

to carry out the agreement at all; in fact, it was an amendment that the House should not be called upon to accept.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Colebatch had repeatedly made attempts to kill the Bill, and this was only another such attempt. He hoped the Committee would see through that hon. member's move, and refuse to give the amendment consideration and support. In any case, he did not think it would be legal to alter an agreement that was already signed. The whole question of the tramway purchase had been discussed for a fortnight, and he did not propose to refer to it any further.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The point raised by Mr. Colebatch was quite relevant; it had been shown that the price to be paid to the company was more than the company should receive. If, for the sake of argument £475,000 was a fair value for the trams, the question arose who was to receive the amount? There were two parties to the agreement, and the two parties should participate in any valuation placed on the tramways. Those two parties were the owners of the trams and the local authorities. In other words, the tramway company had a license until 1939 and no longer; after that date the license belonged to the City Council. Therefore, those two parties should participate in the purchase price. Mr. Colebatch was trying to make a fair division of the purchase money, and had assessed the share of the City Council at £100,000.

Hon. H. P. Colebatch: That is the Government's own valuation.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The price to be paid to the company was objected to during the second reading debate, and now members had additional information before them which placed them in a better position to say whether £475,000 should be paid to the tramway company or not. He was not sure that the amendment made the mover's intention clear, and he suggested that progress be reported so that the amendment might then be properly drafted and fairly discussed.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, put and passed.

[58]

Second, third, fourth and fifth schedules—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments and a Message accordingly forwarded to the Legislative Assembly requesting them to make the amendments, leave being given to sit again on receipt of a Message from the Assembly.

House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 11th September, 1912.

	PAGE
Questions: Transcontinental Railway, Deviation from Bulong	1623
State meat supply at Collie	1624
Bills: University Lands, 1a.	1624
Agricultural Lands Purchase Amendment, 1a.	1624
Bills of Sale Act Amendment, 1a.	1624
State Hotels, Com.	1624

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

QUESTION — TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY, DEVIATION FROM BULONG.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the published statement that it is the intention of the Federal Government to deviate the Transcontinental railway away from the town of Bulong? 2, As the original survey passed through Bulong, and as there is a splendid water supply there, owned by the State, which cost over £20,000, and as it is stated that an equally short route can be obtained running through Bulong after leaving Parkestown, will the Government draw the attention of the Federal authorities to the desirability of adopting a route that will keep faith with the people of Bulong, and at the same time permit the Bulong reservoir to be utilised for railway purposes?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The Attorney General has seen Colonel Miller, Mr. Deane, and Mr. Chinn, who, by request, waited upon him to discuss the subject. He was informed that the ultimate decision rested with the Minister for Home Affairs, and the Engineer-in-Chief suggested that the people of Bulong should set out their views in writing for transmission to the Federal authorities.

QUESTION—STATE MEAT SUPPLY AT COLLIE.

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Honorary Minister: 1, Is it a fact that the Government salesman, Mr. Wedlock, undertook to provide a continuous supply of beef at 2¾d. per lb. to William Brown, in order that he might start a cash butchering business at Collie? 2, Is it true that only three sides of beef were supplied, and that the price was raised to 3¼d. per lb. for the last consignment, and that 8d. each was charged for chaff bags to cover the beef? 3, Is it a fact that Brown was advised that no further supplies could be provided, and that in consequence Brown has had to close his shop within a week, after being put to considerable expense? 4, Was an experiment made with a side of beef at the market to ascertain the gross price received at the present retail prices and how much per lb. would it realise? 5, Did this experiment prove that the present retail prices showed a profit or a loss?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) replied: 1, No. 2, Three sides were sent, one at 3¼d., one at 3d., and one at 2¾d., as agreed. Chaff bags were not charged for; charges were made for ordinary beef bags. 3, Brown was notified that no beef was available wholesale. 4, Weekly tests of carcasses are made. 5, The test proved that present scheduled prices can be continued.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1. University Lands (introduced by the Premier).

2. Agricultural Lands Purchase Act Amendment (introduced by the Minister for Lands).

3. Bills of Sale Act Amendment (introduced by the Attorney General).

BILL—STATE HOTELS.

In Committee.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Power to establish State hotels:

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This was the vital clause in the measure, and would the Premier say whether he was inclined to permit managers of State hotels to apply for a license to a licensing bench in the usual way? We would be doing a wrong if we were to take away this safeguard in connection with the conduct of managers of hotels, whether owned by the State or by private individuals.

The PREMIER: No amendment on the lines indicated would be accepted by the Government, because it would be an absurdity to ask a bench appointed by the Government to consider whether they would grant a license to a person whom the Treasurer considered a fit and proper person to carry on the business of a hotel licensee. If the manager of a State hotel misconducted himself in any way, the Government had the right to dismiss him at once, he not being under the Public Service Act; but they could not do that with a private licensee. The latter had to go before the court and be charged with certain offences, and then it was necessary to wait until the next licensing court sat before that undesirable person could be deprived of his license. If it was shown that the manager of a State hotel was abusing his powers and not conducting his hotel on proper lines, his services could be immediately dispensed with by the Minister controlling the department. To-day the members of a licensing bench were appointed by the Government, and there was evidence that if the political opinions of those gentlemen were not in accordance with those of the Government

they could be removed from the bench. That was what the previous Government had done.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Nothing of the sort.

The PREMIER: The previous Government had dismissed Mr. Kirwan and Mr. Watson for no other reason.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is a foul slander.

The PREMIER: The statement was a fact, and yet the leader of the Opposition asked the Government to consider whether they should not allow a bench appointed in those circumstances to say whether a person whom the Treasurer considered fit and proper should hold a license.

Mr. CARPENTER: Would the Premier not consider whether it would not be better to remove the appointment of State hotel managers from political control? The Premier and the Committee would see from the discussion on the second reading how easy it was, particularly in connection with appointments of this kind, to have charges levelled against the head of the Government, no matter what Government it might be, of granting political patronage to some individual because he happened to be a member of a certain party. He was not going to suggest that any Premier would be guilty of making appointments on party lines.

The Premier: There is nothing in your suggested amendment if you do not hold that view.

Mr. CARPENTER: The suggestion was made for the purpose of disarming suspicion in regard to these appointments.

Mr. Gill: Who would you have to make the appointments?

Mr. CARPENTER: Would it not be better from the point of view of the Government and of State management to put the selection of managers in the hands of the Public Service Commissioner?

The Premier: That would not get over the difficulty. The late Government appointed public servants over the head of the Commissioner.

Mr. CARPENTER: If the Government did not accept the recommendation of the Commissioner, they would have to give good reasons, but in nine cases out

of ten the recommendation of the Commissioner would be acceptable, and that would remove all cause for the petty wrangling such as had taken place during the second reading debate. He would not say as good a man could not be obtained through an appointment by a political head as could be got through an appointment by a non-political person, but it would be a chance of removing criticism without in any way endangering State hotel management. In the Dwellingup case, the Government recognised the Public Service Commissioner by asking him to boil down the 100 odd applicants and choose a dozen for their final decision, but it would be better for the Public Service Commissioner to have the final selection. Then if the Government did not approve of the final selection, it would be necessary to give good reasons for their action. Apparently it was the opinion of the Deputy Public Service Commissioner in the Dwellingup case that the dozen chosen were equal in ability.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Deputy Public Service Commissioner put them in order of merit.

Mr. CARPENTER: If that was so it made the case still worse, and there would be greater danger of having adverse criticism.

The Minister for Mines: Do you think there is any justification for the paltry wrangling and criticism there has been over this?

Mr. CARPENTER: No, but for the sake of avoiding anything of the sort in the future it would be better to allow a non-political person to make the appointments, and altogether remove any danger of charges of political patronage. For the sake of peace, and to remove any cause of dispute in regard to future appointments, something of this sort should be done, either by an amendment to the Bill or by the Government agreeing to allow the selection of the managers of hotels to be carried out by the Public Service Commissioner.

The PREMIER: The hon. member would apparently like to push all responsibility on someone else to avoid

criticism, but he (the Premier) was never one to agree with the "peace at any price" policy, and the Government did not wish to avoid any criticism, but were prepared to take the responsibility for any of their actions. The appointment made at Dwellingup he was proud of. No individual, Public Service Commissioner or otherwise, was better able to select a manager of a State hotel than he was. Judging by the recommendations of the Deputy Public Service Commissioner in regard to the Dwellingup case, he (the Premier) would pit his judgment against a Public Service Commissioner's. The first on the list submitted by the Deputy Public Service Commissioner was a gentleman who was previously appointed as manager of a State hotel, occupying the position for a few months, and receiving the salary but doing nothing. No doubt that gentleman, if given the opportunity in another position, might prove to be a suitable manager of a State hotel, but he would be absolutely useless at Dwellingup. Being among the timber mills, the Dwellingup State hotel needed a man with a personality, and one who, when he gave an order, could see that it was enforced. That was one of the reasons that guided in the appointment of Mr. O'Connor, and Mr. O'Connor had justified the selection. If there had been a mistake made in regard to the appointment, the criticisms from Opposition members would be worth something, but the fact remained that the appointment at Dwellingup had turned out "trumps." The only reason that the Deputy Public Service Commissioner, in company with the manager of State hotels, was called on to assist the Government in regard to the selection of a manager at Dwellingup, was in order to avoid the necessity of the Government having to go through about 160 applications. Several Ministers had been requested by letters to give references to people applying, but it was pointed out distinctly that Cabinet would decide on the merits of applicants as disclosed from other people's references. As to the dozen chosen by the Deputy Public Service Commissioner and the manager of State

hotels, not one of the dozen was interviewed by these gentlemen, not one was known to them, but he (the Premier) knew more than one of them, and from his knowledge of the applicants had no hesitation in deciding that Mr. O'Connor was a fit and proper person to act as manager of a State hotel.

Mr. Carpenter: And the men you did not know had no chance?

Mr. Nanson: Did the Premier interview the other men?

The PREMIER: No. Did the late Government interview the applicants for the position of Principal Medical Officer when they refused to accept the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner, especially when the Public Service Commissioner had everything to do with the appointment of a Principal Medical Officer and nothing to do with the appointment of the manager of a State hotel? If the manager of a State hotel did not perform his duties in a manner creditable to himself and to the service, his services could be dispensed with at once, but the Principal Medical Officer was a public servant and had certain rights accruing to him.

Mr. Nanson: The Principal Medical Officer had been in the public service the greater portion of his life.

The PREMIER: Why did the hon. member's Government appoint Mr. Dunstan as manager of State batteries against the advice of the Public Service Commissioner? There might be some force in hon. members' arguments if they had practised what they preached and accepted the recommendations of the Public Service Commissioner, especially where that gentleman had everything to do with the appointments. Yet now, when it suited them, they posed as champions of removing appointments from political control. No amendment would be accepted. The Government were quite prepared to accept the responsibility for these appointments. The Dwellingup appointment was a credit to the Government and was in the interests of the service.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The heat displayed by the Premier in standing out

so bravely in defence of the actions of the Government was quite unwarranted. The argument of the member for Fremantle was perfectly justified. We could not fancy the Premier spending a good portion of his time selecting managers of State hotels.

