do you vote that all new publicans' general licenses in the district shall be held by the State?" Notwithstanding that, we may have a majority of people in a district—I do not say within three miles radius of the proposed hotel, but still in the district—who do not believe in any licenses at all. They can very easily vote honestly and with conviction in the affirmative on this question, and also against any fresh licenses being granted. The poll which was taken, or shall I say referendum, shows this very conclusively, as will be found in the *Government Gazette*, where it will be seen that out of 42 local option polls taken in different districts only one district declared in favour of increases in the number of licenses. That was a pretty emphatic and a pretty solid expression of opinion by the people throughout Western Australia that they did not want any further increase in the number of licenses.

The Premier: And have no licenses been granted since?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes, 15 miles away from a public house, as is provided in our legislation.

Mr. Dwyer: But nearly all the voters were pretty well provided with hotels.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Probably; and they were aware of the legislation which conferred on the licensing court power to grant a license under such circumstances, so long as it is for a house 15 miles distant from the next hotel. That is in the case of a district outback being newly developed, and having no such facilities at all. In such a case the court can grant the license.

Mr. Dwyer: But a town could swamp the whole of a country district.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But the majority must rule; that is according to the teaching of the party to which the hon. member belongs.

Mr. Dwyer: But that is your Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Exactly; I am not quarrelling with it. I do not know what the hon. member is aiming at; he blames me for the Bill and he blames me also for the statement I make.

The Premier: You would not permit the majority in England to rule us here.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, I do not suppose the Premier wishes to take the majority in England with regard to the matter of issuing new licenses in Western Australia.

The Premier: It would be just as fair.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No. In our own State the majority should decide.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Would you be in favour of a majority of the people in the State pronouncing in regard to prohibition?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes, in a district. I do not think Perth should decide in regard to Wyndham, for instance.

The Premier: It is a matter of degree after all.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes, there is reason in all things, and if we leave the Act as at present we must allow the majority to rule in each district.

The Premier: You did not.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I did, and you cannot prove to the contrary.

The Premier: I can. You object to the majority ruling.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not.

The Premier: Read your Act. You do not know your own Act.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes I do. The next vote given is that out of 42 licensing districts seven only voted against the State holding licenses for the conducting of hotels. That again is no doubt a large majority in favour of State-owned houses, so that we cannot possibly raise any objection on that score nor do I wish to do so. The next return is that out of 42 licensing districts only ten voted against State man-

agement. There again there is a very big majority in favour of the State management of hotels.

The Premier: We are respecting their decisions.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am not saying anything against that.

The Premier: We are not going into any district where there is a majority against us.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: You are not?

The Premier: No, the Bill will not permit us.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I quite agree with some members, and I believe the Premier himself voiced the opinion that we must look more to the facilities we provide—seeing that people have decided we are to have State hotels in many districts—in our State hotels by way of accommodation than to the drinking facilities. I hope when these hotels are established that that will be the main object of the department created for the control of these houses: to see that we have proper accommodation in the public house erected by the State for man and beast, and also accommodation in the way of proper reading rooms and sitting rooms, so that people may enjoy themselves and have the comforts of the hostel without being faced by drink and the presence of too many bars. I am not satisfied that that is altogether the position at present, but I have no doubt that that is the Premier's aim, and if we can do that in Western Australia I am satisfied we can largely reduce the drink bill and that our citizens as a whole will benefit largely in that direction. Although the Premier pointed out fairly clearly that he proposed to practically supervise this business himself, I want to say at once that I do not think he has bettered the legislation already in existence by taking away from the manager of a State hotel the necessity of appearing before the licensing bench and getting a license granted to him in the ordinary course. Under our existing legislation it seems to me that the power which is conferred under this small measure is something enormous, and it

places the Minister, whoever is responsible for the control of this Act, in a position which will either make or break him so far as administering the licensing laws of this State are concerned. Here the Minister takes upon himself absolutely the power to establish a State hotel, and to appoint a manager, and that manager has no need to get any license whatever under the licensing laws. The appointment of the Minister is sufficient for all purposes, and practically that appointment conveys to the manager his powers under this Bill to conduct a public house or hotel just in the ordinary way as a public house under a general publican's license is conducted.

The Premier: Seeing the Minister appoints the members of the licensing bench, I do not see very much difference in not asking for a license.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No Minister can possibly inquire into the details of these appointments, and I have just to remind the Premier of the appointment he made recently at Dwellingup and he cannot tell me that that was a proper appointment to make. When the Deputy Public Service Commissioner and the manager of the department were instructed to select from the numerous applicants for that position 14 names and send them on to the Premier—

The Premier: There were twelve names which I had to select from.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They say 14.

The Premier: Two were known to the Minister, and they did not go into their qualifications.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They say as instructed they submitted 14 names. They say distinctly, not only Mr. Hunter the manager, but the Deputy Public Service Commissioner, that they have gone through these applications and selected them in order of merit and recommended them to the Premier, and the Premier goes to No. 11, the lowest but one with ten men recommended before him, and appoints that man. That does not look too well.

The Premier: I used a little bit of my own knowledge and judgment.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is not a question of knowledge and judgment.

Mr. Dwyer: The results more than justify the selection.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They do not. It is well known that the man helped the Minister for Lands during his election.

Mr. Monger: And put the member for Perth in his present position.

The Premier: Oh! oh!

Mr. Dwyer: It was the incompetency of your administration that put me here.

Mr. George: Then you ought to be thankful for it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This is giving the same preference and direct return for these political services rendered of which we have heard so much in connection with a Federal appointment.

The Premier: It is street corner tittle tattle.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is not.

The Premier: I am absolutely correct.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then why did the Premier select the eleventh man?

The Premier: I instructed them to send the names of twelve and said I would select one and I did it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Why was the instruction sent out for twelve names to be submitted to the Government? I have a copy of the instructions and they are very clear. There were 14 names submitted. The report states: "As instructed I beg to submit 14 names which have been carefully selected by Mr. Hunter from the various applicants and checked by myself." Two responsible men were thus instructed to select 12 names as the Premier says, or 14 as mentioned in this statement from which I am quoting. These names are set out in what was considered to be their relative merit. Numbers 13 and 14 claimed to be included by reason of "being personally known not only to yourself but the members of the Government. You will notice they enclose no written references and they are not personally known, so a definite interview would be necessary to make a defi-

nite recommendation." I take it that is with regard to these two?

The Premier: No, with regard to the lot.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: He says, "You will notice there are no written references and they are not personally known, so a definite interview would be necessary to make a definite recommendation." The appointment was made without any reason being given, "P. J. O'Connor appointed, approved, J. S., Premier." That is a very bad way of doing business. I notice that the man appointed was very strongly recommended by the member for Perth, Mr. Dwyer.

Mr. Dwyer: And deservedly so.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And in his application to the Minister he claimed to be personally known to all the members of the Ministry. I am only pointing out these coincidences; the man did not think it necessary to forward recommendations which he said he could get "from leading citizens as well as from the majority of your own party." That is the man appointed.

The Premier: What have you to say against him?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have this to say against the Premier, that he goes against ten recommendations by the Deputy Public Service Commissioner and the manager of the State Hotels Department, applicants who were recommended ahead of Mr. O'Connor, and appoints him without comment and without stating reasons why or wherefore.

The Premier: Who selected the manager of the Caves House for you?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Caves Board selected him. Appointments were made on two or three occasions I think. I think we are entitled to some explanation as to why ten men considered to be better qualified for this position were passed over and why this man was appointed.

The Premier: That is not correct.

The Attorney General: Why was he included in the twelve?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Why did the Premier ask for twelve names? Was it because he thought the applicant ap-

pointed would come within the twelve although very low down on the list? The Premier no doubt thought that if he asked for twelve or fourteen names he would surely get this man.

The Premier: You have been through the mill and you know the game.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is the position as I have explained it with regard to this appointment, and if we are to have that repeated under this Bill and have hotel after hotel established by a stroke of the pen, and the Premier appointing anyone he thinks proper, and remembering that the manager appointed is fully licensed without going before the bench to have the application properly inquired into in that respect, I think this Bill sets a very bad precedent indeed.

The Premier: I carry the responsibility.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: King O'Malley is carrying the responsibility for an appointment he made for political services rendered to his party.

The Premier: Did you read the *West Australian* this morning?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No.

The Premier: They pointed out that he has saved £25,000.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No. That is the Minister's defence of the appointment, when all these private communications have come out which members opposite thought would never be put on the file. I know the Premier was cunning enough not to put his in black and white; he waited until he went to the Eastern States and made his recommendation there.

Mr. George: I would like to know what his colleagues said when he came back.

The Premier: Do not ask so many questions or you will get your answers.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We have this marvellous statement made by the Premier when moving the second reading of the measure that he eulogised a State hotel manager, I suppose he included this one, for having on one occasion put a man on the prohibited list at the request of his wife.

The Premier: I did not say that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I said I presumed it was the manager of this hotel, for we have only three State hotels in the State. I take exception to the Premier's evident delight that the manager would put any citizen on the prohibited list on his own responsibility.

Mr. Foley: Quite right too.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Quite wrong. The Premier said he would back up his managers in this direction; he is going to transfer the power of the court to his State hotel managers, also he is going to permit them to exercise their discretion whether a man is to be placed on the prohibited list or not. It is contrary to the Licensing Act, which lays down in clear and emphatic terms that every holder of a license must serve anyone who requires refreshment at his hands unless under certain circumstances. If a man is in a drunken condition any manager has the right to refuse to serve that man, but any sober man going into an hotel can demand to be served with the refreshment he desires, and the manager of State establishments ought not to refuse a customer under ordinary circumstances. Of course I would be the last to advocate that a man who shows the slightest sign of liquor should not be served by any keeper of an hotel or public house, State or private.

Mr. Foley: That is your argument.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That just shows the hon. member's lack of appreciation and incapability of understanding.

Mr. Foley: Thanks.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No manager of an hotel has any right to put anyone on the prohibited list, and I am much mistaken if he would not suffer under the law if he undertakes to do so.

Mr. Thomas: Then we ought to give them the right.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Give the State managers the right, perhaps, to vent personal spleen on a citizen, or it may be a selector in a district in which the house is established? I never heard of such a thing. There is all the necessary power under existing legislation to apply to the magistrate and bring in the evidence, and

on the evidence the prohibition order is obtained against the person being served. There is great difference between the proposals of the Premier and the proposals of the Attorney General in the In- is to be taken by a judge or magistrate before anyone is committed to the home, but here because someone says, "Put so-and-so on the prohibited list," if the manager has some personal grudge, he can say "I will put him on the prohibited list, and he shall not get a drink here." That is the way some members would like to have the law administered. I hope the Premier is not going to exercise this extraordinary power which he thinks is vested—but which he may find is not in the Bill although it passes—in his managers, to interfere with a citizen when he seeks refreshment at State hotels.

The Premier: Not at the express wish of his wife and family?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Of course we must look after the wives and families.

The Premier: But you are arguing against that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am arguing against the Premier's childish attempts to give powers to his State hotel managers.

The Premier: You want to compel the wife to go out into the public against her husband.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Certainly, or she may go *in camera* to the magistrate, but she has no right to go to the manager and ask for a prohibition order. If the Premier says the manager may make an application it can be done that way, and that may be the proper way to proceed, but it is wrong that the State manager should have the despotic power which the Premier would desire to give him. I have admitted at the outset that we should respect the views of the people who decide that State management is preferable to private management, and I do not see any reason why people should not likewise decide as to the hours of closing. I am not convinced of any necessity for a change in this respect as far as the State hotels are concerned, but if a fair majority of the people wish to have the hours of closing

made earlier, I do not see any reason why we should not acquiesce. As far as Sunday trading is concerned, this is a note which I made when the Premier was speaking. He advocated moderate hours of opening on Sunday to prevent sly-grog selling or the illicit selling of liquor on Sundays. I am strongly concerned in having the public houses closed down on Sundays. I do not see why we should stop other people doing business on Sundays and allow the public houses to remain open.

The Premier: You are a marvel. You passed a Bill permitting Sunday trading all day long.

Mr. Dwyer: And compelling people to serve on Sundays.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: You know that remark is inaccurate. The Premier has no sense of responsibility at all. He knows full well the police have power to prevent Sunday trading except to those persons who are entitled to refreshment under the Act.

The Premier: Your Act permitted Sunday trading all day long.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It did not. I hope my temperance friends and their followers will be pleased at the intention of the Premier as to Sunday drinking and trading. I want to see the hotels and public houses absolutely closed on Sundays rather than have them open during any portion of the day. I would close them right up and not allow them to sell at all.

Mr. Dwyer: Why did you not frame the Act so?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If the hon. member will turn up *Hansard* he will find it there.

Mr. Underwood: How are you on clubs?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We had another marvellous statement from the Premier. The only way to get prohibition, I think he said, was to have State management and State hotels. That was the first step towards it, and ultimately people would probably come to the view to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors altogether. I cannot follow that argument at all. I think they are more likely

to keep away from prohibition when we have established a certain number of State hotels in our midst. I would like to point out to the Premier that in the United States of America where they have prohibition in many States, it has not come about through State control of the liquor traffic. They have got prohibition from educating public opinion and eventually being able to convince the majority of the electors of the State that they are not to sell intoxicating liquors in the State. Nor has that been the case in New Zealand, so I am at a loss to understand how the Premier can argue that from State hotels we shall step, as it were, automatically into prohibition as far as Western Australia is concerned.

The Minister for Lands: They have no State hotels in New Zealand.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I say so, yet in some places they have prohibition.

The Minister for Lands: There is no prohibition in New Zealand.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In some places they have prohibition in New Zealand and in the United States. The argument is that prohibition is brought about without State control, therefore I maintain that we are not going to bring about this ideal state of affairs which the Premier is aiming at—total prohibition in Western Australia—because we now have State hotels.

The Premier: Not in a single province in New Zealand is there prohibition. There are no licenses, but that is not prohibition.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is prohibition if you cannot buy liquor. The objection to this measure, boiled down, comes to this: that the Minister can of his own accord wish to get established hotels in any district, notwithstanding that the people have already therein voted against an increase of licenses in that district. It absolutely disregards the existing law.

The Premier: It is so under the existing law.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No. "If at any poll of the electors taken under Part V. of this Act resolution B is carried in any district, and on the question, "Do

you vote that all new publicans' general licenses in the district shall be held by the State?" a majority of the votes given is in the affirmative, the Minister may, with the approval of the Governor, but subject to the provisions of this Act—establish State hotels in the district, and carry on," etcetera, subject to the provisions of the Act.

The Premier: Is it not a fact that under the existing Act, notwithstanding that the majority in a district votes against it, that additional licenses may be granted?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Only the 15 miles distance.

The Premier: Well.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is exempted in the Act. Notwithstanding anything in the Act the bench may grant a license so long as the premises are more than 15 miles away from an existing house. That is put in for the special purpose of providing for sparsely populated districts and new settled areas in agricultural and mining centres. The Premier knows that.

The Premier: I know; is that not new licenses?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier proposes that he shall establish hotels wherever he wishes, provided the people within three miles of the place do not vote against his proposition. The Premier says that he is going to establish an hotel, and are the people likely, within three miles of that site, to say, "We do not want this house"?

The Premier: Yes, of course. They have done it scores of times.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier will not only have his house to establish in that district, but he will have to establish others in every populous district also.

