

its more satisfactory working. The report was printed in the Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives (1922, I.-14), but not the evidence. A copy of the report with the evidence was put in by Mr. Spratt. The recommendations of the report require some explanation by reference to the circumstances of the time as revealed by the evidence.

195. The Rev. J. Dawson, of the New Zealand Alliance, alleged before the Committee (p. 30) that during the previous seven years—i.e., apparently, since the war of 1914-18 began—not less than £36,000,000, and probably as much as £50,000,000, had been spent on alcoholic liquors, that there had been 70,000 convictions for drunkenness, and 2,900 prosecutions against the licensed-hotel keepers. These are general figures and we cite them only to indicate the kind of grounds there were for public dissatisfaction.

196. The nature of the dissatisfaction at the time is, however, more fully indicated by the evidence of the Rev. Jasper Calder, of the Anglican Missionary Society [of Auckland. He said that during the preceding two years he had, with assistance, carried on an inquiry throughout the Dominion into the conduct of the liquor trade. His complaints to the Hockly Committee concerned unsuitable licensees and the ease with which Licensing Committees allowed unsuitable men to become licensees; concerned also unsuitable barmen, after-hour trading, the drinking by women in bars, and the failure of some hotels to supply accommodation when they had it. He informed the Committee that he had called meetings of the trade in Auckland, Wellington, and in the main centres of New Zealand (p. 231), and that within the last eighteen months he had cause for considerable gratitude because he had found the trade was really trying to improve the position. Within the last three months, he said that fourteen unsuitable licensees had been put out. He had had assistance from the brewery in the matter. After-hour trading had greatly diminished. The drinking by women was still bad in Auckland, but not nearly so bad in Wellington, Christchurch, or Dunedin. He thought the trade was trying to get drinking by women abolished.

He said that the worst trouble, in his opinion, was "the mad three years' rush." He proposed a longer period between the polls, provided good licensees and good barmen could be obtained. He said the licensee was almost entirely in the hands of his barmen (pp. 231 and 232).

197. There were forty-one witnesses, comprising representatives of the trade, the Prohibitionists, the Moderate Party, and the clubs. A feature of the evidence was the suggestion that goodwills and rents should be controlled. The necessity for the redistribution of licenses was generally accepted.

198. Proposals for reform put forward by the witnesses for the trade included—

(1) Redistribution of licenses.

(2) A proposal for license fees at an increased flat rate, as against a fee based on the percentage of the liquor sold.

(3) An extension of the period between polls to nine years. On this point the Rev. J. Dawson, of the New Zealand Alliance, said (p. 36) that he quite believed that if the trade had a nine years' tenure they would provide better accommodation, but he said that the New Zealand Alliance opposed extension because, if the monopoly were abolished, there would be an open field and satisfactory accommodation would be provided (p. 31).

(4) Nearly all the witnesses for the trade advocated the substitution of a Bench of three Magistrates for the district Licensing Committee, on the ground that a judicial determination was required and that a Licensing Committee was subject to bias. This was supported by a brewer (pp. 5, 11, and 18), by the Secretary of the National Council of the Licensed Trade of New Zealand (p. 63), by the President of the Licensed Victuallers' Association of Wellington on behalf of his association generally (p. 67), and by individual witnesses (pp. 47, 87, 115, 120, 127, 188, and 260). Two representatives of the brewery interests thought that there were difficulties in obtaining the services of Magistrates, and neither seemed to have made up his mind on the subject (pp. 205 and 225). The only direct opposition was from the Chairman of the Auckland Licensed Victuallers' Association, who said his association was in favour of the present system (p. 192).