The Premier: It is evidently giving you a lot of worry.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was necessary to keep the Premier on the right track and prevent him from falling away. The method taken in appointing the manager of the Dwellingup State hotel was absolutely wrong and unparalleled, and should not be followed in the future. Mr. O'Connor might be a good chucker-out. Apparently what the Premier wanted for Dwellingup was a man who was able to throw out his customers when they became rowdy. The applicants were submitted to the Deputy Public Service Commissioner and the manager of State hotels, who were instructed to select twelve names, though fourteen were submitted according to the minute.

The Premier: Two were added because they stated they were well known to all the Ministers.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This was the minute from the Deputy Public Service Commissioner—

As instructed I beg to submit 14 names, which have been selected by Mr. Hunter from the various applicants and carefully checked with him by myself. These are set out in what we consider to be their relative merit; 13 and 14 being included by reason of their claim to be personally known not only by yourself but to other members of your Government. You will notice they enclose no written references, and they are not personally known to either Mr. Hunter or myself. A personal interview and inquiry would be necessary to make a definite recommendation.

The Premier: They were asked to select twelve names, and they submitted twelve names.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: They distinctly stated that they submitted twelve names of individuals who were capable of filling the position satisfactorily. They

set them out in order of merit and the Premier chose number 11, and now gave the reason, which was not on the files. It was that the Premier wanted a man to enforce his commands; in other words, the Premier wanted a good chucker-out. If that was the method for selecting men for responsible positions who were controlling and handling State funds, it was a very bad method indeed, and one could agree with the member for Fremantle that we should endeavour to make these appointments outside political control altogether. The Premier claimed that he did not know all the applicants. Naturally that brought the retort from the member for Fremantle that those the Premier did not know had no chance. If the Premier knew only a few of the applicants, unless he interviewed them all personally and inquired from others who knew their capabilities, those not known to the Premier were passed over, and only those personally known to Ministers could possibly hope to get these positions. It was not the question of saying that the Premier would exercise his power unduly. It might be done unwittingly, but it was an absurdity to expect that any Minister could sit down and adjudicate between applicants for positions of this sort. Someone else should do it. The licensing bench was the proper body to inquire into the character of the men who were going to handle intoxicating liquors.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Were you ever in a licensing court?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): They never make such inquiries.

The Premier: You packed the licensing bench on one occasion.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Nothing of the kind. The Premier has side-tracked on the appointment of the Principal Medical Officer and compared that appointment with the appointment of the manager of the Dwellingup State hotel. The majority of members of Parliament was with the Government in regard to the appointment of the Principal Medical Officer, and a full explanation was made why the Public Service Com-

missioner's recommendation was not accepted. In one case there was a gentleman who had been in the public service for only six months and the other gentleman had been connected with the public service all his life, for 30 or 40 years.

The Premier: That did not prove his fitness.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, but it proved that he should have every consideration. There was no comparison in the claims of the two gentlemen. One had rendered great service to the country and in every way was satisfactory for the position, and we insisted that he should have the appointment, and Parliament endorsed it.

The Premier: This will be endorsed also.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No doubt anything the hon. member brought before the House would be endorsed in this Chamber. The position taken up was that the Public Service Commissioner on the former occasion made a mistake. Why the Premier's own supporters voted in favour of the appointment of the Principal Medical Officer.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I was the only one.

The Premier: And he saved you.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was derogatory to the Principal Medical Officer to draw him into the debate but he (Hon. Frank Wilson) was not going to lose his temper in this matter, and he declined to be drawn by the Premier. When the result was boiled down the Premier would find that he would have to make these appointments on the selection of somebody else, and not on his own selection.

The Premier: You are the only one with any judgment.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: No, but he would not attempt to make a selection. The Premier would only be guided by gentlemen he knew in his political faith.

The Premier: You are not objecting to the person appointed to Dwellingup?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The only objection he had was that the gentleman appointed was a political partizan and presumably, from the Premier's action and the minute read, the appointment was

made more out of political consideration than any other.

The Attorney General: That is what was told you by the member for Northam.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And someone else had told him.

The Premier: And you know it is incorrect now.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If the Premier would make inquiries he would find this gentleman was in the district, and he thought it would be found that his name was on the books of the Kellerrin club. A man saw him there and was prepared to make an affidavit in regard to it. He would be glad to obtain the affidavit if the hon. member wished.

The Premier: Produce the affidavit.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes, that would be done.

The Premier: During the election.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Minister for Lands and the Premier ought not to be so emphatic on the point because it was easily conceivable that the gentleman might have been in the electorate without his knowledge, and unless the Premier had had a direct denial from the man he should not be so cocksure. If the Premier desired it he (Hon. Frank Wilson) would get a statement made in black and white.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The discussion in regard to this appointment inside and outside the House was about the most wretched and paltry that any public man could indulge in, and it had for its foundation the meanest of possible motives, to gain a few adherents to the ranks of the shattered Liberal party. The leader of the Opposition was surprised at the heat shown by the Premier and the Minister for Lands, but it must be remembered that the leader of the Opposition was indulging freely in charges of corruption and Tammany Hall at the Liberal Club, and in the next breath connected these with the manager of the Dwellingup hotel, and there was a cry from his audience of "Shame." That statement was absolutely untrue. It was gathered from kerb-stone information of the irresponsible member for Northam, and when such was done it was only to be

expected that Ministers would grow warm. Did the Minister go round and gather remarks of that kind without trying to find out the truth of them? He challenged the leader of the Opposition to produce an affidavit that the manager of the Dwellingup hotel had ever been in the Avon electorate during the last election. The leader of the Opposition, when challenged, said that he met a man in the street this morning who said that he would produce an affidavit to that effect. What sublime faith the leader of the Opposition had in the knowledge of the Public Service Commissioner. If ever there was justification for the Minister departing from the judgment of the Deputy Public Service Commissioner it was on this occasion, because that gentleman had recommended for this position a man who had been tried and had been found not a success. The Public Service Commissioner was just as liable to make mistakes as was the Premier or any other Minister. A good deal had been said as to political appointments and the leader of the Opposition and the members of the Liberal League were never tired of going round the country endeavouring to induce people to become members of one or other of the political parties in the State. If people did join these parties of necessity they attached themselves to one or other of them, and if a man joined one of these parties, following the logic of the leader of the Opposition, he disqualified himself for a position in the public service, unless, of course, he became a member of the Liberal party. The Government had made dozens of appointments since they had been in office and he ventured to say that 95 per cent. of the appointments were from persons who belonged to the faith of the leader of the Opposition. So far as he (the Minister for Mines) was concerned, he had made three appointments in one of the departments over which he presided, and so far as he understood the three gentlemen gave their political beliefs to the party of the hon. member.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Did you ask them?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There was no need to ask them.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How did you know then; do they carry badges?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: How did the hon. member know?

Hon. Frank Wilson: Because he was helping the member for Perth.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: If by any chance a member of the Labour party was appointed to a position, not because he was a member of the Labour party, but because of his fitness and qualifications, then it was said that corruption was surrounding the whole thing. A thousand times worse actions had been performed by the leader of the Opposition when in office. Not only did he do that but he had removed those who were political opponents and placed others in their stead. Was this not done in connection with the licensing benches at Kalgoorlie and Murchison? Immediately Mr. Kirwan, who for years had held a position on the licensing bench of Kalgoorlie, discussed in his newspaper the Liberal party, he was removed from the bench, and the hon. member appointed one of his supporters in his stead.

Mr. Munsie: And without telling him why.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The leader of the Opposition did the same thing at Cue in the case of David Watson, the secretary of the Labour union. David Watson had been a member of the licensing bench for years and his retention on the bench was supported by one of the straightest and ablest magistrates in the State. Mr. Troy had given Mr. Watson a good character and favoured his retention, but the Government removed him and appointed a nincompoop of their own in his place. That sort of thing had gone on in every direction. During six years of office, they had not created a single justice of the peace who gave allegiance to Labour. The same might be said in respect to postal-vote officers and to electoral officers; of these there were not more than half a dozen in the whole of the State who held Labour views. Virtually all postal-vote

officers were the political friends of the Liberal party.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is not correct.

The Premier: I have evidence of it on the files.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member waxed very indignant on the subject of corruption, but on a previous occasion, when it was proved before the House that a justice of the peace and postal-vote officer who was a supporter of the hon. member had robbed the country of over £100, the hon. member had refused to prosecute.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is absolutely wrong; we never refused to prosecute any offender.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The case was exactly as he had stated it. In the whole course of this discussion, no evidence had been forthcoming against Mr. O'Connor. What could be shown to be wrong with Mr. O'Connor?

Hon. Frank Wilson: I told you what was wrong with him.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Merely that the gentleman happened to be a supporter of Labour. Mr. O'Connor had just as good recommendations as any other of the applicants for the position.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Are you prepared to make a selection yourself individually?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member had followed that course in regard to the appointment of the Principal Medical Officer; yet what was right on that occasion would appear to be wrong on this. This poor little appointment, it seemed, was of sufficient importance to occupy the attention of the House for several hours, and to provide argument at Liberal clubs in different parts of the State. The leader of the Opposition ought to apologise for the statement made at the Liberal Club that a member of the Ministry owed his election to Mr. O'Connor.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I did not say that.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was precisely what the hon. member had

stated at the Liberal Club. When asked for the source of his information, the hon. member had explained that the member for Northam had informed him of it, while, in turn, the member for Northam explained that he was told so. This was the kind of evidence on which serious charges were made by the hon. member at Liberal clubs. As a matter of fact, 95 per cent. of the appointments made by the present Government had been given to supporters of the Liberal party.

Mr. HEITMANN: What system of appointment did the leader of the Opposition desire? The hon. member had urged that the Public Service Commissioner should have sole control of appointments, but in defiance of that policy the hon. member himself had at times neglected the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner, and refused to accept it. The plea that the licensing court was a fit and proper body to affirm or deny the capabilities of any gentleman appointed under the clause would have been better understood had it emanated from the member for Greenough, who had the closest acquaintance with the personnel of some of the licensing courts; for on more than one occasion that hon. member had taken good care to appoint to seats on the courts gentlemen of the same political opinions as himself. This had occurred at Narrogin, at Cue, and at Kalgoorlie. If the leader of the Opposition really desired that all appointments should be left with the Public Service Commissioner, why had he not adopted the system himself? The hon. member had appointed the present Principal Medical Officer on purely political grounds. Moreover, the hon. member had gone a little out of his way to secure promotion for a friend in the police force. The officer referred to had been promoted from corporal to sergeant, notwithstanding that he was so incapable that his superiors were afraid to send him out alone.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Is there any commendation from me in connection with it?

Mr. HEITMANN: The hon. member was not so soft as to put in a recommendation in such a case.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What is the name of the officer?

Mr. HEITMANN: The hon. member could have that privately. In regard to the appointment under discussion, he (Mr. Heitmann) knew nothing whatever about it. He was utterly opposed to the policy of spoils to the victor. Surely the leader of the Opposition could appreciate the desire to be honest on the part of his opponents; yet the moment an appointment was given to a political friend of the Government the hon. member cried "corruption!"

Mr. SWAN: The leader of the Opposition had not moved the amendment with the object of getting it carried.