The Premier: We might have one in Perth.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have no doubt he will have many in Perth, although Perth by an overwhelming majority has decided against further licenses. The votes which were given on the question of the increase of licenses numbered 325 in favour and 1,659 against.

The Premier: State control.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In favour of the publicans' general licenses being held by the State the voting was 2,344 in favour, and 1,705 against.

The Premier: That is a fair majority.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is not a big majority; I think it was a very poor poll. If we could only raise the interest of 4,000 electors in the whole of Perth, in connection with this important matter, it seems to me that the great bulk of the people do not care twopence which way the matter goes. I doubt whether this can be taken as a proper expression of opinion. Further, the poll in Perth with regard to State management throughout the district was 2,277 in favour, and 1,773 against. That was not a very great majority either, considering the small number that polled, and as far as I am concerned, I am disappointed that a much larger number of electors did not go to the poll to express their opinion in regard to this important matter. It seems to me they have been very apathetic.

Mr. Foley: There was something else of greater importance on at the time.

Mr. Dwyer: They will do better next time.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes, but they did not take the opportunity of recording their votes when they had it. There is danger of great hardship being done to some people under this legislation. I believe the Railway hotel in Barrack-street changed hands the other day at a very large ingoing.

Mr. Dwyer: It was bought by a brewery.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And has it not been sold since to someone else?

Mr. Dwyer: Yes, but they must sell the beer there from that particular brewery.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There is no doubt, however, that the high price was paid in the belief that the purchasers had something which was worth the money. Even now it is worth remembering that the law requires tenders to be called for the ingoing in connection with a new hotel, so that the State shall get whatever profit there is in connection with the establishment of a new house. But what



I was pointing out was that we have the position that a large sum of money is paid for ingoing in the belief that there is something worth it, and yet, within a few weeks or within a few months, we may have the Government stepping in and erecting an hotel near an existing house, and perhaps taking from that house half its trade.

Mr. Munsie: You could buy that one out.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Perhaps. Although I have no sympathy with this trade as a rule, I like to go into a first-class place and get decent liquor, and I hope in connection with the establishment of State hotels that the Government will take into consideration the interests of the places which are already established. If the Government can buy out an existing business on reasonable terms, rather than increase competition, especially as so many have voted against a further increase in the number of licenses, they should endeavour to secure properties already in existence, if they are suitable. This of course is another step in the direction of State ownership of many avenues of enterprise, and it has far more to commend itself to me than the suggestion of the establishment of State sawmills and brickyards, and even butchers' shops.

The Premier: What about the steamers?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Or steamers either. At the same time I recognise the power of the majority on the other side of this Chamber; but notwithstanding that, I am satisfied that the Premier and his colleagues will shortly be floundering in a morass of financial difficulty, more especially in connection with these enterprises, for they know not what they are venturing upon. I know they are bound to some extent to give these enterprises a trial, but I hope that they will not go any further, and that, after having established their State hotels, they will not seek to establish State breweries, State aerated water manufactories—

The Premier: They are within the realm of possibilities.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is why I am mentioning them, and also becoming

themselves wine and spirit merchants. Possibly, also, we will find a distillery established by this wonderful Labour Government in the interests of the people of Western Australia. Then by that time we shall have no guarantee of good liquor to drink, and I think it will have the effect of making me a teetotalter, because I am sure that, with a State brewery, a State wine and spirit department, and a State distillery, we are bound to have liquor which will hardly be fit for consumption. The belief which was expressed by the Premier right throughout the introduction of this measure that State servants are infallible, and are to be trusted wherever placed, will be bound to be dispelled. It is as necessary to watch the manager of a State hotel as it is to watch the manager of a private institution. As sure as we lapse from what is a proper safeguard and proper business rules and regulations, so soon will we have improper inroads made on the public purse. It is not sufficient to say there will be no adulteration. There will always be trouble and difficulty as with privately owned hotels. We know what difficulties owners of private establishments have to encounter in connection with this question of adulteration, and we know what some of the employees do in order to make a profit.

The Premier: Poor old employees!

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member knows it. It is the most difficult thing in the world to check and to watch, and because you happen to put an individual in charge of a State establishment you have no guarantee that there will be no adulteration, and that you will have the best liquor, the best management, and the best administration. I hope the Premier will not relax inspection of State-owned premises. I think that the powers provided in this Bill are excessive, and I think we should keep the responsibility of approving licenses with the Licensing Bench, notwithstanding that State hotels are to be established. I shall be glad to see some amendment in Committee in order that the managers of these hotels may come under the full operation of the license laws of the land.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): I do not wish the leader of the Opposition to continue under the delusion that the manager of the State hotel at Dwellingup played any part whatever in my election. I deny emphatically that he played any part in that election, and I do not think that he has ever been in the electorate.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They say he was there for days.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: He was never in the district during the election, and I certainly think the leader of the Opposition should make more inquiries before he indulges in reckless statements of this kind in order to manufacture charges against the Government. It is absolutely discreditable on the part of that hon. gentleman to make such charges.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Will you explain why he was appointed?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I want to point out that it is absolutely discreditable on the part of the leader of the Opposition to make a statement of that kind without a tittle of evidence to support it. It certainly furnishes some support for the reply which the Premier gave to the question asked by the member for Forrest.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What was that?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That the statement was made at the Liberal Club.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It was a poor reply.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It furnishes some justification for an inspection of the brands of liquors which are dispensed at that club.

Hon. Frank Wilson: They only sell tea at the Liberal Club.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I repeat that the hon. member had not the slightest evidence on which to base the statement he made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was not aware that the Minister for Lands was speaking on a matter of personal explanation, otherwise I would have prevented him from continuing. It is not proper for an hon. member to rise without first stating that

it is on a matter of personal explanation that he wishes to speak.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It was not a personal explanation, because there was nothing to explain. The leader of the Opposition was permitted to make a statement without addressing himself on this Bill, which I took the earliest opportunity of denying.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister for Lands knows perfectly well that a reference such as he has made has little in common with the Bill. It is not a discussion on the merits of the Bill. I allowed the leader of the Opposition to refer to the manager of the State hotel because in referring to the manager of the State hotel at Dwellingup he was referring generally to the question of agents, which are provided for in the Bill. Whilst his remarks may have been to some extent out of order, I think the method of appointing managers has a distinct reference to the Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I submit absolutely deferentially that it would be a serious thing if one hon. member was to be perfectly in order in making a wrongful charge against another hon. member in this House, a statement that was absolutely incorrect, and the hon. member against whom the charge was directed had no opportunity of replying to it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that I need say anything further. The Minister knows just as well as I do the rules of debate, and he can always rise on a question of privilege or to make a personal explanation to refute anything that is said injurious to his honour or character. But I do not think it would be right on my part to allow the hon. member to make a reference such as he has made just now merely in order to reply to a statement made by another hon. member in the course of a speech.

Mr FOLEY (Leonora): In rising to support the Bill, I am rising to support a policy laid down by each member on this side of the House, not only at election time, but for several years past. I am pleased to belong to a State which was the first to introduce

the State hotel system. The critics of the Bill have endeavoured to show that State management is not as good as management by private enterprise where hotels are concerned; but as one who has had opportunities which enable me to speak with some degree of knowledge as to the uses to which a State hotel is put, I assure hon. members that the State hotel first started in Western Australia is not only a credit to the State, but is also a credit to the town in which it is situated.

Mr. Harper: It is a huge monopoly.

Mr. FOLEY: I admit that, and I assure the hon. member that the fact of the State hotel being a huge monopoly has hurt many people who wanted to enter into competition with it. Before the advent of the State hotel, Gwalia was one of the wildest places in this State. There were fights wherever one went, and there was practically a state of outlawry existing there in a small degree, but after a few years of experience of the State hotel, Gwalia is to-day one of the quietest places in Western Australia, and from one year's end to the other one will scarcely see a fight take place. That is but one illustration of the way in which the State control of the liquor traffic is going to do good. As a supporter of the Bill, I believe that the establishment of State hotels will ultimately lead the Government to still further nationalise the liquor traffic, and go to the very fountain head of the business, and manufacture the liquor for sale. We as a party consider that if we are going to have State hotels, the very best of liquor should be sold in those establishments. A remark was interjected by the member for York that much of the stuff sold at State hotels is not fit for human consumption. Now, I have here a list of liquors being sold at the Gwalia State hotel at the present time, and after looking over the list I find that one liquor is declared to be the "best made," another is a "splendid make," and each one of the others is a "first-class" article.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I think they are all bad.

Mr. FOLEY: That is a matter of opinion. Personally I am not an authority on liquor matters at all, but if we are total abstainers we should not look at this question from the total abstainer's point of view. The Bill is providing for those people who are not teetotallers, and in that connection I think State management is going to do better than management by private enterprise. The leader of the Opposition in the course of his remarks asked who gave the manager of a State hotel the right to refuse to serve a man with liquor and eject him from the premises. If the hon. member will look at Section 134 of the Licensing Act he will find that the licensee is there given power to put out anybody who goes to the hotel with the intention of being quarrelsome, or who, whilst being there, becomes quarrelsome, violent, drunk, or disorderly. The leader of the Opposition said that at the instance of a man's wife the manager of a State hotel had placed that man on the prohibited list. I think that is a good thing. If a man had not had a drink for a whole fortnight and on pay night took more than was good for him, there could be nothing wrong in his wife asking that he should be no longer served, because his wife is really his partner in everything. She has to provide the food and meet the bills, and see that the money which the husband earns is put to the best use; and if the State can step in and assist that woman to make a good citizen of her husband the State is doing something which the ordinary publican in nine cases out of ten will not do. I am not going to say for a minute that there are not respectable people keeping hotels. There are some of the best men we can find keeping hotels in this State, but we find that the power given by Section 134 to all licensees had never been drawn attention to until it was exercised by the manager of a State hotel. The statement of the leader of the Opposition that a man is altogether placed on the prohibited list is somewhat wide of the mark, because once a man who has been placed on that list at the instance of his wife

returns to the hotel in a sober state, the manager will no longer refuse to serve him. One of the clauses in this Bill says that the manager of a State hotel shall not be called upon to go before the licensing court in the same way as an ordinary publican, and I would like to ask the critics of that provision—Who are the best judges of a man's character and qualifications for hotel keeping; the Government of the State, or the ordinary magistrate who sits on a licensing bench? My own opinion is that the least said about the licensing benches the soonest mended. I assure hon. members that there were many gentlemen on the licensing bench previous to the present Licensing Act coming into force who had the interests of the State much more at heart than a number of those who are on the bench to-day, and it is to the credit of the present Government that they are placing themselves as judges superior to the magistrates.

Mr. George: How do they do that?

Mr. FOLEY: Because a manager of a State hotel has not to come before a licensing court the same as an ordinary publican.

Mr. George: Does that make him a better man?

Mr. FOLEY: No, but he can be equally as good. The whole speech of the leader of the Opposition led me to believe that he was attacking the Government for the appointment of Mr. O'Connor to the management of the State hotel at Dwellingup. At every opportunity the hon. gentleman has hit at the Government over that appointment. I do not know Mr. O'Connor personally, but I took sufficient interest in this question to ask before coming to the House how things were going at Dwellingup, and I ascertained that up to the present time the gentleman who occupies the position of manager there is doing well in every particular, and the sobriety of Dwellingup is equal now to what it has ever been. Indeed there are many men in Dwellingup at the present time who have cause to bless the State hotel, and incidentally to think well of the present manager of that establishment.

Mr. George: It was a little hell with sly grog before the State hotel was put there.

Mr FOLEY: Yes, and once this State hotel was placed there the sly groggeries were stopped. In passing I would like to say a word or two about sly grog selling. A while ago when raids were being made on the sly groggeries, every paper in the State said that the only places where the sly groggeries were touched were those where State hotels were situated. That was an entirely wrong statement to make. In many places where State hotels were not in existence, but would have been but for the leader of the Opposition, the sly groggeries were raided equally with those at Gwalia, and it was only because more groggeries existed at Gwalia that more people were caught. Now I hope that if this Bill becomes law not only will the State hotels be protected against the sly grog seller, but the publicans who pay large fees for their licenses will also be protected. There is next the question as to who should say whether there should be a State hotel established. It is needless to go all over the argument used as to what a referendum might do on the question, but I think the provision in the Bill is a good one, because it takes into consideration the people who are going to use the State hotel or who wish to use it, or even those who do not wish to use it. If it is proposed to put a State hotel in a certain centre, the people most interested are those who live within the three miles radius, and if they do not want the hotel, then the question will be considered as to whether a State hotel should be put there or not. There is, however, this to be said, that the Bill practically only provides for new places springing up. If this measure works well, and if State hotels are put up and do well, I trust they will also be extended to the towns of Western Australia. There was one question raised as to whether it would not be better to buy out existing licenses rather than put up new hotels, but the Dwellingup State hotel should be an object lesson to the Government or to future Govern-

ments, if there are going to be any. The price that was asked for the Dwelling-up State hotel was enormous; the price obtained for the hotel by the gentleman who put it up was a fifth of the price he asked.

Mr. George: What did he get?

Mr. FOLEY: I think the hon. member will find that in the reports.

Mr. George: But he only got compensation for his building and his land, and he was entitled to that.

Mr. FOLEY: I was just coming to that phase of the question. He put up the hotel, and he got compensation for putting it up, but he wished to obtain compensation for what would have accrued to him had a license been granted to him; the license, however, was not granted, and the Government, in their wisdom, with all the faults hon. members opposite will place upon them, had quite enough business acumen to get that hotel for a fifth of the price the gentleman asked for it in the first place.

Mr. George: Surely he never asked for £17,000?

Mr. FOLEY: He asked for a good bit. It is peculiar that the next Bill to the State Hotels Bill is a Bill for the treatment of inebriates. I think after the State hotels have been working for some time there will be less necessity for the Inebriates Bill than there is now under private enterprise. The ordinary publican, in every town in the State, has to keep up a big staff of servants, and to pay a big license fee, and he has other calls upon him that compel him not to serve a man with only what is good for him but to serve him with liquor to the extent of the cash he has. That is one thing that should not be in a State hotel; I believe it will not be. There is another phase of the question—the Government should see at least that they have better accommodation for the travelling public than they have at the hotels already in existence. I believe the Government, even the past Government, are to be commended for their idea of placing a library, or promising it (the present Government did it), at the present Gwalia State hotel;

that library will be right away from the hotel altogether. Wherever a State hotel is needed it is needed to give the people in the district a place to which they can go and where they can improve their minds. I trust that the accommodation for travellers will be better. The Gwalia State hotel is the best hotel to stay at in Western Australia; at any rate it is as good as anything in Western Australia, but there are not enough rooms; if there were a hundred more rooms at that hotel they would be fully occupied and occupied by men who now live in houses that are not altogether desirable.

Mr. Monger: What about reducing the number of bars?

Mr. FOLEY: It would be impossible to reduce the number of bars in the Gwalia State hotel without doing away with the hotel altogether, because there is only one bar in it. I trust the Government will look at this aspect of the question, that is in regard to the accommodation of travellers, and also I trust they will look into the matter of libraries, and other little means of amusement and recreation that the people where State hotels are built will be sure to need. I suppose when the Bill gets into Committee there will be many amendments proposed to it, but I trust that whatever amendments are passed will have the effect of lessening the drink evil in this State. It is the worker's greatest enemy, and the greatest enemy of any man when drink is taken to excess; but I believe that people who desire to have a drink and have it in a respectable, decent manner, should be legislated for, and I trust that spirit will guide everyone when voting on this question.