The CHAIRMAN: There was no amendment. The question was that the clause stand as printed.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You can sit down now.

Mr. SWAN: It was his desire to reply to some statements made by the leader of the Opposition. He had been busy, not only in the House, but outside talking about the appointment of the manager of the Dwellingup Hotel, and if anyone made the same statement outside that Mr. O'Connor had been appointed because he had assisted in the election of the Minister for Lands he would be telling a deliberate falsehood. He was sick of listening to the tripe doled out by the leader of the Opposition with the object of discrediting the Government. The Premier could spend ten times as long as he did at present in dealing with such appointments and still do his duty to the country better than the leader of the Opposition could or was likely to do, because he would never have another opportunity. If the affidavit spoken of was produced, he would take a hand in getting the friend of the leader of the Opposition into gaol, because the affidavit would be untrue.

Mr. DWYER: The question of the appointment of the manager of the Dwellingup hotel had been trotted out, not for the purpose of honest discussion, but

to throw discredit on the Government. Where a new department was created, especially one which involved the handling of a large amount of money, and in which so much depended upon the honest, capable, and reliable conduct of the business, it was the duty of the Government to see that the best possible men were selected. The Treasurer was responsible to Parliament and to the country, and it was in the interests of the country that the best men should be selected. In the circumstances the Minister as head of the department should have the final word in regard to such appointments; otherwise incalculable harm might result. No business required such discretion and tact as the management of an hotel. From his own knowledge he could say it was untrue that the manager of the Dwellingup hotel had assisted the election of the Minister for Lands. He had helped him (Mr. Dwyer), but had been only one of a number, and the reason was that his political sympathies accorded with his own.

The Attorney General: That is his crime.

Mr. DWYER: If that was so, every member on the Government side was tarred with the same brush and was not fit for any position, according to the assumption of the leader of the Opposition. He was on the goldfields when Mr. O'Connor occupied the position of manager of one of the best hotels in Boulder, and the conduct of that hotel reflected the utmost credit upon him. From a large experience of licensing matters, he could say that no better person could have been selected. Mr. O'Connor bore excellent testimonials from his employers, and from the police, who ought to know, he had the highest references. He could say that the Premier had chosen the right man, and since his selection Mr. O'Connor had thoroughly justified the appointment. He had stayed at the hotel at Dwellingup on a Sunday and a portion of the following day, and could say there was no better conducted hotel in the State.

Mr. Lander: That is quite true.

Mr. DWYER: The results attained were a credit to the manager, and if the

leader of the Opposition had been responsible for the appointment he would have felt proud that he had selected the best man of all the applicants. The charge of political favouritism came with very bad grace from members of the Opposition. For years never once had positions been given to people who held Labour views.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I never required to have their political views or religion either.

Mr. DWYER: The leader of the Opposition knew that many political appointments had been made from his side and he was the historical descendant from the old regime which made political appointments on all possible occasions.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. DWYER: From the Forrest regime to the Wilson regime every one had made political appointments, and the leader of the Opposition had stood brazenly before the country—

Hon. Frank Wilson: What are you doing? Go and bury your own sins and do not bother about Sir John Forrest.

Mr. DWYER: The leader of the Opposition was the political descendant of Sir John Forrest.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I was in opposition to him.

The Premier: He is your boss.

Mr. DWYER: When the leader of the Opposition wanted help he sent for Sir John Forrest to bring his big battery and speak from his political pulpits, not because of any weight his arguments could carry, but because he was a well known figure, and probably because the weight of some excellent services rendered would carry conviction.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You will have to live a great number of years before you reach his weight.

Mr. DWYER: It was his sincere hope that that was so. He did not envy Sir John Forrest either his political weight or his weight avoirdupois. The appointments made during the Wilson regime, both honorary and paid, bore out the assertion that in scarcely a single instance had any attention been given to the re-

presentation of the people. The appointments of justices bore eloquent testimony to the fact that the Labour party had been entirely ignored, and that was particularly the case in the appointment of electoral officers. In his own constituency he was placed in a difficulty because of his inability to find a person to take postal votes, at least a person who was not a member directly or indirectly of the party to which the leader of the Opposition belonged; the difficulty was the same in outlying districts. If this department was to be conducted properly, and was to give the best results, and if it was to be shown that the State could run hotels in such a way as to be an example to those who conducted private establishments, it was right that the Treasurer should select the best possible agents, and if he was as successful as he had been in the selection of Mr. O'Connor, the manager of the Dwellingup Hotel, the department would be bound to succeed.

Mr. McDONALD: With what the hon. member had said about the Dwellingup hotel and its manager he was entirely in accord, and he did not hesitate to say that that institution was managed as well as any other in Western Australia. His desire was to give an answer to a question which had been raised by the leader of the Opposition as to what the present Government were doing now in the way of appointments, and he would cite the instance of the appointment which had been made to the licensing bench in Carnarvon, an appointment which was given by the present Government to a gentleman who held the position of president of the Liberal League in Carnarvon.

Mr. NAXSON: The discussion had proved interesting from a wide point of view, because it had shown conclusively that members opposite, or those who had spoken, were strong supporters of political appointments. Possibly they might be inclined to deny the impeachment, but we should consider whether an appointment was political or non-political. The Minister for Railways had laboured the point at length that the late Government had appointed to various positions, and

in a majority of cases unpaid positions, persons who were members of the Liberal party. It was purely assumption on his part that in most of these cases the people appointed were in any sense members of the Liberal party. Hon. members opposite went on the assumption that unless an elector proclaimed almost from the house-tops that he belonged to the Labour party, that, therefore, he must be against them, and by that method of reasoning we found a society like the Royal Agricultural Society branded as a political and a Liberal association, and also the Perth Chamber of Commerce was drawn into the same category.

Mr. Swan : By whom?

Mr. NANSON : By members of the Labour party, and by the Premier, if his memory served him correctly.

The Premier : I did not say that.

Mr. NANSON : The denial would be accepted. It has been noticed, whether it was the Perth Chamber of Commerce or the Agricultural Society, or any other non-political association, these bodies tried to say the same nice things to whichever Government happened to be in power, and no doubt the member for East Fremantle was about to suggest that that was when they wanted to get something out of the Government. Members on the Opposition side never contended for one moment that a person should not be appointed to a public position merely because he happened to be a member either of the Labour party or any other political party.

The Premier : The leader of the Opposition said that the only thing he had against Mr. O'Connor was that he was of our political colour.

Hon. Frank Wilson : No; nonsense.

Mr. NANSON : The argument of the leader of the Opposition did not go so far as that, and if he had said such a thing, on reflection he would have qualified the statement and explained more fully what he meant. It was true that at a general election men must vote for one political party or the other: it did not follow that if a man happened to vote for one party he was a member of that party. There was a vast difference be-

tween a member of a party and being an active worker of that party; no matter what might be said in this Chamber, when it was found that gentlemen working hard through a political campaign on behalf of certain candidates of a party to which those gentlemen belonged, and when that party afterwards came into power it was found that a person who had so worked received a public appointment, whatever might be said inside the House, there would be a number of critics outside who would be inclined to put what they considered to be cause and effect together, and say that the appointment was made because the man appointed had been a very loyal and a good worker and had performed yeoman service for his party.

The Attorney General : Do you say that is the reason?

Mr. NANSON : That was the construction that might be put upon the action of any Government.

The Attorney General : You will admit it might be just?

Mr. NANSON : It was possible that a person so appointed, notwithstanding the fact that he had performed good service for his party, might be fitted for the position to which he was appointed, and if that was so, however fitted that person might be, none the less, the appointment was political, and by nine-tenths of the non-partisan public it would still be regarded as a political appointment. When he referred to the subject some nights ago, the Attorney General advocated the system and pointed out that it was still followed in the mother country, and that he would not hesitate to make appointments of that kind, provided he was satisfied that the political partisan was in every other respect fitted to hold the appointment.

The Attorney General : All other things being equal, I will always recognise my own side.

Mr. NANSON : That being so, we had the admission from a keen and logical member of the Labour party, that at any rate without straining the argument, it was what might be called a quasi-political appointment; in other words, the hon.

member believed in doing what Liberal and Conservative Governments had done for generations past and were still doing in the mother country. We had to take the circumstances into account, that public opinion was running strongly against appointments of that kind, and it was necessary to quote instances where such appointments had been made by political parties other than the Labour party. It was significant that if we talked of these paid appointments, we would have to go back a number of years. One appointment which might be called a political appointment and which was admirable, was the appointment of Mr. William Paterson to the position of manager of the Agricultural Bank by the Forrest Government; another was the appointment of the member for Murray-Wellington to the position of Commissioner of Railways. It was not denied that these appointments had been made, and he was reminded that the present Chief Justice was also at one time a member of Parliament, but that gentleman was not a member of Parliament or connected with a political party when he received the appointment.

Mr. Dwyer: He was not.

Mr. NANSON: There was ample precedent, as the Attorney General had pointed out, but public opinion had been growing during the last few years in the direction of tabooing and condemning those appointments, and it was found that a provision had been inserted in some of our Acts of Parliament, notably the Public Service Act, that a member of Parliament could not be appointed. One of the parties which had played a fairly prominent part in denouncing appointments of that kind had been the party opposite, and that brought him to another point: that these gentlemen when they got into office and found it necessary to justify a political appointment all they could say was, "When you were in office you did the same thing, and we are following your example."

The Premier: This was not a political appointment.

Mr. Dwyer: This man was not an active political worker.

Mr. NANSON: The hon. member admitted he was a member of his own committee.

Mr. Dwyer: I pointed out that he merely attended a couple of meetings.

Mr. NANSON: If a man joined a political committee it was reasonable to assume that he was an active political worker; if he did not work he was shirking his duty, and should not be on the committee. Did the hon. member mean to say that this supporter of his was a shirker?

Mr. Dwyer: I told the hon. member the amount of support he gave, and said that in no sense was he an active political supporter.

Mr. NANSON: It was ungrateful of the hon. member, now that the political campaign was over, to weigh to such a nicely the political assistance Mr. O'Connor had given to him. In making appointments of this kind the Government could find no justification in the allegation that previous Governments had done the same thing. If it was alleged that the late Government made political appointments to positions in the public service, let hon. members mention the names of those gentlemen who were appointed. It was a significant fact that when members on the Government side endeavoured to drive that accusation home, all they could point to were purely honorary appointments such as those to licensing and magisterial benches. Even then he very much doubted if it could be found that the persons appointed were what could be called political workers. So far as his recollection served, in almost every instance the names of the persons eligible were submitted by the resident magistrate and from those names appointments had been made. But assuming that the late Government had committed every sin in the decalogue, was that any justification for the present Government repeating the offences? The Labour party had come into office as a party of purity, not to repeat the faults of their predecessors, but to steer an entirely new course. Yet they were reduced to the humiliating position of justifying their appointments by saying that the late Government had

done the same thing. The Government were condemned out of their own mouths in the mind of every impartial person.

Mr. FOLEY: The clause should be passed as printed. It was much better that the appointment of managers should be made by the Government than by the licensing benches. In many cases when a State hotel was established in an agricultural district, the manager appointed would not be a local resident, and what better chance had the licensing bench of learning the merits of the applicants than the Government who would have the opportunity of studying the candidates' every qualification? Besides, the Government had much more to lose by a bad appointment than had the members of a licensing bench. The Government, before appointing a man to manage a State hotel would thoroughly study his qualifications, and if they heard anything detrimental to his character they would not give him any consideration. The public were protected in the fact that the manager would have to comply with the provisions of the Licensing Act. The appointments of managers, so far, had been admirable, and certainly no one could question the ability and fitness of the gentleman who now managed the Gwalia State hotel.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): What party does he belong to?

Mr. FOLEY: What that gentleman's political opinions were or how he voted did not come into consideration at all, but if an appointment was to be made and there were two applicants, one a so-called Liberal and another a Labour man, all other things being equal the latter should receive the appointment.

Mr. Allen: Why?

Mr. FOLEY: Because what the Opposition were always calling "spoils to the victors" was a proper policy. The Opposition members all believed in it, but they were not honest enough to say so.

Mr. GEORGE moved an amendment—

That after the word "lawful" in line 2 the following be inserted:—"after proper application for a license to and approval of such application by the licensing bench duly appointed for the district."

So far as the manager of the Dwellingup State hotel was concerned there had been no attack on his personal character or his qualifications. In regard to the amendment, the local people on the licensing benches had better opportunities of knowing whether it was desirable or not that a license should be granted. It was laid down in the Bill that after a State hotel was established, notice should be given to the licensing bench, and the licensing laws would then apply to it. The amendment was not putting any slight on the Minister. His own idea was that a Minister should hold a far higher position than having to dabble with petty details of this character.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. GEORGE: When the State decided to enter into a business previously carried on by private individuals, the basis of entering that business must be to carry it on under the same conditions as those imposed on private persons. It would be manifestly unfair if the Government were able to establish an hotel and carry it on under conditions not imposed on private individuals. The Bill made a Minister in a degree responsible for the conduct of State hotels, but a Minister could not give close consideration to the question, and, once a State hotel was established, must rely upon complaints coming in as to the conduct of the hotel. The idea of the amendment was not to put a check on the Government, who were supreme over the licensing benches, but the desire was that the Government should have the aid of the licensing benches, who would be possessed of local knowledge not available to the Government. No doubt the Government would obtain all the information possible before establishing a State hotel, but Ministers had too many calls on their time to give adequate consideration to each individual case. A licensing bench, on the other hand, could do this, and thus Cabinet could obtain the valuable assistance of a local body. As the drink traffic carried with it a good deal of evil, Parliament could not be too

careful in safeguarding anything that would enable us to minimise the spread of that evil.

The PREMIER: The amendment could not be accepted. There was no force in it. Apparently the object of the hon. member was that the Government should apply to a licensing bench before establishing a State hotel. That was tantamount to saying that, after the Government had decided to supply an hotel and the people had expressed a wish for it, the licensing bench could veto both the decision of the Government and the wish of the people in the district.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It was a reasonable amendment. Undoubtedly the best authority to decide whether licenses should be granted in a district was the licensing bench. There was no fear that the Government would not put up proper hotels in accordance with the requirements of the Licensing Act, but the fear was that hotels would be established in districts that did not require them. In the case of Dwellingup, a Bill was passed through Parliament. That was altogether different to the present proposition where a Minister could open an hotel where he pleased without any regard to the licensing court.

The Premier: An hotel can only be established where the people have decided that new licenses shall be held by the State.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: On the question of whether new licenses should be controlled by the State he always voted "yes"; but he would vote "no" on the question of whether there should be an increase of licenses in a district. We were not discussing the provision applying to a radius of three miles, though when we came to that it was his intention to move an amendment that a vote should be taken as to whether a license was necessary. It was not right that one Minister of the Crown should have the power to determine where hotels were to go.

The Premier: Cabinet will decide a question of this sort.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Attorney General would not consult the licensing

benches, though they were responsible bodies.

The Premier: We will consult the people, which is the better plan.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Notwithstanding that the people might have voted against any increase of licenses, if they voted in favour of State ownership the Premier would establish hotels. It was of no use referring to the privileges of petition, because the Premier knew that petitions both for and against licenses were sometimes signed by the same people, and that the responsibility for getting signatures to these petitions always rested on some one section of the community. The proposal of the member for Williams-Narrogin was a particularly good one. The licensing court were the proper people to determine whether or not an hotel should be opened, and therefore they should be consulted.

The Premier: I see no advantage in consulting them. We consult the people before we decide upon the site of the hotel.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: There was no intention to consult the people beyond asking them whether they were in favour of State ownership, which was quite apart from the question of increase of licenses. The amendment he proposed to move would provide that the question of increases of licenses should be asked of the people before the Government established an hotel. Why did the Premier object to the proposal of the member for Williams-Narrogin that the licensing court should be consulted? Someone other than the Crown should determine whether or not a State hotel should be established in a particular locality.

The Premier: We will take beer from the local brewery; we will not shut out any of your friends.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The amendment proposed by the member for Williams-Narrogin was a reasonable one, and should be readily accepted by the Premier.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It was a pity the Premier could not see his way to accept the principle of State hotels being as much under the control of the licens-

ing courts as were private hotels, and the further principle of obtaining provisional certificates for State hotels just as in the case of privately owned hotels. On previous occasions the Labour party had advocated the election of licensing courts, and he believed it was the intention of the Government to bring in an amendment to the Licensing Act, in which that principle would be laid down. At the same time the principle of applying to the licensing court for provisional certificates for State hotels should be adopted.

Mr. Underwood: Have you no confidence in the Government?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: In the present Government he had every confidence if only he had also an assurance that the present Government would always be in office. It was quite within the bounds of possibility that in the fulness of time the present Premier would be representing the State in London. In any case he was not prepared to see the power of deciding whether or not a State hotel should be established placed in the hands of Ministers when he remembered the irresponsible Ministers we had had in the past. He hoped all new hotels would be State hotels, and he believed we should have elective licensing courts, and that all applications for new hotels—State or private—should be submitted to those courts. The public would be the gainer if plans of all new hotel buildings were referred to some magistrate like Mr. Burt, who had been responsible for the demolition and re-building of many dilapidated hotels in his district. It was to be hoped that in all new State hotels the Government would have the bars put right out of the way, where they would not be easily reached by the public, and would further provide a commission for the managers on all soft drinks and tea and coffee sold. It was to be hoped the Premier would accept the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: On the other hand it was devoutly to be hoped that the Premier would not do anything foolish. Surely the Premier was just as competent to arrive at a sound judgment as

any of the licensing courts which the Premier might elect. The Ministry who appointed these courts were certainly as good as the courts they appointed. It was absurd for members to say that a Ministry chosen by the people were incompetent to appoint a manager of an hotel, and that they should submit their choice to a court appointed by themselves. It should be borne in mind that whatever Ministry was in power they must first be elected by the people of Western Australia, and he, for one, had a more profound trust in the people than in the licensing magistrates, not even excepting that model magistrate at Narrogin to whom the member for Williams-Narrogin had referred.

Mr. GEORGE: It was evident the Premier did not understand his own Bill. The clause provided that if a majority in a district voted in the affirmative on the question of State ownership, a State hotel could at once be established in that district. For the Premier to say the people had a vote on the matter was wrong. They had a vote of a sort, it was true, but only after the Minister had decided to establish an hotel, and not before.

The Premier: They have a vote at a previous poll.

Mr. GEORGE: No. The previous poll would be on the question of State ownership. Why should the people not be consulted also on the question of increase of licenses? If it was right to ask this question at a local option poll the other question, whether the people favoured any addition or reduction, should go with it.

The Premier: When they decide that question in the negative to-day new licenses are granted.

Mr. Wisdom: But they are 15 miles away.

The Premier: Never mind the 15 miles.

Mr. GEORGE: The question was asked whether the people were in favour of further licenses in this district. If the answer was "no" it would be possible under this clause for the Government to establish a State hotel by going to the

particular locality, that was within three miles of where the hotel was to be established.

The Premier : The same thing applies now.

Mr. GEORGE : The principle had been established that the people should have the right to say whether they would have more licenses, and the Government would be going against their will if they established a State hotel. We could not give with one hand and take away with the other. If the people said they did not want any more hotels, and if there were any new ones they should be State licenses, the Government would take that as an excuse for establishing State hotels. When people had said there should be no more hotels, the Government would be splitting up the local option power of the district and giving a portion of the district the opportunity to vote on the question. If the Government wished to repeal a law, they should do it in a straightforward manner and not by a side wind.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) : The previous speaker could not have read the Bill. If he had, he would not have spoken in favour of the amendment. Did a licensing court take into consideration the requirements of the district, or did it merely deal with the evidence?

Mr. George : It should do both.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) : After having attended a few, he had very little faith in licensing courts. The Licensing Act, 1911, contained objections which might be taken to the granting of any licenses. The first was if the applicant was of drunken or dissolute habits, or otherwise of bad repute. Would the Government appoint a man to whom such objection could be taken?

Hon. Frank Wilson : They would know nothing about it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) : The second objection was that the applicant had within six months preceding the date of application been deprived of a license. Would the Government appoint a man such as that?

Hon. Frank Wilson : There was no evidence of that sort taken in connection with a recent appointment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) : Another objection was that the applicant had been convicted of selling liquor without a license, or of selling adulterated liquor within the six months preceding the date of application.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Who will inquire into all this?

The Attorney General : The Government through their agents.

Hon. Frank Wilson : You do not go on the evidence of your agents.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) : Other objections were that the premises were out of repair, or had not the accommodation required by the Act; that the reasonable requirements of the neighbourhood did not justify the granting of the license; that the premises were in the vicinity of a place of public worship, hospital or school, or that the quiet of the place would be disturbed if a license was granted. These were the objections which might be lodged before the licensing bench.

Hon. Frank Wilson : But they cannot be lodged in this case.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) : The Government knew the requirements of the district without going to the licensing bench and would decide prior to determining to erect an hotel. Having come to such a decision they would not go to three people and ask if they could erect an hotel, but would go to the residents within the three miles radius.

Hon. Frank Wilson : No, you simply advertise.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) : It would be made known to the residents that it was proposed to erect an hotel on a certain site; then the residents would say whether it should be erected or not. That was quite sufficient safeguard as far as the people were concerned.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Put it the other way about, let them ask for it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) : No Government would take steps towards the erection of an hotel until the

people had first asked for it. That was the first essential to the erection of an hotel.

Mr. Monger: That was not your policy with regard to Dwellingup.

The Premier: Yes, we had a unanimous petition.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): The difficulty had been that the people in the immediate district had not been consulted. Under the old Licensing Act the bench had discretionary powers to decide in what area the ratepayers, not the residents, should say whether they would have a license. He had known an instance where an hotel was placed on one corner of the street and the people on the opposite corner were debarred from expressing an opinion as to whether it should be erected.

Mr. Harper: How long ago?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): Not very long.

Mr. Harper: Where?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): At East Fremantle. There should be no difficulty on the part of people placing their objections before the Government. No Government would erect an hotel contrary to the desires of the people who resided in the particular area. The provisions safeguarded the people without any appeal to the licensing bench.