Mr. NANSON (Greenough): The speech of the hon. member who has just sat down is admirably calculated to take one's thoughts away from the Bill, because, although he covered a very wide range of subjects, the Bill itself is the one subject with which he did not deal. I have not sufficiently robust faith in the ability of governments or parliaments to suppose for one moment that a perfectly admirable

Licensing Bill will ever be drafted by any Government or be passed by any Legislature; and although I played some little part in the drafting of the last Licensing Bill, the present Act, I should be the last to contend that from time to time, in the light afforded by experience, it may not be advisable to introduce amendments to that measure. If the present Bill only went so far as to repair defects in the existing Licensing Act, I for one, instead of taking exception to the Bill, would be prepared to give it a very cordial welcome. It will be within the recollection of hon. members who took part in the debates on the present Licensing Act, that in that measure provision was made for the establishment of State hotels. Though it may be argued that that provision does not go quite as far as is necessary, Section 45 of the Licensing Act provides that, notwithstanding a resolution has been carried providing that the number of licenses in a district shall continue, and be not increased, the licensing bench of the district may sanction the granting of a license provided there is no licensed house within fifteen miles of the locality where the license is applied for. That is a very necessary and beneficent provision in a scattered community such as we have in Western Australia; but I regret that when we were passing the Licensing Bill we did not make provision that in an application for a license under these circumstances it should be possible for the State, through its agent, to apply for a license where, notwithstanding a resolution against an increase of licenses, there is no licensed house within fifteen miles. Had this Bill only gone as far as that, had it been intended to enable the Government to step in when an application is made in these exceptional circumstances and ask the bench to give a license to the State rather than to a private individual, I venture to say there would not be a single member of either side of the House who would take exception to a measure of that kind; but this Bill goes very much further than a simple amendment of that description; it provides that, even supposing a re-

solution be carried in the licensing district, not only forbidding an increase in licenses but also forbidding the renewal of licenses, the Government may put that resolution entirely on one side and may, if they think there is a good stand in a particular locality, or an opportunity of making money, fly in the face of that resolution and establish a public house. It is true that there is provision inserted in the Bill under which persons in the immediate locality where it is proposed to establish a State house may petition against the hotel; but the locality is so immediate, persons must be within three miles of the place where it is proposed to establish the State hotel, that it is obvious, considering the size of our licensing and local option districts, it will be quite possible for a local option district to be enormously opposed to the granting of the State license or any sort of license in the locality; yet the people in the locality where the license is supposed to go may be unanimously in favour of it. I doubt if in any part of Western Australia we will find a single locality where, if the Government were to propose the establishment of a State public house, the idea would not be welcomed, and even by some staunch teetotalers, because it is astonishing, in any part of the State where there is a proposal to spend public money, how seldom we find persons living in that place who are opposed to the expenditure of that money, even though in their heart of hearts they may have some doubts as to the necessity for that expenditure. I remember that during the short time I was Minister for Education—on more than one occasion we had most urgent and eloquent pleas for the building of schools in localities already provided with large schools, and a plea, not without force, was frequently brought forward that the existing school was on an unhealthy site. Of course if that could be thoroughly established it would be a very good plea, but I fancy that in some cases at the back of the minds of a good many of the petitioners was the hope, a very laudable and natural hope, that the locality would ge-

thoroughly up-to-date school, and that in the district would be spent a considerable sum of public money.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): That is your supposition.

Mr. NANSON: Undoubtedly while human nature remains what it is, while it might not be the determining factor, at least it would have some influence, and the hon. member knows it. He knows that constituents are desirous of influencing the expenditure of public money in their districts.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Not where it is not required.

Mr. NANSON: Well, then, East Fremantle must be a constituency of peculiar and shining virtue, and is, I trust, admirably represented by the hon. member. In my opposition to the Bill, I certainly do not oppose it on the ground that it provides for the establishment of State hotels. During the many years in which I have given some attention to the very complex problem of the liquor traffic I have never been able to understand why the State, having created a virtual monopoly with one hand, should immediately proceed to give that monopoly away to private individuals. Personally I shall welcome the day when the liquor traffic is brought very much more under State control, and when it is to a very much larger extent than at present the subject of a State monopoly. But I should hope that if we are to have State hotels throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia, we should at least ensure that it would be impossible to start such an hotel if the people in any local option district were wholly and entirely opposed to the sale of alcoholic drink in any form. It is singular that a Government which have been regarded, and perhaps still are regarded, as champions of the extreme prohibitionist party, should introduce a Bill which, so far as State control is concerned, enables any Government that might be in power to fly absolutely in the face of the wishes of the community. It may be said that the present Government have no intention of the kind. Possibly not; but other Governments may come into office,

or the personnel of the present Government may change. Caucus may decide that some of the members of the Government should be sent about their business—the power that puts those members in office no doubt is perfectly capable of putting them out—and so we may have a Ministry chosen from that side of the House which would be determined, no matter what the opinions of the people of the locality, to force the experiment of State ownership of hotels upon a local option district quite opposed to it. When this Bill was drafted why was not provision made that, in the event of resolutions being carried against the increase of licenses, or in favour of non-renewal of licenses, the Government should have no more right than anybody else to establish a public house? Why was that safeguard abolished under which a Government, like any private individual, are required to go before the licensing court and apply for a license? That is a very necessary provision. We have heard some strong criticism indulged in this afternoon by the leader of the Opposition in regard to the appointment of the gentleman who is manager of the State hotel at Dwellingup. I am not conversant with the facts of that appointment beyond what I have happened to hear in this Chamber, but I can quite understand it is possible that an appointment might be made by any Government which would give rise to a considerable amount of public criticism. Only the other night, when I obtained from the Attorney General an exposition of the Government's views as to the basis upon which political patronage should be bestowed, as to the basis upon which public appointments should be filled, the hon. member, with the utmost candour, did not hesitate to state that he should follow what has been very largely the practice in the old country, and, given that he thought the person was suitable for the position, he should not hesitate to reward party services by securing for the person who had rendered those services a public appointment. I am perfectly ready to admit that in other countries, and even in the old country to a very considerable

extent, unfortunately, there are even to this day a large number of appointments made of persons, possibly suitable to the appointments, but who would not have been appointed but for their connection with the political party which happened to be in power. But I think that in Australia public opinion is setting strongly against the making of appointments on that score; and if there is one cause which more than another is likely to do damage to the Federal Labour party at the next elections, it will be the suspicion that that party is inclined to favour, or at least does not look upon it as a very heinous thing, the rewarding of political services by public office. In regard to the question of State hotels, it is possible that a very large amount of political patronage may be placed in the hands of a Government if any considerable number of these hotels should be established, and surely it is well that we should have some tribunal sitting in public, liable to public criticism, by its oath and office compelled to act impartially, which could review those appointments. If the procedure provided by the Licensing Act had been followed the Government would have been compelled to send their agent before the licensing court. And in case any Government, either in ignorance or wilfully, were to make an unsuitable appointment—an appointment that might seem perfectly suitable in Perth, where all the facts might not be known, and yet not be so considered in the locality itself where the appointee—it is certainly a desirable provision that the appointee should have to go before the licensing court and satisfy the court that he is a suitable person to hold a license. But the Bill takes away that power, so far as State hotels are concerned; the Government take away that power from the licensing court and, in consequence, the Government become the sole arbiters as to the suitability of the appointee. In moving the second reading the Premier did not attempt to show that there was any reason to suppose that the licensing courts were not capable of exercising that power properly. We know that within

a very short time, even within a very few days, probably, the Attorney General will be introducing a Bill to amend the existing Licensing Act. It is very probable that in that Bill there will be provision for making the licensing courts elected instead of nominated. The provision for the nominative courts was only carried by a narrow majority, and indeed was at first defeated in this House, and one may assume that one of the proposed amendments in the licensing law will be the appointment of elected courts instead of nominated. Do the Government propose to show that courts of that description are not better tribunals to decide—sitting locally and knowing the local requirements, in a way which the central Government cannot be expected to know them—that they are not better tribunals to decide whether the Government appointee to the State hotel is a suitable and proper person to run an hotel?

The Premier: Would you allow any other body to veto your appointments?

Mr. NANSON: Undoubtedly. I provided in the Licensing Act that where a State hotel was proposed to be established, the agent of the Government had to go before the licensing court just the same as anybody else, and obtain his license. One ground on which the court might refuse the license was that the person appointed was not suitable. A Government might in all innocence appoint someone unsuitable, and the fact might come out, whereupon the court might say "In view of the evidence presented to us we do not consider this person suitable; therefore we refuse the application, and advise the Government to put forward another nominee."

The Premier: How frequently would it occur that a license would be refused on the sole ground that the court was not sure the applicant was perfectly suitable?

Mr. NANSON: I should say very rarely indeed. A licensing court would not be justified in refusing the application on those grounds. It should be shown in evidence that the person was unsuitable to hold a license. It would be wrong to refuse the application



merely from prejudice. If the police or a private individual were to think the license should be refused because the applicant was an improper person, then those persons holding that belief must be prepared to go into the witness box and state the facts on which their belief was based. No court of law is justified in acting on prejudice; it must act on evidence. A great deal has been said, not altogether germane to the discussion of the Bill, as to the question of serving prohibited persons. I do not think really there is much need to debate the question, because it is provided in the Act that once a State hotel has been started and the manager appointed, he is subject to the provisions of the Licensing Act which deal with the duties and liabilities of licensees. If, without reasonable cause, a State hotel manager were rash enough to refuse to supply a person with drink, undoubtedly he would lay himself open to a penalty.

The Premier: Would you call it a reasonable cause if the customer were engaged in spending the whole of his money in the hotel?

Mr. NANSON: Undoubtedly. In refusing to supply such a person the manager would simply be doing his duty. But if merely out of prejudice the manager were to refuse to supply a person with drink, then if that person liked to take action against him it would be incumbent upon the manager to show that he had reasonable cause. I suppose none of us will quarrel with a provision of that sort. Probably it is a hope with no possibility of fulfilment that the Government will see their way to redraft the Bill so as to put it more in accordance with the local option provisions of the Licensing Act. Therefore, in conclusion, I will merely state the opinion that the Bill goes very much farther than is necessary in order to provide for licenses being granted to State hotels in districts where there is no public house within a distance of 15 miles. If the Bill went as far as that, and no further, it would be a perfectly satisfactory measure. In my mind the objection lies in the fact that it extends a principle hostile to local option very much further than the situation calls for.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Mr. THOMAS (Banbury): I desire to take advantage of the opportunity to make a few remarks on this question. For a long time past I have held very strong convictions on the question of State control of the liquor traffic, and I am pleased to see that at the present early stage steps are being taken towards giving effect to this desire. There has been some criticism of the measure introduced by the Premier, but up to the present the tendency seems to be to support the principle generally, although there may be some faults to find with the details of the measure. Of course that is a position to which no one can take exception. If the principle is good, no doubt any slight defects in the measure can be easily rectified when it reaches another stage in this House. Some arguments have been used by the leader of the Opposition in regard to the measure, and questions have been asked as to what benefits would be brought about by State control of the liquor traffic that would not be derived under private management. I think there is one point in connection with the whole matter which cannot be stressed too much and which makes the whole difference between State control and private enterprise. Whatever arguments it may be possible to use against State enterprise in other directions, the same arguments cannot be pursued with regard to the State management and control of hotels. We must remember that in all stages of wrong we always find that before we get a criminal there was an incentive to his crime, that is unless he is a mad man. In private enterprise there is always this fact that there is keen competition, and it is essential if an individual in his hotel desires to make a living and to pay wages, etcetera, to force his trade to the greatest possible advantage to himself. It becomes absolutely compulsory to use every inducement within his power to bring trade to his hotel, to induce people, not only to have the liquor they require while there, but to take as much more as he can sell them and more than is good for them. Under State control that does not exist,

for my conception of it is it should not be run for the purpose of the profit to be made from it. I have personally very strong opinions on the question of how the profits of State hotels should be used. I really think the whole of the revenue should be ear-marked for special purposes, so that the day might never come when even a needy Treasurer will have the power to use the income from State hotels to assist a declining revenue. I do not care whether it is a State Treasurer, or a private individual, once there is an incentive to use the funds from State hotels there would always be the possibility of the grand principle we are aiming at being lost sight of, and there would be a desire to secure greater revenue for temporary purposes. I trust that so far as the State hotels are concerned, that will never come into operation. Some people will say it would be to the interest of the manager or any employee in a State hotel to sell as much liquor as possible, as it might improve his standing with his superior officer. We might just as well use the argument that in our post offices a man selling stamps behind the counter would have an incentive to try to sell more to the purchaser than he required because he wanted to improve his standing with his superior officers.

Mr. Underwood: You are away out.

Mr. THOMAS: If I am, I should only be in keeping with the hon. member on the majority of occasions when he interjects. I claim that under State control it would be no more to the interest of a man to sell more liquor than to the man in the post office whether he sells a penny stamp or a pound's worth of stamps. In fact, I am of opinion he would rather sell a penny stamp, because it is much easier. Hence if that is the case we are removing from behind the bar of the State hotel the incentive which exists behind the bar of the privately managed hotel to push the trade for all it is worth and secure as much money as possible. A great deal has been said firstly on the appointment of State hotel managers. Even supposing some of the wrongs alleged have crept in in connection with State managers, if the faults

of these State managers become sufficiently obvious to the public the remedy is in their hands immediately. The State manager not fulfilling his rightful position and not carrying out his duty can be immediately removed, but what is the case with a private owner. So long as he keeps within the four corners of the Licensing Act he may push his nefarious trade right up to the hilt, and all the public opinion, and all the teetotallers and total abstinents and liquor reformers are powerless to interfere with him in any way whatever. Under State control that man is continually watched by the public; he is the servant of the whole of the public. If he ceases to carry out his duties properly pressure can be brought upon the Ministry, no matter what party is in power, and that man can be removed. He becomes immediately amenable to public control. A great deal has been said with regard to the method of appointing the manager of a State hotel. The leader of the Opposition commented on the fact that the Ministry called for twelve names to be submitted to them from which they could make a choice as to the man most suitable to fill the position at Dwellingup, and the leader of the Opposition said because the applicant appointed was tenth on the list it was a personal preference on the part of the Ministry. According to that argument, the individual that should have been appointed was number one on the list. If the Ministry were to be guided entirely by the first name upon the list, why should they call for twelve names from which to select one? It would not be a question of obtaining a suggestion from the Public Service Commissioner or the General Manager of the State Hotels Department; it would be a question of a direction on their part, and they would say that the names were put in the order of approval, consequently number one should be appointed. If the Ministry were justified in asking for twelve names to be laid before them to decide on which one should be selected, they were justified in selecting the one of the twelve who appeared to be most entitled to the position. It appears to me from the

general trend of the debate—although I am rather loth to say it—that there is some effort on the part of the leader of the Opposition to disparage the individual who has been appointed to that position. I do not know the man, and I have never met him in my life, and I know nothing of him, but it seems to me regrettable that the individual appointed to fill this public position should be singled out and that opportunity should be taken by the privileges given in Parliament to find fault with that individual without bringing one fraction of proof forward to support the statements.

Mr. George: Is it a fault of the individual or of the selection? I think it is the selection.

Mr. THOMAS: I have heard a good deal of comment upon the selection, but have not heard any reason why this man should not have been appointed.

The Minister for Mines: The judgment of the person who appointed him is as good as that of the Commissioner.

Mr. THOMAS: Twelve names were asked for, and the Government selected one of them. There has been no special charge brought against this individual. There has been no effort to prove his incompetency, but the only statement made has been that he was appointed because he was known to the Ministers of the Crown. It seems to me that the Ministers of the Crown must be becoming very disreputable individuals if, when immediately an individual becomes personally known to any of them, he is not fit to occupy a public position. I cannot see any other direction in which to apply the argument, and it seems to me that politicians must have reached a very low level indeed. It is regrettable, no matter on which side of the House we sit, to level such paltry accusations at those occupying the Treasury benches to-day. They are possibly no better and no worse than other Ministers. I noticed in one of the Perth papers some time ago a statement that the public generally had very little respect for politicians, because they seemed to have no respect for one another. It may be permissible for younger members of the House to stray

a little in their first toddling efforts when they get on the floor of the House to make a speech. It may be excusable if we sometimes drift from the path and indulge in a few personalities, which we should not do, but it seems to me profoundly regrettable that the members who should lead the House, including the leader of the Opposition, and who should endeavour to raise the tone of debate and place it at all times on a higher level, are the first to get it down in the political gutter. Parliament will never win the respect of the people and neither will the leader of the Opposition win the respect of the House so long as he bases his arguments on that class of abuse towards his opponents. We have an exact proof in the reply made by the Minister for Lands to the accusation of having appointed a man who had helped him at his election. We have direct proof in an absolute denial that the man was never inside the electorate during the election. I would accept the word of the Minister for Lands against that of any man in this Parliament or in Western Australia. That is the amount of respect I have for the honourable member. Whatever his politics may be, there is no man in this Parliament, or in the country who will deny that hon. gentleman's honesty and integrity. I am pleased and proud to be able to say that on the floor of the House, and I would ask the leader of the Opposition if he is prepared to deny it. I think I may pass on from that phase of the question. The member for Greenough has taken exception to the appointments of managers of these hotels being made by the Government and he suggested that it would be wise to appoint a board for the purpose of making these selections, or failing that, that the matter should be left to the magistrate of the district. It seems to me a very curious course of reasoning that the hon. member should claim that a Ministry elected by the majority of the people should be incapable of selecting a man to manage a State hotel, whereas a magistrate or an appointed board would be capable of making a more perfect selection. I do not claim for politicians that they are

completely free from bias; I do not believe that the individual exists in this world who is free from bias of one description or another; it may be unconscious bias, but there is bias existing, and a police magistrate in any particular locality is just as likely, in fact infinitely more likely to have personal friends whom he would desire to promote to such a position than any Minister of the Crown. The hon. member said that a police magistrate or a board would be amenable to public opinion. Are not Ministers of the Crown amenable to public opinion? If they are not, what body who have been elected by the people are?

Mr. Underwood: The Opposition.

Mr. THOMAS: Yes, they did not carry out the dictates of the people and they are now in their unfortunate position. There is another advantage, so far as State control is concerned, particularly to the people who are in favour of partial prohibition or total prohibition. So far as I am personally concerned I am not a total prohibitionist. I do not know that I should be entirely happy in a State in which a man could not get a drink. It is not the use of alcoholic drinks where the danger lies, it is in the abuse.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Abuse grows from the use.

Mr. THOMAS: But I think if you were to annihilate any use which might ultimately lead to abuse, we would have such straight-laced people that we would be deprived of everything that tends to make life brighter and better. I claim that in establishing State hotels we are in one respect striking at the question of vested interests, but should it become the desire of the country to reduce the number of hotels in the future, when the population has grown more than it is to-day, and those hotels happen to be State hotels, then there will be no question of compensation to consider. It is purely a matter of the people having to pay the piper. These hotels belong to them, they are under their control and if they wish to abolish them they have the power to do so without the question of restraint cropping in as to what is right being done to the private individual.

Mr. Harper: You would favour that being embodied in the Bill?

Mr. THOMAS: It already exists. We give local option, we give power to say that the hotels shall be reduced, and these provisions remove the necessity for considering the question of compensation. I am entirely in accord with the Premier in his remarks with regard to the question of the manager refusing to supply drink to an individual who has been taking a great deal more than is good for him. That is one of the things I have looked forward to in connection with State management. It is degrading for a woman to have to take her husband to a police court and expose him to public ridicule in order to get an order against him to prevent him from making a beast of himself at every public house he goes to.

Mr. Dwyer: Those orders are mostly inoperative.

Mr. THOMAS: For the simple reason that the question of profit comes in, and if an hotelkeeper can turn an honest or dishonest copper by selling a man drink on the sly, as is frequently done, he will undoubtedly do so, and it is a fact that we often see these men staggering along the street on any day of the week.

Mr. George: What are the police doing?

Mr. THOMAS: If we were to station a policeman inside each hotel, I am rather inclined to think that the policeman himself would become a dipsomaniac before long, because the publican would fill him up with liquor to such an extent that the policeman would not be able to determine whether a man was a prohibited individual or not.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: That is rough on the police.

Mr. THOMAS: I am not making any disparaging remarks against the police or the hotelkeepers. As a class the hotelkeeper is as honourable as any other man, but even if we put a minister of religion in the place of a hotelkeeper to-morrow, and he became amenable to the same circumstances to which the publican is subjected, the constant dripping of water would wear away the stone.

Mr. George: You are severe on the parsons.

Mr. THOMAS: I selected ministers of religion because I look upon them as the highest class in the community by virtue of their calling, but even they, near as they are to perfection, would, I repeat, if placed in similar circumstances to the publican, become amenable to the surroundings. It is not in human nature to resist.

Mr. Underwood: You are talking absolute rubbish.

Mr. THOMAS: The hon. member says I am talking absolute rubbish. If, in his opinion, that is the case, I can only regret it. The hon. member when he gets on the floor himself is given to saying such profoundly wise and well thought out things that of course there may be possibly some excuse for him to reflect on others. I am entirely in accord with the proposal to give the manager of a State hotel discretionary power—because I regard drunkenness as a disease and I do not hold any feelings of hatred or anything else towards the unfortunate drunkard; I extend to him my profound pity—to refuse drink to such an individual, and I think we are placing in his hands a power which will be used for the good of the community. When a man is incapable of taking care of himself, it is time that the State stepped in and took care of him, and if the provision does not already exist, if the manager of the State hotel is breaking the law by doing so, the first opportunity should be taken to give him power to act.

Mr. Dwyer: He is not given the power.

Mr. THOMAS: I do not know of any individual who would be likely to interfere with the manager in the exercise of that power. I know of cases such as those referred to by the Premier, where men have been placed, vulgarly speaking, "under the dog act," as they call it, and for weeks at a time have been compelled to keep perfectly sober. The result is that wives and families have benefited to a considerable extent. I trust that the criticisms indulged in in connection with this Bill will prove rather of a constructive than of a destructive nature. Even if members of the Opposition do not approve of this form of socialism, if they

approve of socialism at all, under ordinary circumstances I think at least they might give a little consideration to this particular measure. I do not claim that the measure is perfect. I am inclined to think that slight alterations might be made to improve the measure. I trust, however, in connection with it that party spirit will be entirely forgotten, both in this House and in another place, because I believe this measure when passed will do incalculable good to the country. I believe we can eliminate the question of profit, and we can eliminate many of the things that at the present time tend towards the worst conditions of the drink trade. I believe as time goes on by restraining and restricting the use of alcohol that the coming generations will be more sober generations than those of to-day. I am not a believer in drastic legislative reformers dealing with this question, and I believe that intemperate reformers can do as much harm as intemperate supporters of hotels, and the object of this House should be to do what is just to the community irrespective of what those in their extreme desire to do good may aim at. I trust that the Bill will receive very careful consideration at the hands of the Opposition as well as of Government members, and I trust it will be sent out of this House in as perfect a condition as possible to receive approval elsewhere, and I also trust that in the near future Western Australia will be receiving the benefit of its enactment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I desire to say a few words on this Bill, particularly in regard to the criticisms of the leader of the Opposition as to the appointment of the manager of the Dwellingup hotel. I also want to reply to the member for Bunbury, and to others who think it is good form to use cheap, although untrue criticism of publicans, and who say that every man who is a publican is a rogue and a vagabond.

Mr. Thomas: I never made use of that expression, and I take exception to it. I said they were decent men.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member declares they are decent men, but he said even if we put a minister of religion in

a publican's place the constant dripping of water—but it was alcohol that he meant—would wear away the stone—of virtue, I presume he meant. I want to resent that. I want to say as one who has been through a considerable portion of this world, having travelled among many people. I have found among publicans men as good as any engaged in other walks of life, and I will always resent these cheap platitudes and cheap attempts at virtue by belittling those who get their living by being publicans. I do not care whether it hurts the member for Bunbury or the member for Subiaco or anybody else. For my own part, I have received many kindnesses and much assistance from publicans and I have never yet come across a publican who tried to take me down or sell me more than I wanted.

Mr. Thomas: You are trying to make cheap capital out of misrepresenting others.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member made cheap capital out of belittling the publican. To my mind the publican is as good a man as a minister of religion, or a man of any other occupation, and that is proved, so far as I am concerned, by a long experience of publicans and a very short experience of ministers of religion. In regard to the charge of the leader of the Opposition respecting the appointment of the manager of the Dwellingup hotel, the honourable gentleman said that twelve names were sent in, and from those twelve names the Premier selected one who had assisted a Minister to be returned to Parliament. Now as a matter of absolute positive fact, the man appointed to this hotel was not in the electorate of any Minister during the last election, either as a voter or in any capacity as assisting to get a Minister returned. The truth of it is the leader of the Opposition has raised another mare's nest, as he so often does. Another man by the same name up at Cunderdin was a strong supporter of the present Minister for Lands. The leader of the Opposition hears that a man named O'Connor supported the Minister for Lands, and then he hears that a Mr. O'Connor has been

appointed manager of a State hotel, and he immediately exclaims, "Ah, here it is; spoils to the victors again. O'Connor assisted Bath to get elected, and O'Connor has been appointed manager of a State hotel." I have not the slightest doubt that each one of those twelve or fourteen gentlemen whose names were sent along assisted somebody to get returned, and are only those debarred who assisted a Minister to get elected? Is it laid down that if a man wants to get into the public service he must not assist anybody, or is it laid down that he must only assist Liberals? The leader of the Opposition should give us some idea of what he means, or what his complaints are.

Mr. George: I thought he had done that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The honourable gentleman told us that this man was guilty of the heinous crime of assisting in the election of a member of Parliament. Now, in my opinion, any citizen is entitled to vote for whom he likes in politics, and to work for whom he likes, and if he is competent to fill a Government position he should be appointed to that position. In regard to the statement that Mr. O'Connor was one of twelve names sent along, the fact is that there were roughly twelve dozen candidates. The Premier said in effect, "Now, there are twelve dozen names; give me a dozen of them and I will pick one from the dozen." The individual who made the selection was not asked, and it would be absurd to ask him, to put the dozen in order of preference, because if that were done, the Premier would immediately say, that he would take the first one on the list.

Mr. George: But why should the Premier interfere when you have a Public Service Commissioner?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Hon. members may attack the Premier on that point if they like and then they will be logical, but let them not think for one instant that the Premier would be so absurd as to say, "Give me a dozen and put them in order of merit." If he had said that he might as well have said, "Appoint the man yourself." The leader of the Opposition took me rather severely to task

and spoke of my rudeness, and uncouthness and vulgarity, and a lot of other things, because I made a simple suggestion that he had appointed one or two squibs to the public service.

Mr. George: What are "squibs"?

Mr. UNDERWOOD: "Squibs" are men who cannot do their work.

Mr. George: "Rotters."

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The hon. member can use his own term, but I hope his language will not be written up to me. Because I made that remark, the leader of the Opposition came forward to-night accusing the Premier of appointing somebody unfit for the position, and taking the word, I presume, of a dirty, filthy paper like the *Sunday Times*. Writers in the *Sunday Times* are beneath the contempt of men, and these are the men that the leader of the Opposition has taken the word of. Because two or three of these mongrels who write for the *Sunday Times* have decided to write Peter O'Connor down, the leader of the Opposition comes along and lends an air of respectability to those men who, after all, are not fit to be called men. One cannot help feeling somewhat degraded, even in his position in Parliament, when the leader of the Opposition will follow the lead of the dirty, miserable objects who write for the *Sunday Times*.

Mr. GEORGE (Murray-Wellington): One needs great caution in these times in rising to speak after the speeches of the hon. member who has just sat down and the hon. member who preceded him. I am sorry that the leader of the Opposition is not present.

Mr. Underwood: So am I.

Mr. GEORGE: I believe the hon. member is, because I believe he would sooner face an opponent than see his back, but I am sorry the leader of the Opposition was not present to hear the member for Bunbury and the somewhat strong language which was used by the last speaker. So far as I can judge, the cravenness of the charge made by the leader of the Opposition was more in the fact that the Premier took up a position in connection with deciding this matter

which should certainly not appertain to the office of Premier.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: That is not the charge you have made to-night.

Mr. GEORGE: I have not made any charges. The Premier, occupying as he does the position of first citizen of the State and leader of the party governing the State, should find more important duties to occupy his time than the appointing of managers of State pubs.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): But he administers that department.

Mr. GEORGE: That may be so; then I regret that the Premier has such trivial matters forced on his time and attention, when the affairs of the State need all the time and experience which the honourable gentleman possesses, to see that the ship is steered properly and well for the prosperity of the State. Personally, I have no knowledge as to whether the statement made regarding Mr. O'Connor is correct or not. The Minister for Lands has given us his word that this particular Mr. O'Connor did not assist in his election contest, and from what I know of that honourable gentleman I would accept his word without any question. The hon. member for Bunbury, with a sort of almost mock modesty which did not impose upon anybody, took the older members of the House to task for not laying down a higher tone in debate. Why, if the honourable gentleman could only see himself and hear himself as others do, he would know that the exaggerations he attempts to put in his apparently polished periods are hardly suitable to this place and do not lend argument to the Bill. As to the Bill itself, I should like to see that new hotels, wherever they are established, are State hotels, and I desire to see them established for the reason that I believe that in the conduct of these hotels, where the personal element of gain is eliminated so far as the manager is concerned, his salary satisfying him, the public are more likely to receive from that hotel the treatment which hotels should always carry with them. They should be able to obtain decent lodging, decent food, and de-

cent drink if necessary, without having to go to excess, and without having any allurements to lead them to excess.

Mr. Harper : Why not substitute restaurants for hotels?

Mr. GEORGE : That is a point I shall come to shortly. I am merely stating my opinion, and I think it is the opinion of a number of people in this State. We are not making complaints against hotels that are properly conducted. There are hotels in this State that are conducted splendidly, and so far as they are concerned, I do not think it is intended in any shape or form to make any attack upon them, but we do know that there are pubs—let hon. members call them hotels if they like—where that care is not taken, and where the first consideration is not so much the respectability of the house, but rather whether those who frequent it will land money in the pockets of the proprietor. Those are the places where inferior liquors are sold, liquors which take away the little sense which a man has left and make him a danger not only to himself but to everybody else he comes in contact with. The fault, I find, in this Bill, is that I would prefer that instead of the Government having absolute power it should be laid down that the Government should have the assistance and counsel of the licensing board in the district. The members of a licensing board in any district must be better acquainted with the circumstances of the different portions of that district than can a Government sitting as an administrative executive in Perth. Of course it will be said that the Government have the best of information at their command at any time, and are therefore in a position to judge, but I take it that beyond the decision on the part of the Government that a hotel shall be established if all things are suitable, the Government should not go further.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) : That is what the Bill provides for.