Mr. DWYER: A good deal of misconception had arisen about this matter owing to the bad state of the licensing law passed during the last session of the previous Parliament.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is the best we ever had in the history of the State.

Mr. DWYER: That particular section of the Act was so indefinite and created such confusion of issues that the people when they cast their votes did not know exactly the true meaning of the questions on which they were voting. First they had the issue whether they would have hotels, State or privately owned, and in nearly every instance they voted for State ownership; then they voted as to whether the numbers should be increased or not. If the people had understood that new licenses were to be taken over by the State, he felt sure that the vote would have been entirely different. As it was

they voted for no increase, mainly under the belief that an increase would be a private increase. These were the two issues which were clouded. An arbitrary distance was fixed beyond which the licensing bench had the power to grant licenses which they thought might be necessary. This arbitrary distance was 15 miles, but if we took most of the country electorates it would be found that the population was concentrated in one place and possibly in two, and the bulk of the people there would have the power to say whether that whole district should have more licenses or not; therefore, no provision was really made for the growing country districts except those outside the 15-mile radius. If the people in any district wished that a hotel should be established, and if the district was new, personally he thought the State ought to have the right to establish an hotel there.

Mr. Wisdom: They can do all that under the present Act.

Mr. DWYER: They were powerless under the present Act. First of all the 15-miles radius crippled them and secondly, dealing with State hotels, would show how they were excluded. This was another instance of the way in which the Act was clouding and obscuring the intelligence and even the wisdom of the hon. member for Claremont.

The Premier: They do not know the provisions of their own Act.

Mr. DWYER: Assuming that the people were desirous of having a State hotel, it was only just that the State should step in and provide it. No Government would erect a hotel in the midst of a community unless there had been an expressed desire for it on the part of a majority of the people in that community.

Mr. WISDOM: On reading Part VI. of the Act he found that if on a poll of the electors taken under Part V. Resolution B was carried on the question "Do you vote that all new publicans' general licenses shall be held by the State?" the Minister could establish a State hotel in the district.

The Premier: That is not within the 15-mile radius.

Mr. WISDOM: That was within the 15-mile radius.

Mr. Dwyer: That was outside the radius.

Mr. WISDOM: Apart from that the licensing bench had the power to grant a license outside the 15-mile radius, but according to Part VI., so long as the resolution had been carried that the number of licenses be increased, and the vote had been carried that the new licenses be held by the State, the Government by applying in the ordinary way could be granted a license.

The Premier: Under the existing law the State cannot establish a hotel in any district even outside the 15-mile radius.

Mr. WISDOM: Why?

The Premier: They have no power.

Mr. WISDOM: They had the power.

The Premier: Would you not put them on the same plane as a private person?

Mr. WISDOM: Certainly.

The Premier: Well, they are not.

Mr. WISDOM: Members opposite spoke of refusing to establish a hotel against the will of the people, yet the whole tenor of the present Bill was to place the Government above the will of the people as expressed by the local option vote. They were taking the power, in cases where Resolutions A and C had been adopted, provided only that the question as to whether the people of the district were in favour of State-owned hotels had been carried. If the Government were so anxious to accede to the will of the people as expressed by the local option vote, all he could say was that they had all the powers necessary to establish hotels under the present Act.

The Premier: We have not.

Mr. WISDOM: Yes, under Part 5. The whole thing rested on Resolution B. If that was carried, the licensing bench could grant a license. If Resolutions A and C were carried the bench could not grant a fresh license because it would be against the deliberately expressed wish of the people. If Resolution B was carried—and that was the only resolution which provided that the people should say whether they should have increased licenses or not—then the Government

could in the ordinary course under the present Act apply to the licensing bench to establish hotels. If the Government did not intend to place themselves above the will of the people as expressed by local option polls, then they had every power under the existing Act and the present Bill was unnecessary.

The PREMIER: One thing had occurred in connection with the Bill and that was that at the eleventh hour there had been an expression of opinion from members opposite in favour of placing the control of the liquor traffic in the hands of the people. That would materially assist the Government when introducing the Local Option Bill in the near future, and members opposite, if they were at all consistent, would then have an opportunity of doing what they now wished to do, namely, to place completely in the hands of the people the control of this traffic. He did not want them to try and cover up their tracks by urging that they did not mean what they had said. With regard to what the member for Claremont had said one would imagine, knowing the interest that hon. member had in the liquor trade, he would have known something of the licensing law, but the hon. member had shown his absolute ignorance of it. If we had all the powers he stated we were now asking for, why oppose the Bill? The hon. member knew that the State was excluded from taking up new licenses in districts if they were 15 miles from an existing license. There was no provision in the present Licensing Act which permitted a licensing bench to grant a license to the State in such cases. If the Government wished to establish a State hotel 15 miles or more distant from an existing license, they could not do it without a special Act of Parliament in each case, and under the existing law the licensing bench could not grant a license, even if they felt disposed to do so. The Government were now asking for power to establish a State hotel where the people had at the local option poll expressed an opinion in favour of the State holding all new licenses; but before proceeding to establish the hotel the Government

would publish a notice in the *Government Gazette* and in a newspaper circulating in the district, and if within one month no petition signed by a majority of the people within a radius of three miles from the site of the proposed hotel was received in opposition to the hotel, the Government could then go ahead with its establishment. To-day the Government were continually receiving petitions for State hotels to be established, in some cases where licenses were already existing.

Mr. Monger: On a point of order, is the Premier in order in making another second reading speech on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier was not in order, nor were several speakers who had immediately preceded him. He would ask the Premier to confine himself absolutely to the amendment.

The PREMIER: Instead of applying to the licensing bench for permission to establish a State hotel, he preferred to apply to the people. This was giving the people complete control, and until the licensing laws were amended to give complete local option to the people this was a much wiser provision than that in the existing law. As he had already pointed out, whilst the licensing bench had power to grant to a private individual a new license 15 miles or more from an existing license, the bench had no power to grant such a license to the Government. Very cleverly the late Government had made a provision in the Act whereby, whilst appearing to have no objection to the people expressing an opinion that new licenses should be held by the State, they took care to make that expression of opinion ineffective. What was the good of making a provision in the Act to appeal to the licensing bench, when the bench had no power to grant the license? Members opposite were opposed to State control of the liquor traffic, but they were not prepared to come out in straight opposition, and therefore they attempted to achieve their end by inserting such a section in the Licensing Act.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	24

Majority against .. 10

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Monger
Mr. George	Mr. Moore
Mr. Harper	Mr. A. E. Plesse
Mr. Johnston	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman

(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bath	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Cofler	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Swan
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Foley	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Gill	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Green	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lander	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Helmann

(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MONGER: The personal element had been introduced into the discussion to a very regrettable extent. The Premier, during the afternoon, had gone out of his way to make unnecessary comparisons in regard to the appointment of the gentleman who ruled the destinies of the Dwellingup State hotel, and he had exceeded his duty as Premier when he referred to Mr. Dunstan, who was in charge of the State batteries, as a gentleman appointed by a late Minister of the Crown.

The Premier: On a point of order, is the hon. member in order in discussing the appointment of the Superintendent of State Batteries on this clause?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order. At an earlier stage the appointment of managers of State hotels had been discussed, but that had been on an amendment proposing to place those appointments in the hands of the licensing bench. The hon. member must adhere to the clause.

Mr. MONGER: A comparison was made between the appointment of Principal Medical Officer by the late Govern-

ment and the appointment in regard to the management of this State "pub." The Premier went out of his way to make nauseating comparisons. Later on the Minister for Mines referred to the Liberal League and the Liberal Club. Other points dealt with during the discussion referred to the appointment of justices of the peace.

The Premier: Is the hon. member in order?

The CHAIRMAN: It was only right to allow latitude, and the hon. member would be allowed to proceed, provided he did not go too far.

Mr. MONGER: The Minister for Mines referred to the appointment of justices by the previous Administration, but some of the appointments by the Scaddan Government were a discredit to them. Practically no notice was taken of a recommendation by a member of the Opposition, whereas recommendations coming from the Trades Hall and other places—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is going altogether too far.

Mr. MONGER: It was also said that members of the Government were perfectly justified in giving "spoils to the victors." If that was to be the motto in Australian political life in the future, on some future occasion perhaps members of the Liberal party might have the opportunity of reciprocating.

Mr. HARPER: There was no need to rush the Bill through to give the Government control over the liquor traffic. The State should own any license to be granted in future, but first of all there should be a request from the people in the district for a license. The radius of three miles was not sufficient. No doubt there were many small centres where the people would like to see fine edifices in the way of State hotels erected to beautify them, but a request should come from the surrounding district, from a radius of at least 15 miles. The Public Service Commissioner should appoint managers, and the licensing bench should deal with an application in the same way as a private individual's application was dealt with. The Treasurer had too much to do to

deal with small matters. The granting of the Dwellingup license did not reflect credit on the Government granting it. It was purely a drinking hotel, though, of course, it was introduced as such when the Bill was passed. The hotel was put there because they were all good drinkers at Dwellingup. A better man could not have been appointed for the rough trade at Dwellingup than the man already there. He was the champion weight thrower of the State. Licensing benches usually made inquiry into the character of applicants for licenses, and they desired to do the best they could in carrying out their duties. A State hotel should only be established after it was approved of by a majority of the people in the district and submitted to the licensing bench.

The CHAIRMAN: We have already voted on the question of licensing benches.

Mr. HARPER: It seemed that there was some idea behind the scenes of some hotel that was required in some neighbourhood at a very early date. It was noticeable that the Government were always anxious to start State hotels in districts where there was a big bar trade.

Mr. Green: Would not you do the same yourself?

Mr. HARPER: Possibly he would, but he did not expect the State to follow the tactics of private individuals.

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved an amendment—

That in line 16 after "State" the words "and also on the question, 'Do you vote that the number of licenses existing in the district be increased?'" be inserted.

Various questions had been put to the electors in the poll taken on the 26th April last. Amongst other things, they had been asked did they vote for increase in licenses, did they favour new licenses being held by the State, and were they in favour of State management? An examination of the votes cast would show that, with the exception of Gascoyne, every district had voted against increased licenses. In all, 17,623 votes had been cast against increases and 4,554 for increases. In the case of Beverley, 488

votes had been cast in favour of State ownership and 464 against, while, on the question of State management, 464 votes had been in favour and 308 against. What would the Premier do in that case? While it was true that a majority was in favour of State management, it was also true that on the more important vote of increases the majority was against it. Notwithstanding that vote, the Premier asked the Committee to agree to a Bill which said he might open hotels where he pleased.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Were you not interested in that application from Yorkrakine?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: No.

Mr. Green: It was claimed all through the district that you were.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Then it was false, and the hon. member knew it.

Mr. Green: And the same thing occurred at the Wongan Hills.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: That also was false.

The Premier: It is remarkable.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: That remark was worthy of the Premier.

Mr. Green: But you were not telling the truth.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The hon. member never did tell the truth.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: In accordance with the ruling, he would withdraw. The Ministry were altogether unfair in endeavouring to make the vote cast by the people in favour of State hotels as against privately owned hotels a justification for the establishment of State hotels in districts which had voted against increase of licenses. Under the Licensing Act no fresh license could be issued in any district, with the exception of Gascoyne, within the 15 miles' limit.

The Premier: Your amendment will exclude it altogether.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Premier, the champion of the no-liquor party, was bewailing the fact that the amendment would prevent him from opening unnecessary hotels. If the Premier really be-

lieved in local option he would not refuse to accept the amendment.

Mr. S. STUBBS: For many hours he had been listening to speeches wearisome and irrelevant from both sides of the House. Even now, he was not fully seized with the intention of the Premier in regard to the establishment of State hotels. What occasion was there for rushing the measure through if the Premier intended to bring down a more comprehensive Licensing Bill this session? A point on which he would like to be clear was as to the intention of the Premier supposing a petition were to be received for the erection of a State hotel at, say, Dumbleyung, where quite recently a private licensee had erected a new and commodious hotel at the cost of some £9,000. The license had only been granted after a very exhaustive inquiry by the licensing court, the hotel was the only one in the district, and there was not sufficient trade to justify another. Would the Premier in such a case establish a State hotel to compete against the privately owned establishment?

The Minister for Mines: And opposition will do him a lot of good.

Mr. S. STUBBS: There was no room for two hotels in the town. Why should not the Government be fair in a case of this kind and buy the hotel from the man? He was not holding a brief for anyone, but the man who applied for a license a few months ago would not have done so if he had thought that the Government were about to come down with a Bill such as this.

The Minister for Mines: Every man who applies for a license knows he gets it for only 12 months and has to take his chance after that.

Mr. S. STUBBS: That argument was worn out many years ago.

The Minister for Mines: It is still true.

Mr. S. STUBBS: The understanding was, provided that a man was of good behaviour, the license would be renewed.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in discussing that matter on this amendment.

Mr. S. STUBBS: There was no urgent necessity for the Bill. The Government should accept the amendment. The Gov-

ernment would not be warranted in establishing an hotel in a small district if a petition was presented. He desired to see fair play to those at present holding licenses.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If the Premier would not accept the amendment he would have to disagree with him.

The Premier: Why did you vote for the Bill?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: On the bustings he undertook to oppose any hotels in a new district except with the consent of the people.

The Premier: Why did you vote for the second reading?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: When the second reading was passed he was not present, but he would have voted for it and made sure in Committee that State hotels were established only in new districts where it was proved by a local option poll that the people desired an hotel. He was as strongly opposed to the Government putting an hotel in a district where it was not wanted, as to a private individual doing the same thing.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is what we are fighting for.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): They are fighting to get a private individual put into the district.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If the Chairman would accept it, he proposed to move an amendment to prevent fresh licenses from being granted to private individuals contrary to the local option poll, as in the case of Dumbleyung. He would like to see a clause inserted in the Bill that no fresh licenses should be granted in Western Australia except to the State.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: If we granted the powers under Clause 2, we would be creating a position which would bring very great trouble upon the head of Ministers who had to administer the law. If we established a number of these hotels where the agent was appointed by the Minister, and the Minister had the sole power to make the appointment, sooner or later there would be serious trouble. We were getting away from the principle of local option. When supporters of the

present Government were in Opposition, members heard a great deal about giving the people full and complete local option, and the Government were inconsistent in introducing this Bill, particularly as regarded Clause 2 of the measure.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment was the matter under discussion.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: The amendment was in the right direction and would have his support. When a poll was taken the whole of the people in the locality should have a voice in deciding the matter. Every person within a 15 miles radius of the centre where the hotel was proposed to be established should have a vote. Members had not been enlightened by the Government as to why a radius of three miles was being adopted. Considering that a number of these hotels were likely to be established in agricultural districts, the greater proportion of which were represented by members on the Opposition side of the House, and considering the people in the agricultural districts were responsible for the great development taking place, they should have full and complete local option in deciding this important question.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	23

Majority against .. 9

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Monger
Mr. George	Mr. Moore
Mr. Harper	Mr. A. E. Piesse
Mr. Johnston	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman

(Teller).—

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bath	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scadden
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Foley	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Gill	Mr. Walker
Mr. Green	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lander	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Lewis	

(Teller).—

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. GREEN moved a further amendment—

That the following be added after "Act" in line 25:—"Provided that such agent shall not employ any female or suffer any female to assist or serve in or about any bar or in or about the sale of liquor on such premises of such hotel."

It was hardly necessary for him to press the question. The intention, as far as State hotels were concerned was that barmaids should not be employed. This amendment inflicted no hardship so far as the barmaids who were at present employed in private hotels were concerned. State hotels, the manifest object of which was to regulate the hotel traffic, should not be the place for the employment of barmaids. The environment of an hotel was bad enough for a male, but how much worse was it for the female who took up that particular avocation. He had nothing to say against the barmaids of Western Australia to-day. Amongst them were many fine and noble women, but it could not be contended that this particular work helped to uplift them. Those gentlemen who had frequented hotels had told him that the language of the saloon bar was something that was not fit for the ears of females. The members for Northam and York could tell the House that the language of the bars they had frequented was such that decent men, let alone women, would not care to listen to. The amendment he had moved was not an innovation; the State of South Australia set the example so far as all its hotels were concerned, and it was to be hoped here that the Government would provide, in regard to the State hotels, for the prevention of some of the finest girls in the land being sullied by coming into contact with this doubtfully honest occupation. Other countries had substituted men for women in this occupation, and he pointed to the United States in which country only those places known as "dives," and which were the lowest form of drinking saloons, employed females. In all decent bars there the trade was conducted by men, and the

position was, that if a man wanted to get a drink he got one simply because he was thirsty. It was unfortunately true in our own State that in Northam and other such disreputable centres, the tendency was for the bar trade to be exceedingly bad. In some particular hotels in this State there were no barmaids, and the effect was good so far as the trade was concerned, but it was known in regard to other hotels that the women were kept there merely as decoy ducks.

Mr. Monger: I do not know those establishments.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Are there any barmaids in our State hotels?

Mr. GREEN: No. It was to be hoped that the Premier would accept the addition of the clause.

Mr. GEORGE: The amendment would receive his heartiest support, but he thought it would require to be redrafted because as it appeared it would prevent the employment of domestics in an hotel. Out of the respect he had for the women of Western Australia he hoped, however, that it would be carried.

Mr. WISDOM: Having had probably as much experience of hotels as any member in the House, he might be allowed to heartily support the amendment. It was perfectly true, as the hon. member who proposed the amendment had said, that there were a great many good and noble women engaged in the avocation of barmaids, but he was afraid it was also true that they were really the survival of the fittest, and it was sad to remember that this employment had resulted in demoralising and ruining a great many more women than were employed in the bars at the present time. The business of serving behind a bar was absolutely unsuited to a woman and he would be extremely sorry to see any female relation of his engaged in that pursuit, and as he would not care to see any of his relations so engaged, he certainly did not care to advocate such employment for other women.

Mr. CARPENTER: The amendment would receive his support. He had hoped that there would have been some more

comprehensive legislation providing for reform generally of public houses. What he meant was that we should as far as possible in our legislation remove every objectionable feature from the trade, and this certainly was one of the reforms which he would like to see initiated, not only in regard to State hotels, but every other hotel as well. We were not dealing with other houses at the present time, but he hoped with the promise of an amendment of the Licensing Act the general question would be discussed and decided. If there was one thing we hoped for in connection with State hotels it was that the attractions for drink would be limited. Everyone knew that the employment of barmaids was one of the attractions which the hotelkeeper set up in order to increase his trade and for that reason, as well as for others he would support the amendment.

Mr. FOLEY: It would be better if no females were allowed in a bar at all, but females were employed in other portions of well-conducted hotels, and if the amendment were carried it would prevent a waitress from even bringing a glass of liquor to a person dining in the hotel. The same embargo would apply to the licensee's wife. Still, if the majority of members thought it would be better to prevent the handling of liquor even by waitresses, he would support the amendment, because undoubtedly much drinking was caused through the presence of women in hotel bars.

Mr. McDONALD: It was pleasing to see so many members supporting the abolition of barmaids, but it was surprising to know that the member for Kalgoorlie associated with men who used bad language in the presence of women in a bar.

Mr. Green: You have heard it in the Nor'-West many a time.

Mr. McDONALD: That was so, but many a time a big man had been thrown out of a bar in the Nor'-West for daring to use bad language in the presence of a woman. One could not think much of the hon. member's friends if they listened to bad language in a bar in the presence of a woman without protesting beyond

a complaint to a member of Parliament. It was reasonable to assume that in the future. State hotels would be the only hotels, and if Parliament closed down that avenue of employment to women in State hotels it would be a far step towards the abolition of barmaids. It had been said that there were many superior women in hotel bars. That was true, and whilst some might be otherwise, all should not be condemned because of the few. If members were going to close that avenue of employment what alternative were they going to provide? Would they send them to manufacture shirts at 2s. 6d. a dozen, or send them to sweating-clothing factories, or to drudge for small wages in domestic service, or send them to an even worse profession? He opposed the amendment.

Mr. MONGER: The member for Gascoyne was to be congratulated on his remarks. It was difficult to understand such an amendment being introduced by the member for Kalgoorlie. If that hon. member could only recollect the time when Kalgoorlie was not a flourishing settlement as it was to-day, when people depended on the services of those ladies who were permitted to serve behind the bars of hotels in days when fever-stricken patients were raving on all sides, he would remember that the women who served in bars in those days did yeoman service to the men on the goldfields. Many of those in city bars to-day were women one might well be proud to occasionally converse with. If the amendment was carried, it would practically debar any female from being on any licensed premises under the control of the Government, and it would be impossible for a woman to even take to a boarder's room such mild refreshment as a morning cup of tea, let alone stronger refreshment if nature so required it. Further than that, no female would be allowed to wait at dinner. Was it the desire of the hon. member to entirely abolish women from hotels? For his own part, he would sooner see women who were closely connected with him associated with a respectable bar in a respectable hotel than serving and sweating behind the counters of

some of the big and so-called reputable firms in the city.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister): It would be impossible to carry on the business of a State hotel or any other hotel if the amendment was carried. The words used by the hon. member in his amendment were contained in the Licensing Act in regard to the sale of liquor after hours, but in the Act liquor was defined in the interpretation clause as "intoxicating liquor." According to the amendment it would be impossible to have a glass of water placed on a dining room table by any woman. In those circumstances, the amendment was going too far. It was necessary that in any hotel accommodation should be provided for those who stayed there, and that they should be supplied with their meals, which involved their being served with liquor. The particular function of a State hotel was to provide proper accommodation for those who were travelling, not only drinking accommodation, but also living accommodation. There could not be reform unless there was something to reform. No Government had employed a barmaid in a State hotel. The proper place to deal with the question of the employment of barmaids was in the Licensing Act.

Mr. GARDINER: The member for Kalgoorlie held himself up as a paragon of virtue and claimed the member for Roebourne as his informant as to the language one heard in bars.

Mr. Green: I meant to refer to the member for Gascoyne.

Mr. McDonald: If the Standing Orders permit I will gladly call the member for Kalgoorlie "Ananias."

Mr. GREEN: Information as to the language used in bars was not gleaned by personal experience but was told him by the member for Gascoyne.