Mr. GEORGE : Hardly as far as I think it should do. I notice also a point which was raised by the leader of the

Opposition, when he pointed out that the Bill provided that a majority of adult persons residing within a radius of three miles of the proposed site of a State hotel might send in a petition against an hotel being established, and if that petition is presented to the Minister, as it would be, then the hotel should not be established. Of course it is pretty obvious that if the majority of people in the district signed against having an hotel, even if an hotel were established, the prospects of business would not be particularly bright. But I consider that the licensing benches are bodies which should be consulted, and I see no reason why it should not be imperative on the promoters of the State hotel to apply for a license under exactly the same conditions as any private person, because if they apply and the bench does not consider it necessary that the license should be granted, the very fact of the State having been refused a license for a State hotel will absolutely block further applications for licenses from outsiders. That is a point which I think should be considered. The member for Leonora has referred to the conduct of the State hotel at Gwalia, and I am pleased to hear it. I have not seen the hotel, but I have heard a great deal about it from the time of its inception, and I am pleased at any rate it is one State venture that has been decently conducted and has done a considerable amount of good. The hon. member let fall the information, or at least I understood him to do so, that it would be within the province of the Government to acquire licensed houses if the owners are prepared to sell them. I hope that will not be accepted by the House or considered by the Government. I know no reason why the Government should attempt to buy any of these licensed houses, and I hope that the principle, even if it be put forth in a semi-jesting way, will not be considered, or accepted. We are all desirous that temperance principles should be carried out. A previous speaker has pointed out that intemperance is not solely the possession of those who take too much alcohol, but is sometimes the attitude of those who



take too much water and cold tea. From my experience the world is getting more temperate and more sober year by year. Whereas at one time it was considered fair for a man to say he was going to get "jolly tight," the number of those who go in for that sort of thing to-day is nothing in percentage to what it was, thirty, forty or even longer years ago than that. The spread of education, and not altogether the efforts of the temperance party, although they have done their part, education, wider travel, and more conveniences, and a better style of living have in a measure done away with the great drinking of forty years ago. Whether we take the big cities in the new world, or the big cities in the old world, we will see nothing like the proportion of drunkenness there was thirty or forty years ago. If in regard to State hotels the Government could see their way to providing that the power of the licensing benches applied equally to State hotels as to private hotels I think the Bill would be another step in the progress of temperance in this State, and I would feel I was doing my duty in helping it forward.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS (Subiaco): It is with very mixed feelings indeed that I rise to support this Bill because, while recognising the evils even of the most moderate use of alcoholic beverages, I am convinced that, while the people through their lack of knowledge demand to be supplied with these beverages, State control is in the best interests of all concerned. There are one or two arguments used by temperance reformers which I should like briefly to reply to. One of the principal objections they have to State control is that they are made shareholders in a traffic which they absolutely abhor, but they seem to forget, when urging that contention, that through the very fact of the State collecting licence fees, though the traffic is in the hands of private individuals, they are made equally as much shareholders as though the industry was controlled by the State. So I contend that that argument loses its force. Another objection and a more valid one, is the objection that

with the extension of State control the revenue collected will be a considerable item, and that the Government of the day may be influenced to throw their weight into the scale when the time comes that the people may make a demand for the prohibition of the liquor traffic; and for that reason I contend, the same as the member for Bunbury contended here to-night, that all the revenue derived from the drink traffic should be earmarked for a specific purpose. I contend that the whole of the revenue derived by the State from the liquor traffic should be used in the direction of combating that traffic and educating the people and placing before them the latest scientific expositions of the evils of alcoholism, and in the direction of establishing libraries and gymnasiums and such like institutions which would have the effect of drawing our rising youth away from the public houses and giving them more congenial amusement. With regard to the criticisms used by members opposite, if they can be called criticisms, because I contend that they have not criticised the system of State control versus private control, to my mind they have no arguments against the State control of the liquor traffic.

Mr. George: Give us an argument for it.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: I have already given the argument. Everything is in favour of the State controlling the liquor traffic while the people, through their lack of knowledge, demand that they should be supplied. The people through State control will be supplied with a far purer and better class of drink than is possible through private enterprise. The member for Bunbury dealt very fully with that phase of the question. He pointed out the keen competition there is between those engaged in the traffic to make a profit, and the incentive there always is to adulterate liquors and to use all kinds of devious means by which to enhance profits; but under State control all that is eliminated: there is no incentive to adulterate liquors or, on the part of the manager of an hotel, to try to induce people to drink more than is good

for them. On the other hand it should be, especially with a Government whose object is to diminish the use of alcohol, something in the manager's favour if he induced people to drink less rather than drink more. The principal objection urged by hon. members opposite is that the Bill gives the Government powers which should be enjoyed only by the licensing bench, and that it gives the Government power to establish a State hotel wherever they think fit without consulting a licensing bench; but members seem to forget, if they have read the Bill, that the Government are appealing to a higher tribunal than even a licensing bench. The sovereign people through a twice expressed vote have the right to say whether a State hotel should be established in their midst. First of all, under the present Licensing Act, which gives the people the power to say whether they shall have State control in their midst, they have to carry a vote in favour of State control; then when the Government notify their intention to establish a State hotel in accordance with the expressed wish of these people, the people within a three-mile radius of the State hotel have the right to object to the hotel being put there.

Mr. Male: Then if they do that it cannot be their expressed wish to have it.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: I say they first have the right to vote whether they are in favour of State control in their district and then when the State notifies its intention to place a hotel in the district the people within a three-mile radius have the right to object to a hotel going there. I give the people the right to change their minds from the previous vote; and I contend that when we are giving that right to the people who are concerned there can be no necessity to apply to a licensing bench. But then we have the objection that the manager the Government may appoint may not be a suitable man, who perhaps might not be granted a licence if he applied to a licensing bench; but I contend that that argument cannot possibly have any weight, because no Government would dare to appoint a person as manager of

a State hotel unless he possessed the necessary qualifications and was a man who would undoubtedly receive a license for a private hotel. The criticisms that have been levelled against the Bill seem to be of the same nature as those advanced by the party to which my friends belong right throughout Australia. They seem to be suffering from some fidget of the brain that no Labour Government will appoint anyone to a position except in return for political services. It is a most unfounded and cowardly charge. I challenge my friends to prove that they ever appointed a Labour supporter or sympathiser to any position when they were in power.

Mr. Munsie: Never one.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Never one throughout Australia. In every instance the fact that a man has been a Labour supporter was an effective bar against him getting an appointment from the Liberal Government. On the other hand, there are numberless instances where well known Liberal supporters have been appointed to high positions by Labour Governments, and simply because one or two known Labour men who have possessed the necessary qualifications, and there has never been an attempt made to prove that the qualification was not there. Because they have been appointed to positions, we have the cowardly charge made that it was because of their political opinions that they have been so appointed. I think if hon. members had any shame in them they would blush for the absurd statements they are making. The member for Murray-Wellington tried to excuse his leader when he said that it was not the appointment that that member cavilled at so much as the way in which the Premier did it. In the Liberal Club the leader of the Opposition said it was a distinctly political appointment and something that the people should not allow to go on. The people are the better judges, the people know that no Labour Government has appointed any supporter unless that supporter was fit for the position. I believe that by the extension of the State control of the liquor traffic all

the worst evils of that traffic will be eliminated.

Mr. Thomas: Hear, hear.

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: I am glad to hear the hon. member for Bunbury say "hear, hear," because of some of the statements he made to-night which I cannot endorse. He admitted in one part of his speech that the drink habit is a disease. As one who possesses some medical knowledge I should imagine that when the hon. member recognised the existence of a disease he would be willing to go to its source in the hope of exterminating it. When a disease exists, if it be an epidemic of fever or any other disease, we should always trace it to its source and proceed to eradicate it. I believe, with my friend and anyone else who has studied the latest scientific teaching on the subject that the drink habit is a disease, that all alcohol is poison, as the Attorney General pointed out in his eloquent speech the other night, and when we recognise this we should go to the very fountain head and endeavour to stamp it out altogether. I believe, as I said in my opening remarks, that the people are not educated to that standard, and all the revenue derived from the State control of the liquor traffic should be utilised towards educating the people to the evils of indulging in alcoholic beverages—

Mr. George: Is there no good in the indulgence?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: The latest medical science teaches that the supposed benefits derived are purely an illusion.

Mr. Thomas: But there are contrary opinions?

Mr. B. J. STUBBS: Another matter upon which I am thoroughly satisfied is that when the time comes that the people are educated to the necessity for prohibiting the drink traffic, if it is in the control of the State, we shall not have individuals spending large sums of money to try and prevent a free expression of the will of the people, and that is undoubtedly what we have at the present time, whenever a local option poll is being taken. We have those who are deriving large sums of money from the sale of alcoholic beverages spending that money towards

preventing a free expression of the will of the people. When the people are asked to pass a vote with regard to the abolition of some portion at least of the liquor trade, I am convinced that with the trade in the hands of the Government, such a state of things will not exist, and whilst I say I am one of those who believe that nothing but evil comes from the use of alcohol, I have very much pleasure in giving my support to this measure because I realise that the people demand that they shall be supplied, and whilst they make that demand I would rather see the traffic in the hands of the Government than in the hands of private individuals.

Hon. J. MITCHELL (Northam): The hon. member who has just sat down will find it a little difficult to reconcile his views with the opinion he has just given utterance to. His last statement is that, whilst he disagreed entirely in the use of alcohol, the Government should have power to regulate it.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I explained why.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was a very feeble explanation.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I said because the people demanded it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier was on safer ground, but whilst he is asking for power to open State hotels, we have before us another Bill which provides that the Government may control and cure those who are suffering from the effects of the excessive use of alcohol. The Attorney General is endeavouring to provide a home for these people. The Attorney General will agree with me that it is strange just now when the finances are so strained, that he should ask the State to undertake so much expenditure.

The Attorney General: We make profits out of the State hotels in order to cure the drunkards.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There is some comfort in that.

Mr. Carpenter: Do you take comfort from it?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The comfort will be for hon. members opposite. We have no quarrel with State ownership of hotels. I believe thoroughly in the system

which says that the State should own all hotel licenses. If hon. members will cast back their minds a year or two they will remember that I provided that in all new townships liquor should not be sold on land other than that which was owned by the State. At Bullfinch we sold two hotel sites for a considerable sum of money, and it was provided that these should revert to the State in ten years.

Mr. Turvey: And so did a number of the blocks you sold.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I have no doubt about that, but the State derived a considerable revenue from those who purchased these blocks and they had a fair run for their money. That, at any rate, shows that our management of State affairs was satisfactory.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): But it was not satisfactory to those persons who bought the blocks.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hotels built on Crown lands will revert to the State in ten years time without any charge. Although I do not approve of the State running hotels, I think it would be much better if hotels were leased under satisfactory conditions by which the State would derive a sufficient revenue and by which the hotels would be under control. I have also advocated that the leases should be from day to day in order that transgressors might be dealt with whenever the occasion warranted. Under the system now proposed some hotels will be State owned and others will be held by private people. The Government have taken upon themselves, even where the local option poll was against them, to establish a hotel. They are taking the power to ignore the votes given at local option polls.

Mr. Dwyer: Where was that done?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was done at Dwellingup where a majority of the people voted against increased licenses.

The Attorney General: The majority of the people there signed a petition asking the State to establish a hotel.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: What has a petition to do with the local option vote? I repeat, the majority of the people at

the local option poll voted against increased licenses.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: They voted against a license being granted to a private individual.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: That was not so, because that was not the question before the poll, and what the Government did there they will do again. The Government opened an hotel there against the wish expressed at the poll by a majority of the people. The people have been told that the late Government promised that a hotel license should be granted at Dwellingup; but the late Government had nothing to do with the granting of a license there. We believed then, as we believe now, that the licensing bench should be the body that should have the power to grant hotel licenses. We have no responsibility for any promise made by the bench, if such promise were made. Had we had the opportunity we would have prevented the license being issued by the bench at Pinjarra.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): You could not have prevented it.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: We would have done so. The Bill which established a State hotel at Dwellingup was proof that as Ministers had time to introduce such a Bill they would have had time to amend the Licensing Act to prevent the license being issued for that locality.

The Attorney General: The majority voted for the State hotel in that very district at the local option poll.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It is perfectly true, and I would vote to-morrow for the State ownership of all hotels. But the vote on that question had nothing to do with the question of increase of licenses at all. The Government here seek to cover up their iniquitous behaviour by saying that they will not establish a hotel unless the majority vote in the affirmative on the question "Do you vote that any new publican's general licenses in the district shall be held by the State?" Probably every man would vote "Yes" on that question; I would myself vote "Yes" on that question, but I would vote "No" on the question of increased licenses. This question has nothing to do with the issue

of licenses at all, yet the Government make it an excuse for the bringing down of a measure for the establishment of State hotels. People voted for the State ownership, but did not express any desire whatever that the Government should take power to open hotels in wholesale fashion. If the measure pass it will be possible for the Minister to open hotels wherever he pleases, even where they are not required at all. The Premier says an hotel is required at Kununoppin, and another at Wongan Hills. Both are centres in new agricultural districts where a great deal of work is going on, and a large amount of wages being paid, and I think it would be just as well if we allowed the men earning those wages to have the use of them, instead of providing Government hotels in their midst in order that the Government might share in the distribution of those wages. I believe that if State hotels are to be established in these agricultural centres the Government will find it necessary to exercise the greatest possible care in the appointment of managers. In my experience hotels in agricultural districts have done a great deal of harm, and even under the Government system unless great care is exercised in the choice of manager this harm will be perpetuated. We have had experience of State hotels at Gwalia and at the Cave House, and now at Dwellingup. I know the two first named fairly well. Both are well run; indeed it is a pleasure to visit them. I know nothing of the hotel at Dwellingup, but if all one hears about it is true it is not a very creditable establishment. I believe its early history would shock even the member for Collie.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: It is not fair to make charges against the manager under privilege of the House.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I am not talking about the present manager at all; I say that in the early stages of its existence the hotel was disgracefully run, and was indeed a discredit to the State.

Mr. Lander: Go down and have a look at it yourself.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I think the hon. member would be much happier down there than would I.

Mr. Lander: You have no right to try to injure the present manager.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Nothing of the sort; I was speaking of the early history of the place.

Mr. Lander: You are trying to injure the manager. Give us something about your brother having been appointed agricultural inspector; that is more in your line; that and the Narra Tarra estate.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I have heard something of my brother having been appointed to the Agricultural Bank, but it has nothing to do with the question. However, if the lunatic who represents East Perth will keep quiet—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw and apologise.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: I withdraw and apologise. I had nothing to do with the appointment of my brother to the Agricultural Bank; the position occupied by him is one under the managing trustee. When introducing the Bill, the Minister said little of the result of the operations of the hotels we have already established. Surely it would have been fit and proper for him to tell us exactly how these ventures stand. If we have made money out of the business we are entitled to have from the Government some statement in regard to each of these hotels. Something has been said, too, of the appointment of manager of the State hotel at Dwellingup. I was told that Mr. O'Connor, the manager, was in the electorate of the Minister for Lands, and had worked for the Minister for Lands.

The Attorney General: It has been denied; you know that.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: No, I believed it to be absolutely true.