Mr. GARDINER: The environment of hotel life was not conducive to the good of young women; there was language used in some bars which was not fit for young women to hear. It was a fact that barmaids were employed to induce people to visit hotels when possibly they might not do so otherwise. He supported the amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: This was not the proper place to insert such an amendment; it should be done in a Licensing Bill. When the last Licensing Bill was before Parliament he had endeavoured to put in an amendment to prevent the employment of barmaids after those already in the trade gave it up. He considered those women already in the trade should be allowed to remain in it, that no legislation should take away the occupation of those already in the trade, and that no distinction should be made between private hotels and State hotels in this respect. The hon. member was a great reformer, but his reform went too far because from its wording the amendment would prevent the employment of waitresses in State hotels.

The PREMIER: The member for Kalgoorlie should consider the Bill in the nature of one empowering the Government to provide State hotels under certain conditions. It was provided that the manager of a State hotel should be bound in every respect by the provisions of the Licensing Act, except in regard to applying for a license; and that was all that could be expected. The hon. member's amendment would not prevent the employment of any barmaid, because no barmaids were now employed in State hotels, but it would prevent the employment of waitresses. The hon. member would have the opportunity of making the reform he sought in the Licensing Bill the Government were committed to bring down. We should certainly give notice to those engaged in the trade that after the passing of a Bill which might be presented to Parliament there should not be any further persons employed in that trade.

Mr. Carpenter: That would not keep them out of State hotels.

The PREMIER: Yes, the State hotels would be conducted on similar lines to other hotels, and if provision was made in the Licensing Bill that barmaids must not be employed they could not be employed in State hotels.

Mr. Green: Let us have it in black and white.

The PREMIER: Was this merely a cheap advertisement for the hon. member? The hon. member should have given the Government some notice of the fact that he intended to introduce a new principle into the Bill. If the Government admitted this amendment any member of the House would be warranted in asking for the inclusion of an amendment dealing with anything in the Licensing Act with which he disagreed. It surely should be sufficient for the member for Kalgoorlie to have the assurance from the Government that there was no intention to employ barmaids in State hotels, and that the Government were pledged to an amendment of the Licensing Act where the hon. member's amendment would find a proper place. Why should we load the Bill with something that had no application to its principles?

Mr. THOMAS: While entirely in accord with the prohibition of barmaids in hotels he agreed with the Premier that this could be done later on, and that the amendment went further than necessary and would act as a restraint in the ordinary working of State hotels. The assurance was given that barmaids would not be employed and for himself that was sufficient. He was content to wait until the time arrived when it could be made to apply to all hotels in the State.

Mr. CARPENTER: If, as the Premier stated, an amendment to the Licensing Act would be brought down later on, unless it was specified in that promised Bill that no barmaids would be employed, we would not get what we required; because in any proposal for the abolition of barmaids the Premier would require to safeguard the interests of those already in that employment. The whole question just now was that there should be no barmaids employed in a State hotel. He hoped the hon. member would persist in his amendment.

Mr. DWYER: The amendment was purely harassing, and had really no application to the Bill. The Bill was one merely to enable the Government to establish State hotels. The question of the employment of barmaids did not enter

into the consideration of this measure. The Government were pledged to introduce an amendment to the Licensing Act, and that would be the time at which to discuss the amendment moved by the hon. member.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: For once he would be found voting with the Premier. The Minister had said he intended, in the amendment to the Licensing Act, to limit the employment of barmaids. It therefore seemed reasonable that the member for Kalgoorlie should withdraw his amendment. But for the assurance of the Premier he (Mr. Mitchell) would have voted with the member for Kalgoorlie, notwithstanding the impertinent way in which that hon. member had introduced the amendment. There was no justification whatever for the manner in which the member for Kalgoorlie had referred to Northam. He (Mr. Mitchell) did not know that the hon. member had ever been to Northam, and for the credit of Northam it was to be hoped that the hon. member had not been there.

Mr. Green: Why I was there to fight against you, and I will be there again.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Probably with the same success the hon. member had achieved last time. The hon. member was so well known that it was unnecessary to defend Northam against his attack.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was to be hoped the hon. member for Kalgoorlie would withdraw this amendment, because if it went to the vote many members would be placed in a false position, inasmuch as they would appear to be maintaining the existing order of things, whereas in his (the Minister's) case, at all events, he would be voting simply for the strict method of introducing a measure in accordance with the order of leave. The House had given permission to introduce a Bill for an Act to authorise the establishment and maintenance of State hotels. That was the whole object of the Bill, and to go outside that object would be to go outside the order of leave. The Bill was not for the management and conduct of State hotels; that properly came under the Li-

censing Act, and if we were to introduce the principle embodied in the amendment there was no reason why we should not insert in the Bill the whole of the provisions of a comprehensive licensing law.

Mr. Carpenter: It is within the scope of the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was not within the scope of the order of leave. There were hon. members who would attempt to introduce their pet hobbies on any occasion when any semblance of right or relativity made itself apparent. Seeing that an assurance had been given that the point embodied in the amendment would be dealt with in the amendment to the Licensing Act it should be sufficient.

Mr. GREEN: The Premier had so far forgotten himself as to say that his (Mr. Green's) purpose in introducing the amendment was the securing of a cheap advertisement. He was satisfied that when the Premier thought calmly over the statement of that kind he would be sorry for having made such a reference to as loyal a Labour man as was the Premier himself.

The Premier: You might have a little consideration for those in charge of the measure.

Mr. GREEN: As far as the Bill was concerned, he, with others, had not been consulted in regard to the form the measure would take. Whilst he recognised it was unwise to widen the scope of the Bill and bring in many outside matters, he claimed that in the Bill we were establishing State hotels, and he believed it was thoroughly in accordance with the principle for which he stood that we should have no barmaids in State hotels. He had the assurance of the Government that this principle would be duly observed, but he required also an assurance that no other Government would violate it. As far as he was concerned he was going to stick to this thing. He believed barmaids were a curse, and that the quantity of liquor consumed and of bad liquor sold would be less if there were no barmaids. We knew the conditions surrounding the liquor trade were not such as they would be if they were

conducted under decent conditions. We had the testimony of gentlemen on the other side of the House who were intimately acquainted with the liquor trade, and who had told the Committee that they would be sorry indeed to see any feminine relatives of theirs connected with the liquor traffic. The Government should not stand on any false and petty dignity but should see that the clause was included in the Bill if they considered it just.

Mr. TURVEY: If the amendment conveyed what he believed the member for Kalgoorlie wished, namely, the prohibition of barmaids in State hotels, he would support it, but as it would prevent any female from being employed in or about a State hotel he could not support it. The Bill had been introduced to provide for the establishment of State hotels and the other question should be dealt with when the Licensing Bill was before the House.

Hon. Frank Wilson: When will it be before the House?

Mr. TURVEY: The Attorney General stated in a week or two. His experience was that men would not use insulting and disgusting language in the presence of a female to the extent they would in the presence of men, and a barmaid very frequently had an elevating influence on the men in her presence. He had sufficient confidence in women to know that the majority were ready to resent insults and innuendoes on the part of drunken men. At Young and Jackson's hotel in Melbourne not a female was employed, and it was doing the biggest business in Melbourne. That exploded the argument of the member for Kalgoorlie, but demoralising influences were to be found in that hotel.

Mr. Green: What are they?

Mr. Turvey: The hon. member should go and see.

[Mr. Male took the Chair.]

Mr. MULLANY: Although in accord with the principle of the abolition of barmaids, he opposed the amendment, because it went further than the member

for Kalgoorlie intended, and would do away with the employment of any female on State hotel premises. If a person called for a glass of liquor with his dinner the barman could not leave the bar, and waiters would have to be employed as well as male bar attendants. His objection to the employment of females in the liquor traffic was not so much the influence which the traffic had upon them, as the influence they were likely to have upon young men inclined to indulge in a little liquor. The employment of barmaids tended to young men drinking more than otherwise would be the case.

Mr. Monger : Absolute nonsense.

Mr. MULLANY : In the cities where barmaids were employed young men gathered and females were sometimes employed as decoys to attract trade. A woman, if she desired, had sufficient power in her own womanhood to prevent unseemly language from being used in her presence. If she resented it, there was always a Britisher or an Australian to assist her to prevent it from being repeated, and often decent men would resent it even if the barmaid did not. He was pleased to have the assurance of the Attorney General that an amending Licensing Bill would shortly be introduced and he trusted that a full discussion on the point would take place on that occasion. No one in favour of the abolition of barmaids would agree to throwing them out of employment immediately; time would have to be allowed them. While barmaids were employed, the State hotels should be the best place where they could be employed. If it was not harmful for them to engage in the liquor traffic, it should not be harmful for them to be employed in State hotels.

Mr. HEITMANN : The employment of barmaids was not conducive to the welfare of the barmaid and particularly to the young people beginning to drink.

Mr. Harper : You were young once yourself.

Mr. HEITMANN : Possibly, like the hon. member, he could speak from experience. The Bill was brought in for

the express object of making provision for State hotels. Members should not make this an occasion for pointing out all the evil effects of one phase of the liquor traffic. If the hon. member wished to wipe out a class of employment which did greater harm to young women than the liquor trade he should study the sweating conditions in the factories. More harm was done there than in the bars. Would he endeavour to give effect to the earlier closing of hotels?

Mr. Green : I have never advocated it.

Hon. Frank Wilson : Why should not he?

[Mr. McDowall resumed the Chair.]

Mr. HEITMANN : These matters could be dealt with better when the Licensing Bill was before the House.

Mr. MUNSIE moved an amendment on the amendment—

That all the words after "bar" be struck out.

The amendment would then read, "Provided that such agent shall not employ any female or suffer any female to assist or serve in or about any bar." Though this was not a Bill dealing wholly with the conduct of the liquor traffic, when we introduced a Bill to establish and maintain State hotels it was not going too far to establish the fact that no barmaids should be employed in these State hotels. We knew no barmaids were now employed, but the Premier might not always occupy his present position. It was the right principle that the member for Pilbara advocated that barmaids at present employed should not be deprived of their occupation; but as no barmaids were employed in State hotels, there would be no harm in our saying at once that in future they should not be employed in State hotels.

Mr. FOLEY : Was this not an amendment to the Licensing Act? Was the discussion in order?

The CHAIRMAN : The amendment dealt with the question of State hotels, and showed what persons should be em-

ployed in them. The amendment could not possibly be refused; it was in order.

Mr. GREEN: As the amendment of the member for Hannans removed from his amendment some of the objections that appeared to be valid he accepted it.

Amendment (Mr. Munsie's) put and passed.

Mr. HARPER: It was not opportune to have this amendment inserted in the Bill. If it were agreed to we could go on making amendments to the Bill in all directions. Even as amended it would still prevent waitresses getting drinks at the bar to serve in the dining-room.

Mr. A. A. WILSON: It was surprising to hear so many yes-no opinions. He believed in the amendment and would vote for it.

Mr. LEWIS: The Bill was introduced to give the people control of the liquor traffic. As the people did not desire to see barmaids employed in State hotels the best way to give effect to their wishes was to pass the amendment.

The PREMIER: Members should endeavour to confine themselves to the purposes of the Bill, and should not overload it with matters absolutely foreign to its purpose. The member for Collie had been heard to express yes-no opinions.

Mr. A. A. Wilson: Never.

The PREMIER: Members did not oppose the principle contained in the amendment, but this was not the proper place for the amendment. A Licensing Act Amendment Bill was the proper place for it. He believed that the people should be able to decide the hours at which hotels should close, but he would not apply it to State hotels only by introducing that principle in this Bill. The same thing applied to many other matters. This Bill was merely to establish and maintain State hotels. Once a State hotel was established the manager would need to comply with all the requirements of the Licensing Act. There was no likelihood of barmaids being employed in State hotels before Parliament had the opportunity of dealing with the Licensing Bill.

Mr. Munsie: You may not get it through in the Licensing Bill where you are up against vested interests in another place.

The PREMIER: There was one principle at stake in the Bill before the Committee. Let both Houses give a decision on that one principle which was to get over the necessity for providing a Bill for each hotel the State established where the people in a district had voted that new licenses should be controlled by the State.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The amendment moved by the member for Kalgoorlie would not meet with his support. He believed that women could act as barmaids without losing any of their dignity or self-respect. What he rose for was principally to combat the views of the Attorney General and the Premier regarding hon. members' right to introduce amendments in accordance with their convictions to any measure which the Government thought fit to submit to the Chamber.

The Premier: Rubbish.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member ought to withdraw that expression.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not hear it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier said "rubbish."

The Premier: I will withdraw it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: When the Premier introduced a Bill, it became the possession of the House, and any member had a perfect right to move any amendment he thought desirable.

The Premier: No one ever disputed it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier had disputed it, and he had said that members must wait until a comprehensive measure in connection with the liquor trade was introduced before they could move amendments which they might consider vital. The Bill before the Committee provided for the control of State hotels and for the appointment of managers by the Minister and to that extent it provided for the control of State hotels. Any member therefore had a perfect

right to move an amendment or a new clause.

The Minister for Lands: It is not a question of right, it is a question of wisdom.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Hon. members had been taken to task by the Minister because they had dared to introduce amendments to this measure which was only for the establishment of hotels.

Mr. Munsie: But we are still moving them.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That was so. Although he was opposed to the particular one before the Committee, it would to some extent be incongruous to have limitations in regard to State hotels which did not apply to privately owned hotels. It might be in the opinion of some hon. members undesirable that we should refuse to allow barmaids to be employed in State hotels and yet permit them to be employed in privately owned hotels. With regard to barmaids, it was his experience that they could hold their own and command much greater respect from their customers than a man when he was employed behind the bar. The ordinary customer of a hotel—or a great majority of them—respected the female who was behind the bar and if one forgot himself in that bar there would be many others to put him in his place. It was not his intention to support the amendment and he only rose to protest against the attitude of Ministers on the introduction of amendments to this measure, and because they had promised to bring in, at a future time, a more comprehensive Bill.

Amendment (Mr. Green's) as amended put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	25
—				
Majority against	14
—				

AYES.

Mr. Gardiner
Mr. George
Mr. Green
Mr. Johnston
Mr. Lander
Mr. Lewis

Mr. Munsie
Mr. A. E. Plesse
Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Carpenter
(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Angwin	Mr. Monger
Mr. Bath	Mr. Moore
Mr. Collier	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Foley	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Gill	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Harper	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Layman	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Male	Mr. Heltmann
Mr. McDonald	(Teller).

Amendment as amended thus negatived.

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved a further amendment—

That in line 11, after "in" the words "at least three issues of" be inserted.

It would be insufficient to publish notice of the intention to establish a State hotel in one issue only of the *Government Gazette*.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: It would be as well also if the notice were posted on the proposed site of the hotel, as provided in the Licensing Act.

Amendment put and passed.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was provided that in the event of a petition being received, signed by a majority of the adult persons residing within three miles of the proposed site of a State hotel, praying that the hotel be not established, such hotel should not be established. This provision should be inverted; in other words, the establishment of the hotel should be made conditional on the receipt of a petition praying for its establishment.

The Premier: And make it that a hotel "shall be established?"

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Yes.

The Premier: I would never agree to that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Government would decide that a hotel was necessary and advertise their decision in three issues of the *Government Gazette* and a newspaper circulating in the district. But they could not establish the hotel until they received a petition from a majority of the adult persons residing within three miles of the proposed site saying that they desired a State hotel

to be established. That was the amendment he desired, instead of the provision in the Bill that unless the Government received a petition from a majority of persons opposed to the hotel, they could proceed to establish a State hotel. How were the Government going to get that petition of a majority of the persons within a three mile radius against the hotel, or to know that the signatures represented a majority? Had not the people been given in the Licensing Act the right to say whether the number of licenses should be increased or otherwise; and why should the Government now take away that right altogether? The alteration suggested would preserve to the people the degree of local option conferred by the Licensing Act. He moved an amendment—

That the words "may not" in line 5 of the last proviso be struck out, and "shall" inserted in lieu.

If the amendment was carried he would then move to strike out "not" in the last line.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	23

Majority against ..	12
---------------------	----

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. A. E. Plesse
Mr. George	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Malo	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman
Mr. Monger	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bath	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Carpenter	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Foley	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Gill	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Green	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lander	Mr. Heltmann
Mr. Lewis	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The clause provided for a petition by persons residing within a radius of three miles of the pro-

posed site of the hotel. The radius should be 15 miles and it would then include the people to be served. Would it not be better to have the clause redrafted? At Wongan Hills, for instance, very few people would be included within a radius of three miles, and the hotel would serve a very large area, whereas in Kalgoorlie or Perth the hotel would serve a small area but a large number of people. Would it not be advisable to increase the radius to ten miles in the country and reduce it in the case of the more thickly populated centres? He moved an amendment—

That the word "three" in line 31 be struck out, and the word "fifteen" inserted in lieu.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	21

Majority against ..	10
---------------------	----

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. A. E. Plesse
Mr. George	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Malo	Mr. Wisdom
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman
Mr. Monger	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Bath	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Dooley	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Foley	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Gill	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Green	Mr. Walker
Mr. Johnston	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Lander	Mr. Heltmann
Mr. Lewis	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: An explanation should be given regarding the form of the petitions. As a member of a licensing bench, he knew the amount of weight to be attached to petitions. He knew of an instance of a number of people having signed a petition praying for a license and also a counter petition in respect to the same license. The Government were somewhat inconsistent in not making the local option provisions apply to the Bill.

It was unsatisfactory to obtain an expression of opinion by petition. It would be useless for him to move an amendment after the divisions which had been taken, and he would content himself with protesting that the means adopted were not satisfactory.

The Minister for Lands: The provisions of local option will apply equally to State hotels and to privately conducted hotels.

Mr. A. E. PIESSE: Why not make them apply instead of the petition?

Hon. J. MITCHELL: The Minister had voted against his amendment to have that principle applied. Under the Bill the local option provisions were entirely disregarded.

The Minister for Lands: We intend that local option will apply to a State hotel as to any other.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That may be your intention, but it is not in the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: It will be provided for in the Licensing Bill.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: It had been clearly shown that except in the Gascoyne district every licensing district had voted against an increase.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Yet a lot of licenses have been granted.

Hon. J. MITCHELL: Yes; but the Bill provided that State hotels might be opened subject only to a petition. The Minister was wrong in saying that the local option clauses applied. The Bill provided that Ministers could open hotels wherever they liked subject only to the safeguard of local petitions.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member was aware that the Government were going to deal with the general licensing laws and with local option, and any Local Option Bill would apply equally to State hotels and other hotels.

Clause as amended put and passed.

Clauses 3 and 4—agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON moved—

That the following be added to the Bill to stand as Clause 5:—"Subsection 1 of Section 45 of the Licensing Act, 1911, is hereby amended by omitting the following words: '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 15 miles from the premises to which the application relates.'"

The PREMIER: Was it in order to move an amendment to the Licensing Act in a measure which did not deal with the Licensing Act?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The Bill did affect the Licensing Act. It gave the Government power to make certain applications outside the 15 miles radius, a power they did not previously have. That being so it absolutely followed that we could also take away the power private people possessed to obtain such licenses.

The CHAIRMAN: The Title of the Bill was, "A Bill for an Act to authorise the establishment and maintenance of State hotels." As the amendment was to delete a provision of the Licensing Act he must rule that it was an amendment which would require to be dealt with in a Bill to amend the Licensing Act.

Dissent from Chairman's Ruling.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: I dissent from your ruling.

The Speaker took the Chair.

The Chairman having stated the dissent,

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The Bill we are considering is giving the Government the right to establish new hotels 15 miles from existing hotels, which right the Premier has told us the Government did not previously possess. For some time past, in spite of the fact that local option polls taken in agricultural and other districts, and the people, by huge majorities, declared against any new hotels being established, under this particular section fresh private hotels have been and are being established throughout the country districts.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member might confine his remarks to reasons why the amendment should be accepted.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: The reason I would urge is that since this measure gives the Government increased facilities

to establish State hotels in the outlying parts of Western Australia, we are justified in considering the amendment, the effect of which will be to correspondingly reduce the right of private people to support these new hotels.

Mr. Speaker: I endorse the Chairman's ruling in this matter. The amendment the hon. member desires to move cannot be added to this measure. It is an amendment which can only be moved to an entirely different measure and not the one under discussion.

Committee resumed.

Mr. McDowall in the Chair.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 12th September, 1912.

	PAGE
Leave of absence	1655
Bills: Fremantle-Kalgoorlie (Merredin-Coolgardie Section) Railway, Com. .. .	1655
Industrial Arbitration, 2A. .. .	1662
Methodist Church Property Trust, Returned .. .	1661
Health Act Amendment, Returned .. .	1661
Landlord and Tenant, 2A. .. .	1676

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom, leave of absence granted for twelve sittings to Hon. R. W. Pennefather on the ground of ill-health.

[59]

BILL — FREMANTLE-KALGOORLIE (MERREDIN-COOLGARDIE SECTION) RAILWAY.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 10th September; Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Authority to construct:

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: At the previous sitting the point had been raised as to whether the Bill, in addition to prescribing that the line should be of a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, should not contain some provision for the temporary laying of rails on the 3ft. 6in. gauge. The point had since been referred to the Crown Law Department, and in response the Solicitor General had submitted the following opinion:—

1, The construction of this line will not be completed until the gauge is of 4ft. 8½in. In the meantime there is no reason why rails should not be temporarily laid at any lesser gauge. It is not essential to mention the intended gauge of a railway. 2, There is nothing in the Public Works Act requiring the gauge to be stated in the special Act authorising the construction, or to prevent the gauge of the railway being altered during or after construction. 3, In the case of the Merredin-Coolgardie railway, however, the intended gauge is stated, apparently to indicate that it will be a section of the Transcontinental railway. The words "with a gauge of four feet eight and a half inches," however, are not essential, and, if they are omitted, the operation of the Act will be in no way affected, and, on the other hand, if they are retained, it will not affect the temporary use, pending completion of the line, of the narrower gauge for the purposes intended.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: Will they guarantee a certificate on the 3ft. 6in. gauge?

The Colonial Secretary: It will not be open to public traffic.

Hon. H. P. COLEBATCH: The present financial position of the State did not justify us in giving the authority