The Attorney General: But you have since been told that it is not.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: If the Attorney General will keep quiet, I will endeavour to explain. I have since been told by members opposite that Mr. O'Connor, who worked for the Minister for Lands, is not the Mr. O'Connor, manager of the State hotel. I want to say that the leader of the Opposition heard from me that the two Mr. O'Connors were identical; and I had good authority for the information I gave to the leader of the Opposition. My

informant told me that the same Mr. O'Connor had worked for my friend the member for Perth.

Mr. A. A. Wilson : Do you object to his working for the member for Perth?

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Not at all; but I wish to make the matter clear. The leader of the Opposition dealt with this question on the strength of the information I had given him.

The Attorney General : And you are now sorry for what you did.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : No, I am not sorry. I think the appointment was a jolly bad one. Probably if the Ministry were frank they would tell us why they asked that the applicants for the position should be reduced to twelve. Was it in order that Mr. O'Connor's name might be included, even though he were only eleventh on the list? Did one ever before hear of a Minister asking the Public Service Commissioner to reduce the applicants for a position to twelve for a final choice? Why were they not cut down to three, or two, or better still, to one? The name of the appointee was the eleventh on the list. It is strange, to say the least of it, that this method of selection was adopted. The member for Subiaco declared that no Labour supporter had ever been appointed to any position by the late Government. He knows that to be wrong. Hundreds of unionists were sent out to work by the late Government.

Mr. Dwyer: At pick and shovel; those are the only jobs you ever gave them.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Hundreds of men out of work to-day because we are not in power were found work by us, and hon. members opposite know it quite well. Then there were other appointments, too, which were made; it did not concern me whether a man were Labour or Liberal, so long as he was a good worker. Your own Premier will tell you that. Another objectionable feature in this measure is that whilst the Premier proposes to disregard entirely the local option poll it is provided that there may be prepared and presented petitions against the granting of all licenses, signed by persons residing within three

miles of the site of the proposed hotel. It seems to me it is an objectionable practice to receive petitions in regard to proposed licenses. The local option poll would be preferable to that. But I suggest to the Attorney General that he allow a clause to be inserted providing that a secret ballot be taken of the residents before it is decided to establish a hotel. The Premier should respect the Licensing Act. I think that so drastic an alteration as is represented in the Bill should have been made in the Licensing Act. The Premier says that prohibition is impracticable just now, but that it will not be so when people have had experience of State hotels. He must entertain a very bad opinion of the effect his hotels will have. I understood it was proposed to improve the brand of liquor.

The Attorney General : Are you unconscious that you are misrepresenting the Premier?

Hon. J. MITCHELL : I am conscious that I am representing him correctly.

The Attorney General : No.

Hon. J. MITCHELL : Yes; I have read his actual words from *Hansard* itself. I hope that the Bill will not become law, and I am very surprised indeed, that it has been brought down. From time to time we have been told that the Ministry are in favour of reducing the opportunity for purchasing liquor. We are told that they favour local option in the fullest possible measure; there is to be no half-heartedness about it. The majority are to have the right to say whether liquor shall be sold or not; but if this Bill is carried, it will not matter very much what the people say. It will matter not at all if the people vote as one man against the issue of licenses; so long as they vote that if hotels are to be established the Government are to establish them, the Government can establish them wherever they wish. It seems to me that the Government are asking for a power that is altogether too great, and they are asking Parliament to pass a Bill that will work great harm. I hope, however, there will be found sufficient members in the House who believe

that the liquor traffic should be controlled by the people, and who, even if they favour State ownership of hotels as I do, will yet vote against a measure which will place in the hands of one man the sole power to say when, where, and how hotels are to be established.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): I have been very much surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Northam. He admitted that he was responsible for an unwarranted attack on the Government through an error, and yet he did not have the manliness to apologise for his mistake. I must say that if anyone had told me that the member for Northam, when he found that he had made a mistake, would not have taken the first opportunity of apologising to the Minister for Lands for allowing a false statement of corrupt practices to go through the country, I would have said that person was mistaken.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Wait till I get it confirmed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The interjection of the hon. member serves to confirm my statement that he did not take the first opportunity of rectifying the error when he found that he was in the wrong. The hon. member has stated that the Bill empowers the Government to open as many hotels in any district as they desire, whether those hotels are wanted or not, and he said that in all probability the Government would open hotels, even if they were not required. I would like to draw attention to the fact that continually this evening the hon. member has interjected that it will not be long before the Government are sitting on the Opposition side again.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Quite true too, if you go on like this.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): If the hon. member believes that, I want to say that the Government to-day believe that any body of men who hold the Treasury benches will not force a hotel on any district contrary to the wishes of the people in that district.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is not provided in the Bill.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No, because we believe in the honour of the men who hold the Treasury benches for the time being, and we believe that they would not dare to go against the wishes of the people in any district. In regard to Dwellingup, the hon. member said that the Ministry had forced a hotel on the district contrary to the wishes of the people, but why does the hon. member not honestly admit that in the Licensing Act the Government of which he was a member introduced a section which nullified the local option in that district and any other so situated. The late Government inserted a clause in the Bill that the magistrate should have power to override the desire of the people in any district if an application applied to a hotel outside a radius of 15 miles of any other hotel. Section 45 includes the following provision:—

Except when Resolution D has been carried and is in force in the district, the Licensing Court may in its discretion grant a license for premises in any locality in which no licensed premises are situated within a radius of fifteen miles from the premises to which the application relates.

That shows that the hon. member's own Act nullified the local option vote so far as Dwellingup is concerned, and the same section has been exercised in other districts as well as Dwellingup. I want to draw the attention of the House to the vote in the Forrest licensing division. At the time when the local option vote was taken there were 177 votes in favour of increasing the licenses in that district, and there were 327 against an increase. Those 327 voters were against granting a fresh license to a private individual in that district, because when we go farther on we find that there were 728 voters in favour of granting a license to a State hotel.

Mr. Harper: That was a requisition.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No, that is the result of the referendum as published in the *Government Gazette* over the name of Mr. E. G. Stenberg, the Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. George: Because sly grog was rampant.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): That might be so, but that was not the argument which the hon. member for Northam put up. The vote in that district was conclusively in favour of the erection of a State hotel. The member for Murray-Wellington argued that the State should go before the licensing board in the same manner as a private individual, and he contended that if the State was blocked from getting a license, it would be useless for any private person to apply. If that is so, how has it acted in the past? I have known of individuals in a district being refused a license, and of the licensing district, when the power was in the hands of the magistrate, being made to suit other individuals who were applying for licenses. I had that experience in a case in which I was opposing an application.

Mr. George: Do you not admit that if the State was refused a license, the licensing board would never dare to grant a license to a private individual?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): No, because, as the member for Bunbury pointed out, the members of licensing courts are human, and if they acted fairly and squarely as their position requires they should, why should they refuse a license to one individual and make it available for another applicant?

Mr. George: Have not the Government power to deal with the licensing board in such cases?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): None whatever. They can remove the members of the licensing board later on, but by that time the injury has been done. The same thing could happen in this district. Suppose the State were applying for a hotel license, and some private individual was wanting a license in the same district, there would be a possibility of the individual being favoured, especially if those who sat on the bench were not in favour of State hotels. I am in favour of State hotels, because I believe this to be the first step towards prohibition. I believe that if we can get State hotels established private interests

will be gradually eliminated, and those who wish to rid the State of what is an evil will be able to do so without the opposition of private interests. But we must not forget that money rules to a great extent, and if there is a local option poll taken, especially where it is likely to affect private individuals whose interests are at stake, it is only to be expected that those who are opposed to the drink traffic will have to fight strongly against those whose interests are at stake. Private interests would put up a big battle, but if we have State hotels and there are no individual interests, that opposition is removed, and there is a greater possibility of reducing the number of hotels, if not wiping them out altogether, than exists to-day. A good deal has been said about the hotel at Dwellingup. I have not had the opportunity of visiting that hotel, but if it or any other hotel did not get more custom from others than it gets from me, very few of them would be in existence. I have, however, had the opportunity of visiting the State hotels at Gwalia and Yallingup, and so far as the former is concerned, no one who went there with the idea of forming a fair opinion could come away without being strongly in favour of State hotels. While I was at Gwalia, I never saw one man standing at any time in the bar of the State hotel, but, in the neighbouring town of Leonora, one could see men standing there hour after hour, and no doubt in many instances continuing the drinking which was doing them an injury. At the Gwalia State hotel, immediately a man took his drink, he left the bar, because it was recognised by the people of the district that the State hotel was not a drinking shop, but an accommodation house; and the same thing will apply no doubt to the State hotels wherever they are established in any part of the State. I have seen petitions lodged for the erection of State hotels in one or two agricultural districts, and I was rather surprised by a number of the names and occupations of the gentlemen who signed those petitions. The reasons given were that they realised that within a very short period, the time would come when pri-



vate individuals would apply for a license in that district, and under the clause I have read relating to the 15-mile radius, that license would be granted. In the interests of the district, and the safety of the people of the district in trying to keep down the consumption of intoxicating liquors, they prefer to have a State hotel to a drinking shop in their midst.

Mr. Monger: What is the difference between a drinking shop and a State hotel?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The hon. member ought to know; he has had more experience than I have.

Mr. Monger: I doubt it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The State hotel is erected for the express purpose of accommodating the people who travel and reside in that district, while a drinking shop is erected for the express purpose—well, it brings to my mind a remark I heard in a train while coming from the goldfields not long ago. A farmer stated that the hotels were the best friend the farmers had. He was asked why such was the case, and he replied that if the hotel had not been there, there would be no farm labourers because they would all be owning farms of their own. That, no doubt, is a fact. The farmers' cheques are dropped into the drinking shop, and that accounts for the cheap labour on the farms.

Mr. Monger: Where are the drinking dens?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): I did not use the words dens. In regard to the Bill now before the House, I feel satisfied that the interests of the people in any district are amply protected. Before an hotel can be erected a petition may be lodged against it by people living within a radius of three miles of where the hotel is to be erected. At present there is no necessity for that petition if the hotel is outside of the 15 miles radius. The magistrate has full discretion, and seeing that is so, I do not think that any Ministry, no matter what party it might come from, would force an hotel in defiance of the wishes of the people of any district. The provision of this radius of three miles, giving residents

an opportunity to oppose the erection of an hotel, I think fully safeguards their interests.

Mr. MULLANY (Menzies): While rising to support this measure, I do so in the hope that it will pass this Chamber as well as the Legislative Council in its present form, and I trust that it will lead to a considerable extension of the State control of the liquor traffic, and that in the near future there will be considerable additions to the number of State-owned hotels in Western Australia. A good deal has been said in the course of the debate regarding the character of the bulk of the men who are earning their living as publicans in this State. Like the member for Pilbara, I think I can claim to have had a fair experience of publicans, and of other business men, and I feel justified in claiming that the business morality of hotelkeepers is quite as good as that of other classes of business men in this State. Whether that is the case or not, we cannot do any injury to the bulk of the people by a considerable extension of the system of the State control of the liquor traffic. The first object which should be sought in the State control of the liquor traffic is the elimination of the element of profit to any one individual concerned in the traffic, and by having State hotels we will make one large and definite step in this direction. Neither the State manager, nor any employee in an hotel, would have any more interest in forcing up his sales, or inducing people to drink, than the officer in charge of any other Government department would have in trying to force the business of his department.

Mr. Monger: Why do not you keep the highest class of spirit then?

Mr. MULLANY: I think I will be able to show that State hotels do keep the best class of spirits procurable, but I think we can go further, and I trust the State will go further and distribute its own spirit with a guarantee of its purity. I was struck by a remark made by the leader of the Opposition to the effect that the hotel business is one of the hardest upon which to keep a check. That statement is open to great criticism. I was

inclined to think directly the opposite to that, because it is well known to people who have had any experience of the trade that when a quantity of liquor is sent into a house to be sold, they know exactly what percentage of profit should be returned from it. If this department is run on business lines, and there is a strict watch kept on the hotels, and the returns are properly kept, I fail to see where the leader of the Opposition can find grounds for the statement that the liquor traffic is one of the hardest to control in a business-like manner. That gentleman went further and said that some employees might be tempted, for their own profit, to adulterate liquor, or sell liquor which they should not. We have in Western Australia a system of State batteries. This is a system upon which I think it is very much harder to keep a check, as regards the manager or employees, than State hotels would possibly be. Yet we do not hear that it is impossible to get an honest manager, or honest employees for a State battery, men who if they wish to be dishonest, have greater opportunities than the manager of a State hotel would have. The Government have been able to get honest men for the State batteries, and why should they not get honest men as managers for the State hotels as well? To a certain extent I agree with the leader of the Opposition in the statement that State hotels should be open to inspection by an inspector of liquor. I do not know that there is any provision in this measure to that effect.

The Attorney General: It is provided that they shall be.

Mr. MULLANY: With this provision I do not see why the leader of the Opposition should be so fearful that bad liquor will be sold in State hotels. Mr. Monger asked why they do not sell good liquor. It is news to me to hear that bad liquor is ever sold. I have a list of the liquors sold at the Gwalia State hotel; I do not know whether the brands are good or not, but I might mention that in the list are Hennessey's Three Star, Martell's, Black Horse, and others. I will pass the list to the member for York and he will be able to say whether they are good or not.

Mr. Harper: They are shilling drinks, are they not?

Mr. MULLANY: Yes, all goldfields' drinks are.

Mr. George: Why?

Mr. MULLANY: I suppose they are very rich in those parts. The leader of the Opposition seemed to be very solicitous, as he usually is, for the property owners; he said he hoped that the Bill would not lead to the State buying hotels, or entering into the hotel business, in cities or towns where there is already ample hotel accommodation. He instanced the Railway Hotel in Perth, the unexpired portion of the lease of which has recently been sold. I believe the Swan Brewery has control of this hotel. I am not very solicitous about the interests of such as the Swan or any other brewery which seeks to monopolise the drink trade. Undoubtedly, while these large corporations or companies are able to buy up and gain control of a large percentage of the hotels in any town, bad results must follow, and we cannot do better than create a greater monopoly, a monopoly by the State, although those words are a contradiction because there cannot be such a thing as a State monopoly. It is obvious that there can be no State monopoly, because it would break down of its own weight from the fact of every citizen being a shareholder in it. This system of companies, large or small, getting control of a number of licensed houses, I contend, is a bad one, and if I am ever given an opportunity, and I trust we will get an opportunity, to bring legislation forward to deal with the tied house system, I would be pleased to do all I could towards wiping out this system. I have seen beer which has been refused by a free house on account of its quality, sent back to the brewery, and when the carter reported that the load had been returned it was, without being taken off the trolley, sent to a tied house which could not refuse to accept it. This, I believe, is done repeatedly, and it is necessary to combat this evil of the tied house system in this State, a system which I believe prevails in the other States also. I do not intend to say anything regarding the method of

appointing State hotel managers. I care not whether a Liberal or Labour Government is in power, but when we put gentlemen in charge of the Treasury benches we should accept the appointments they make and give them credit for making appointments which are in the best interests of the State.

Mr. George: They are human and liable to err.

Mr. MULLANY: Mr. George infers that he has not such faith in their appointments as other members have; that is probably due to his long experience in political life. I have faith that the gentlemen on the Treasury benches can administer the affairs of the State. I was surprised to hear the member for Northam state that there were rumours that the conduct of the State hotel at Dwellingup was a disgrace to the State. I am surprised indeed to hear a man such as the member for Northam, one who has filled the responsible position of Minister of the Crown, state in this Chamber on such a flimsy ground as rumour, that the conduct of the hotel was anything but creditable. Surely the hon. member should have something with which to substantiate that statement. In the next breath the hon. member admits he has never been at the hotel at Dwellingup. He knows nothing from his own knowledge, and he gave us no information as to the source from which he got his information. If I may be permitted to use the expression, it is cowardly for him to come here and attack the reputation of the manager of the State hotel at Dwellingup on what he says is mere rumour. The hon. member knows that his words will be published in the newspapers through the State, and that they cannot be construed into anything else but a direct attack on the competency and character of the man in charge of the hotel at Dwellingup. It is a cowardly thing on the part of the hon. member to make such a charge against a man without having anything to back it up. I am sorry the hon. member is not now in the Chamber, but he will have the same opportunity of reading what I say as the public will have of reading his attack.

I have a little more knowledge of the State hotel at Dwellingup than the member for Northam. I have stayed there for several days, and I have visited the State hotel at Gwalia and stayed at many private hotels in different parts of the State; and I can say from my own observation that, while I was at the State hotel at Dwellingup, it was as well conducted as any hotel, State or private, in Western Australia. I have no direct knowledge of the present manager except for having met him while I was a guest at the hotel; but if the hotel is conducted on the same lines as when I was there, the State need not be afraid of its conduct under the present management.

Mr. George: There has been no attack on the conduct of the present manager.

Mr. MULLANY: The member for Northam said that it was rumoured throughout the State that the conduct of the State hotel at Dwellingup was anything but a credit to the State.

Mr. George: That was in the early days.

Mr. MULLANY: Last Christmas? What do you mean by early days? At any rate I am pleased I am stinging someone.

Mr. George: I did not wish you to make a mistake.

Mr. MULLANY: When members make charges they should have better information to go on. I trust that the carrying of this measure will lead not only to an increase in a number of State hotels in the State, but ultimately to the State going in for the manufacture, distribution, and sale of alcoholic liquors of all sorts which people like or find necessary to use. Alcoholic liquor of good quality, used as it was intended to be used, is useful and necessary. If we go back through history I think it is impossible to go far enough to find any time when alcohol in some shape or form was never used. If we are to try to stop the use of alcohol in a legitimate manner we will find people, perhaps, taking things more harmful to them than is the use of alcoholic liquor in a moderate shape. While human nature is as it is

I believe there will always be alcohol used, and I think we are on right lines to try to get the State to control the sale now, while at some future time I trust the State will control the manufacture, distribution, and sale of alcoholic liquor of all sorts.

Mr. ALLEN (West Perth): It was not my intention to speak on the subject, but there seems to be a great deal of heat introduced into the matter of the appointment of hotel managers. I am totally opposed to the establishment of State hotels. I think it is simply another encroachment on private enterprise. The Government have enough to find money for without entering into private enterprises of this description. There has been a great deal of heat introduced into the debate to-night on account of the appointment of managers of State hotels. I have heard the denial by the Minister for Lands that the gentleman appointed manager of the Dwellingup State hotel was not the same individual who assisted him or the member for Perth in the recent elections. The controversy to-night, however, has shown that it would be much better for the selection of the managers of State hotels to be made by the Public Service Commissioner and confirmed by the licensing benches. There would then be no opportunity for suggesting that either party in power had an ulterior motive in appointing a manager of an hotel. It is regrettable so much personality and heat has been introduced into the debate on a Bill of four clauses.

Mr. McDowall: Who introduced it?

Mr. ALLEN: Both sides.

Mr. McDowall: It was a misstatement from your side.

Mr. ALLEN: The statement was made, and it was common talk about the town, though I am glad to hear it denied as being untrue, that for supporting a certain candidate this manager received his appointment. I am glad to hear the Minister's denial, but the rumour was afloat.

The Attorney General: And your side set it afloat.

Mr. ALLEN: The member for Menzies made a loud-voiced attack on the member for Northam because he condemned the mismanagement of the hotel at Dwellingup in its early days, but certainly it was in its early days.

Mr. George: In the first week.

Mr. ALLEN: In regard to taking a referendum within a radius of three miles, it is quite possible for a district to have the bulk of the population within three miles, and the population within that radius may be strong enough to out-vote the proposition altogether. Some amendment should be carried in Committee to this. Another clause provides for notice to be published in the *Government Gazette* and in a newspaper for a certain period. I think there might be an improvement in that regard by giving further time for circulating the notice. A great deal of time has been taken over this Bill of four clauses, and we have been debating it from all standpoints outside the Bill itself. It is to be regretted a great deal of time has been taken up by outside matters, and that a great deal of heat has been introduced that might have been omitted.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I respectfully submit before this debate continues that the discussion on the appointment of the manager of the Dwellingup State hotel is outside the provisions of the Bill. I allowed it to be introduced because it had some relevancy to the appointment of agents, and I could see no reason why the method of appointing agents should not be discussed, but, as has already been pointed out, a great deal of the time of the House has been taken up in discussing that one matter and it has led to the introduction of other matters which have got further beyond the provisions of the Bill. As such proceedings may go on *ad infinitum* I think it is better to get back to the provisions of the Bill, because I think enough has been said on both sides in regard to a matter that does not come within the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE (Toodyay): I favour the principle of State hotels, because I believe it is only by such means that we can hope for any appreciable

restriction of the sale of liquor. From my knowledge of the conduct of privately-run institutions the principal objection to them is the wholesale supply of liquor to the public in general. The sale of liquor is encouraged beyond a safe degree. In my district we have voted quite recently for the establishment of State hotels where necessary, because we felt that by having a State hotel we would have something of a model institution; but if we are to be guided by reports in circulation with reference to the Dwellingup State Hotel, I fear our dreams in that respect have been somewhat upset; because it is common talk that that hotel makes about £100 a month profit from the sale of liquor, which I maintain is somewhat defeating the object of those who installed the hotel there. The turn of the debate to-night has been principally upon the supply of liquor. Members seem to hold the view that liquor supply is one of the first objects. I maintain the first and principal object of a State hotel is to provide accommodation. That is all we desire in the country districts. First the accommodation, and then, of course, a little drop of that necessary liquid which so many think is so desirable to depressed spirits.

Mr. Harper : Why not have a restaurant and coffee palace?

Mr. A. N. PIESE : That question has been often asked. I fear it is a reasonable conclusion that these institutions will not pay unless they have the liquor sales combined with them. If the Bill becomes law it creates an anomaly as compared with the Licensing Act which lays it down that there shall not be another hotel within 15 miles of one already existing. If it is good for the State that there shall not be a privately conducted hotel within that distance, I am at a loss to see why it is good for the State that a State hotel should be run unless it is of a particularly model character. I would like to see an amendment giving the licensing bench some control over these hotels before their erection. In the Licensing Act we have it laid down that the licensing bench shall approve of plans before a building is erected. That is very

necessary. I know where applications for provisional certificates have been lodged and in many cases they are for wooden buildings. Wooden buildings from my experience when travelling about the country, are a decided menace to the comfort of the people, and it is absolutely impossible to rest in those buildings if there are noisy individuals on the premises at the time. We would be told, no doubt, that such would not be the case in the State hotels, as the Public Works authorities would plan for proper stone or brick buildings in preference to structures of wood, but I might say there is great temptation to reduce the cost and hastening the construction of these buildings, and I fear that if the licensing court does not exercise some supervision in that direction we shall have blunders. I also think it is necessary as regards the agent that the licensing court should have the power to recommend that that agent be removed or that his license be suspended in the event of a misdemeanour being committed. At the present time the licensing court has only power to move when a breach of the Act is committed, and I maintain that does not affect the agent to the degree that we would like. We are decidedly in need of State hotels, but I do not think that it is altogether necessary that more control should be given to the licensing court than is proposed in the measure. When the Bill is in Committee I will take the opportunity of moving an amendment in the direction of increasing the powers of the court over these hotels.

Mr. GREEN (Kalgoorlie) : I am very pleased that the Government have brought forward this Bill, and at the outset I might say that I agree with the member for Murray-Wellington that it is fortunate for the people of Australia that drunkenness has been on the decrease for many years past. I remember within my own time, when I was a lad, the number of cases of drunkenness in the country towns were very great indeed, but I am pleased to say to-day that statistics prove that the Australians are becoming moderate drinkers. That has been brought about principally because

the conditions in Australia are improving, and also because we recognise as a business community that it is necessary for us, if we wish to become an effective nation, to become at the same time a temperate nation. It was said of the Americans when the American fleet were at Albany that the men of that fleet were almost all teetotallers, and I take some pride of grace from the fact that the party to which I belong are largely a temperance party. In the Federal Ministry nearly all the members are temperance men, while the majority of the members of the present Government—if I am not considered personal in referring to them—are also temperance men. The Labour party in the old country—under the leadership of Mr. Keir Hardie, one of the finest men in the old country—

Mr. Monger: Do not call him that.

Mr. GREEN: I know that the course of life pursued by Mr. Keir Hardie would not be on all fours with that of the member for York, so that he cannot possibly hope to have an admirer in that hon. member. What I was going to remark was that I am pleased the Labour party in the old country are a temperance party. We recognise if we wish to get the working people to think, and it is only necessary for them to think to know that what we go after we get, because we are in the majority, if they are temperance people we have a greater chance of lifting them and fighting for the objects for which we are striving. The drink question is a burning question as between the temperance party and the rest of the community, and the temperance party sometimes blame the Labour party for the proposal to introduce State hotels. I want to say that we are essentially a democratic party and we take this position that it should be left with the people themselves in any particular community to say whether or not they should have hotels. We contend that is a democratic standpoint and we do not intend to trim our sails to catch any particular party, either the publicans or the temperance party, but what we intend to do is to place the matter in the hands of the people. This Bill provides for that very

question and it is entirely safeguarded. We believe in State ownership from higher motives than those which appear to actuate the member for Northam, who believes that the Government should rake in some of the profits that are being made from hotels. I believe with the Minister who has just recently spoken that this is largely a temperance question and that there is no more rapid way of bringing about temperance reform than to make this traffic clean. The member for Northam considers that the licensing bench should be given more power. Unfortunately under the administration of the Government to which the hon. member belonged, the experience of licensing benches was not too satisfactory so far as the State was concerned. He will perhaps remember, if he will allow me to recall the matter to his mind, that Mr. Kirwan, one of the representatives of the South Province in the Upper House, was a member of a licensing bench and because of his particular cast of political thought the Government of which the member for Northam was a member, had that gentleman's name removed from the bench.

Mr. George: Why was Mr. Kirwan removed?

Mr. GREEN: He was not reappointed by the late Government.

Mr. George: That is a different thing.

Mr. GREEN: The member for Northam knows full well that these reappointments are continually made on the expiration of a term of office unless there are serious objections against the reappointment. The presentation of the papers to the House was sufficient to show that the failure to reappoint Mr. Kirwan was because of the political opinions that gentleman held at that particular time.

Mr. George: He has no political opinions.

Mr. GREEN: We might very well add that to the taunt of the hon. member. The member for Northam, too, is beautifully inconsistent in his arguments. I know of no other member who trims to suit the particular interests that serve his purpose.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Is the hon. member in order in using the expression that I trim to suit my purpose? I have never trimmed so far as I know, at any rate on this particular question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Northam takes exception to the remark. Any remark which is personally offensive is out of order.

Mr. GREEN: If the hon. member deems the remark personally offensive, I withdraw it. What I was going to say was that the hon. member trimmed on this particular occasion, and if he will allow me to complete my sentence he will understand what I mean. It was stated in the newspaper to-day that the hon. member said he was against certain broad principles, but so long as the workshops for agricultural machinery went to Northam, he would be prepared to see that they went through. That simply goes to prove the contention I gave expression to, and which, according to the usages of the House I had to withdraw. Returning to the subject matter of the debate, I desire to mention that I had the unfortunate experience to-day of learning what private ownership of hotels means. While I am proud to think that in Australia generally drunkenness is gradually decreasing, it is at the same time a regrettable feature that in some of our country districts it is still something appalling. This morning I left the town of Quairading where there is a small hotel owned by private enterprise, and I am bold enough to say that never in the whole of my experience have I seen any hotel conducted as that particular place is being conducted at the present time. Night and day there are drunken men hanging around that hotel in a most deplorable condition, getting poisonous liquor even when they are in a state of intoxication, and the consequence is that drunken brawls are continually occurring. Last night through a drunken brawl a man was killed at that particular hotel and the man who was unfortunate enough to take a part in that affray is now lodged in the York gaol. Under State control the manager of that hotel would have been dismissed immediately

he began to supply liquor to drunken men, and then such a tragedy as that which I have related would never have occurred. Such a thing should be sufficient to justify members in this House, irrespective of their particular trend of politics, to unanimously declare for State hotels. In my electorate of Kalgoorlie and the adjoining electorate of Boulder there are no fewer than 96 hotels, and I think I am safe in saying that if past Governments had been wise enough to bring in a measure to see that these hotels, at any rate, had been State hotels, licenses would not have been granted so freely. I have much pleasure in giving my support to the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MONGER (York): After the remarks of the member for Kalgoorlie, it is necessary that I should have something to say, even if I had not otherwise intended to speak on the question. During the Premier's speech I referred to the quality of the liquor supplied by the State hotels. It is regrettable to learn from the member for Kalgoorlie of the incident he referred to as having taken place in a portion of my electorate. I attribute this, and many other incidents which have been referred to in the debate, to the quality of liquor supplied, not only by those in the backblocks, but those in the towns, and more particularly the gold-fields towns, where so many licenses are held. But I am told that the quality of the liquor supplied by the State hotels is above reproach. One of my friends on the opposite side has been good enough to hand me a list of these liquors, and of the various brands which, I understand, are supplied at the State hotel at the ordinary price when called for. I do not know which Minister has charge of these State hotels, but I would suggest to him that he cut out five-sixths, or I might almost say seven-eighths, of the brands on this list, and supply only the remainder. That would mean that only the very best of liquors available in Western Australia would be supplied to customers at the State hotels. I think I will be supported by members on both sides of the House when I say that if the liquor is of the

highest possible quality very little harm will be done, even if a man or a woman should occasionally take a little in excess of the quantity which he or she is entitled to. But in regard to some of the brands on this list, I would suggest to the member for Leonora that he have another look at the report prepared by Mr. Inspector Mann a couple of years ago. All these liquors, I am told, are sold at the one price. Much as I like Australian brands of brandy, if it is intended to compare "Boomerang" with "Martel's Three Star," and charge the same price for each, it is intended to do something a little bit above what I was expecting. From my experience, and from what I have heard of these State hotels, whilst not attempting for one moment to cast the slightest reflection upon the management, past or present, I would ask the Minister in charge to delete from this list the greater proportion of the brands shown thereon.

Mr. Foley: What is wrong with some of them, according to Mr. Mann's report?

Mr. MONGER: I might hit you hardest if I struck the most familiar one of the crowd. Take "Walker's Special Black Label," and here, immediately underneath, "Bruce Scott"—there is no comparison between the two. The first named is invoiced from the old country at 15s. a gallon, and the last at about 5s. They pay the same duty, so how can the two be compared? And why should the same price be charged in the hotel for both? My principal objection to the State hotels is that hitherto their policy has been to make money. They have done this even at the cost of the comfort of those residing in their immediate vicinity. Their one attempt has been to make money by selling to the mining population and the timber population, the class of liquor referred to by the member for Kalgoorlie as having, perhaps, caused that incident related by him this evening. In my sojourns through this State, and more particularly through the agricultural districts, I have seen labelled up more brands of inferior mixtures than I had previously thought to be in existence.

Mr. Lander: Where are your blind inspectors?

Mr. MONGER: I am glad of the interjection, because I myself want to know where our inspectors are that they are not at these places. How is it that when an inspector goes up into an agricultural area, or into a mining district, somehow or other the dogs get to know, and instead of selling illicit liquor, perhaps liquor manufactured on the premises, they have time to stow it away to be produced at some subsequent opportunity?

Mr. Foley: That is not the case with the State hotel.

Mr. MONGER: I know the State hotels can do no harm. If the Bill be passed, and power given to the managers of the State hotels as proposed in the measure, perhaps the time may come, Sir, when you and I may be refused a little refreshment at the hands of the manager of a State hotel. I desire to commend, first to the Minister in charge of the Bill, and secondly to the Chief Accountant of the Mines Department—

Mr. Foley: He has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Wisdom: He controls explosives.

Mr. MONGER: I desire to commend to those gentlemen this list of liquors supplied by the various State hotels at the one price, as I am assured by the member for Leonora; and I will content myself with the one suggestion that they obliterate from their list all these faulty and mixed blends, as referred to in a harsh and severe style in Mr. Inspector Mann's report furnished to Parliament a couple of sessions back. If they will confine themselves to keeping only those pure and high-class liquors, and if the Government, in their desire to assist the comfort and well-being of the people, will give greater facilities to those who occasionally come along in search of pure liquor, they will be doing more in this regard than has hitherto been attempted. In conclusion, I submit that the policy of the Government, if it be in the direction of State hotels, should be good liquor, good accommodation, and comfort for those who patronise these establishments.

Mr. WISDOM (Claremont): As I understand there is likely to be a division on the second reading I do not desire to



give a silent vote. So far as the establishment of State hotels is concerned, I personally have no objection. As a matter of fact, I favour State ownership of hotels, and I think it has been shown fairly conclusively that the people generally realise that in the retailing of liquor it is better that the State should control that traffic. In listening to the debate this evening, I was interested to note that on few occasions did the members speaking stick to the meaning or intentions of the Bill. We have heard a great deal about the appointment of managers, of the quality of the liquors, the question of tied houses, breweries, and many other subjects connected with the liquor traffic. But it seems to me that this Bill has nothing to do with those questions. My conception of the Bill is that the Government, in wishing to establish State hotels, are endeavouring to evade certain provisions of the Licensing Act, 1911. We have had the principle laid down from the Government side of the House that wherever the Government entered into competition with private enterprise, they would do so on the same lines and under the same conditions as private enterprise, but here we find that the Government propose, in establishing State hotels, to get out of several of the responsibilities that private enterprise has to undertake in that trade. In the first place the Bill seeks to enable the Government to avoid approaching the licensing bench in connection with the establishment of a new hotel. That means that they will not be bound to submit plans of the proposed building, or to consider local requirements in any way whatever. I know that licensing boards have been hitherto most exacting in regard to the class of buildings and the accommodation to be supplied, and in many cases of my own knowledge they have forced the applicants to construct buildings much in excess of the requirements of the district. The Government propose to get out of that responsibility altogether, and I do not think that can be said to be competing fairly with private enterprise. Another thing I object to is that in ignoring the licensing board, they are ignoring the body which is best constituted to judge of the requirements of

its particular district with regard to licenses. It is absurd to expect that any Government department can judge the requirements of a licensing district as well as the board which has been constituted to carry out that duty.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: This Bill is placing it in the hands of the people.

Mr. WISDOM: The Bill takes a portion of the power out of the hands of the people, because it enables the Government to ignore two provisions in the local option clauses of the 1911 Licensing Act, and to only observe one.

The Minister for Mines: The number of hotels already in existence does not speak well for licensing boards in the past.

Mr. WISDOM: In those circumstances it would be simpler and fairer to the Government and to private enterprise to amend the Licensing Act. There is no question as to the desirability or otherwise of State hotels. The Government already have every power to erect State hotels if they wish to do so, but they have to apply in the ordinary way and comply with all the conditions that private applicants have to observe. That, I think, is fair. If the Government wish to erect State hotels, and that I favour, let them come under the same conditions as apply to private enterprise, and those conditions are set forth in existing legislation. Therefore, if the Government are honest in their professed desire to compete fairly with private enterprise, there is no necessity whatever for this Bill, because they have all the power necessary in the existing legislation.

Mr. HARPER (Pingelly): Whilst I am not opposed to the ownership of hotels by the State, I certainly am opposed to granting licenses until another referendum is taken. The last vote taken on this question showed a small majority of people to be in favour of an increase of licenses.

Mr. Taylor: It was a very small poll.

Mr. HARPER: A very small number of votes was recorded in favour of licenses being increased, although there was a much larger number in favour of State-owned hotels. There are some provisions

in this Bill in regard to State hotels that I object to; one is that a majority of people in a district have to vote against the license being granted. I say that that provision should be reversed, and districts that require a license should vote in favour of having a license granted; thus the responsibility would be placed on the people. We all know that the people are inclined to be a little neglectful in recording their votes, but if a district or town required a license I think the people would take sufficient interest to vote to that effect, in which case they could make application to the Government to have a State hotel established. In regard to the Dwellingup Hotel, I am of opinion that that hotel was forced on the people of the district.

Mr. Taylor: They have taken to it very kindly.

Mr. HARPER: Yes, but I remember that some of the hon. members who advocated the establishment of that hotel said that the men in the district were of fine physique and earned good wages, and therefore a hotel was very desirable. Everything points to that hotel being only a drinking shop, a tap room; that should not be the aim or object of a Government in connection with State hotels.

The Minister for Mines: We do not mind buying out hotels such as the Esplanade.

Mr. HARPER: The Government can buy out the Esplanade Hotel at any time, because all the drink trade it does is harmless. It has been said that the Gwalia State Hotel is a great success, but that is because it is a drinking establishment. It is in a place where there are a large number of men earning good wages, where there is no opposition to it, and where there have always been a number of sly groggeries. It seems to that the Government are anxious to erect hotels wherever there is a good drinking trade to be done. That should not be the object of the Government; they should have in view the erection of hotels at seaside resorts, and other places where it is pleasant to live, instead of placing them where they are specially required for drinking purposes. The Dwellingup

State Hotel is essentially a drinking establishment, because I am pretty certain that no hon. member can prove that many people reside on the premises.

Mr. Lander: I have resided there.

Mr. HARPER: People only reside there for a brief time. There are not a large number of travellers in the district, and the hotel cannot have been placed there for their convenience. A great deal has been said about the management, and my opinion is that State hotels ought to be under the same conditions in every respect as those houses working under the Licensing Act. The police ought to have the same supervision—

The Attorney General: So they have.

Mr. HARPER: I am glad to hear that. And the excise officer ought to have the same privilege of testing the liquor at any time as in any other hotel.

Mr. Dwyer: In a State hotel there is no incentive to adulterate liquor.

Mr. HARPER: To err is human, and a State hotelkeeper is just as likely to err as anybody else. Liquor could be easily adulterated and larger profits made, which perhaps might not go in the right direction. There exists, to my mind, absolute necessity for strict supervision. The greatest care should be observed in the selection of a manager of a State hotel, because in all hotels a great deal depends upon the management, which is a very responsible and arduous duty.

The Minister for Mines: Do you think we ought to have barmaids in the State hotels?

Mr. HARPER: No, I would not approve of barmaids in State hotels. I am not altogether concerned on that matter, because it is one that can be left to the licensing bench, and that bench should have the right to grant a license to a State hotel as well as to any other hotel. As regards the matter of accommodation, if the State has the right to put up a small place with inadequate accommodation it would be very unfair to the residents and travellers in the district concerned. I hope many amendments will be made in Committee. I do not see the necessity for passing the Bill at present seeing that a large number of voters

at the last referendum opposed any further licenses.

Mr. Foley: You should see how they voted where they have a State hotel.

Mr. HARPER: I think drink has done a great deal of harm in the agricultural districts.

Mr. Foley: It has done a great deal of good in the mining districts.

Mr. HARPER: I do not think drink has done good in any district. I would be better pleased if alcohol of every description was abolished. I think people could live much better without it than with it.

The Minister for Lands: Why do you aid its distribution by owning an hotel?

Mr. HARPER: I think that hotel is a credit to Western Australia, and I do not care personally if every license in the State is abolished. I think any country would be better if there was no drink in it whatever. I do not think it is a necessity, and for that reason I am not in favour of it. I have been a good deal in New Zealand and America, and have visited prohibited districts, and people get on very well without beer, whisky, or wine. It is all right for those who can use it with discretion, but a large number of working people drink to excess.

Mr. Lander: And so do some of the big ones.

Mr. HARPER: Yes, but it is far more objectionable to see a man who cannot afford it drinking to excess than one who can afford it. Many young fellows when they earn their wages go and spend them in drink.

Mr. Lander: Caused by the boddlers' sweaters; they cause the poor men to drink.

Mr. Taylor: That is not a bad excuse.

Mr. HARPER: I have given my opinion of the drink question, and I hope the Government will do their best to minimise the traffic.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): I think the House is pretty well ready for a vote, and I should not delay the debate any longer if it were not that I feel one error in assumption has been made that ought to be corrected.

The whole of the Opposition, strangely enough, appear to be in favour of State hotels. They are all religiously pinning their faith to that gospel, and some of them, while in favour of State hotels and of the State running hotels, are in favour of the abolition of the drink traffic. Yet, strangely enough, when the Government come down with a Bill to get absolute control of the drink traffic with the sole view of regulating it, and ultimately extinguishing it, they rise up *en masse* to oppose it and keep us debating all night.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: Why not confine this Bill to hotel licenses and not to publicans' general licenses?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Because we want to enter the trade and control it in every aspect, and not to go into one section only and not touch another.

Mr. George: This is one step towards prohibition.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes; if the whole of the liquor traffic ultimately comes under the control of the State, the State can turn off the tap at any moment.

Mr. Taylor: A lot of us would be very thirsty then.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member would be grateful if the evil of drink were saved to his fellow men who are going about now with aches and pains traceable to even the slightest indulgence in the past, and we would be grateful if the next generation escapes these evils. I am anxious now only to correct one wrong assumption made in this debate, and that is that we are going against the Licensing Act, or evading it.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: And against the principles of local option.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That is not the worst assumption against this Bill, but that we are going against the provisions of the Licensing Act by not appealing or applying to the licensing bench in the first instance. I am a little astonished at the general expression of opinion in that regard which has come from the Opposition. I venture to think that anyone of them who has used that

argument has either done it thoughtlessly or else has done it for the purpose merely of throwing dust in the eyes of the general public, because it must strike even the dullest intellect that there must be a difference between the Crown and the ordinary citizen, between the State and the ordinary speculator. What is the licensing bench but the instrument by means of which the State grants a license. It is undoubtedly a creation of the State, a servant of the State, and created solely for the purpose of the State granting licenses.

Mr. George: With special local knowledge.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It does not matter what the local knowledge may be. Who grants the license? The State which uses the licensing bench.

Mr. George: They use their discretion.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The licensing bench is there as the instrument of the State.

Mr. A. E. Piessé: They approve of plans and specifications.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Exactly. This is a Crown court. A private individual applies to the Crown to get a license. Now the Crown applying to the Crown to get a license would be an absolute absurdity.

Mr. Allen: I do not think so.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Crown applying to itself in its own and inferior creation, to its own creature, to be permitted to hold a license is the very height of absurdity.

Mr. George: It is not logic.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not appeal to my friend as to what is logic or what is practical.

Mr. George: All the same you have to listen to my opinions.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I admit it, it is one of the tortures of my experience, one of the penalties of occupying my position, and I do it as cheerfully as I can. The whole assumption is that we are doing some great wrong. I submit that the very fact of the State undertaking a work of this kind is the best guarantee the public can have that it will

not be done without inquiry, that it will not be done for mere speculative purposes, that it will not be done as an infliction to a district, and that it will not be done to foist public houses on the community. I do not care what Government are in power. If we left these benches to-morrow and the opposite side came in, with all their loudly ejaculated convictions as to the wisdom of State hotels, before they would build a State hotel they would inquire into the needs of the district and the opinions of the district, and into the vote expressed at the last local option poll in the district, and they would send up their special agents to inquire, they would inquire from those best able to give an opinion in the district and they would weigh every point, and after deciding on the weight of evidence that an hotel was necessary and that if it were not a State hotel it would be a private hotel, as the people would have an hotel of some kind, and after resolving that in place of a private hotel a State hotel must be erected, they would go to their architects and give instructions for an up-to-date building and they would inspect as to its character, and the officers and all the machinery of the State would be set to work to correct errors and to get the best place suitable, of course, to the requirements of the district, they could get. That is what the Government would do if that side were in power to-day; that is what we shall do. No Government dare go in the face of the general expressed will of the people to foist hotels upon them, more particularly when the purpose of the present Government is to lessen the drink evil and ultimately destroy it. In these circumstances the public have every safeguard in giving this power into the hands of the Government. In the very case that has been so often mentioned to-night—that of Dwellingup—what were the facts? In the first place the people voted for State hotels, and practically unanimously. In the next place it was well known, and known to the Government, that if the Government did not step in a private licensee would open out his shutters and start business in his own

place. It was a declaration of the licensing bench that that course would be done. A private individual had built the very building we purchased.

Mr. Allen: Could not the Crown step in?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Under the Licensing Act in force we could not prevent it; we could not stop the erection of an hotel outside the 15 miles if the bench favoured it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You could alter the Act.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: We could, and we are altering the Act in the right direction, in the direction of State hotels.

Mr. Allen: You are not amending it properly.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member is the only consistent one; I give him credit for it; he is opposed to State hotels; but when a member is in favour of State hotels, when we alter the Act in favour of State hotels as against private hotels, it is wrong to complain about altering the Act.

Hon. J. Mitchell: But you have not taken away the power of the licensing magistrates to grant an hotel outside 15 miles.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, but wherever beyond that 15 miles we find that private enterprise is seeking to establish an hotel, we want to be allowed to step in and say that if the people want an hotel and if that hotel is necessary we can come in and give the people the hotel. That is the object of the Bill. Whatever defects there may be in the Licensing Act are under the consideration of the Government now, and in due course we shall come down with our Licensing Bill, when that provision to which the hon. member refers may or may not be dealt with.

Mr. McDowall: This Bill does not affect a district like Perth.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It will only affect districts under the present Act wherever the State finds that an hotel is needed by the people. I do not think an hotel is ever needed; but when an hotel is requested, then the State will

do it. I think I have explained these points sufficiently. No doubt they will again be discussed in Committee, and it will only be labouring the subject to go further, but I did wish to make that one point clear, that the reason why we do not appeal to a licensing bench is because if the Crown is applying it has the obligation forced on it in all instances to do the right thing and to make full and sufficient inquiries before taking the first step.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	20
Noes	..	..	..	8
Majority for				12

## AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Dooley	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Swan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. George	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Green	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lander	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Underwood
	(Teller).

## NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. A. E. Plessee
Mr. Harper	Mr. A. N. Plessee
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Monger	Mr. Male
	(Teller).

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

### Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending the Bill.

### BILL—GAME.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

### BILL—PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.