

Legislative Assembly,

Monday, 5th November, 1897.

Paper Presented—Message: Assent to Bill—Question: Perth-Fremantle Road (South Swan)—Question: Goats introducing Tick in Kimberley—Question: New Wharf Sheds for Fremantle—Question: Works and Railways Report—Employment Brokers Bill: committee, *pro forma*—Industrial Statistics Bill: committee, *pro forma*—Cemeteries Bill: Amendment on report—Sale of Liquors Act Amendment Bill: in committee (resumed); Division on New Clause—Motion: Plans and Reports re Water Site near Coolgardie—Immigration Restriction Bill: first reading—Imported Labour Registry Bill: first reading—Width of Tires Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 7-30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.**PAPER PRESENTED.**

By the MINISTER OF EDUCATION: Report of the Education Department for the year 1896.

Ordered to lie on the table.

MESSAGE—ASSENT TO BILL.

A message from the Governor was received and read, assenting to the Perth Gas Company's Act Further Amendment Bill (private).

QUESTION—PERTH-FREMANTLE ROAD (SOUTH SWAN).

MR. HUBBLE, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works, Whether the Government could see their way to take any immediate steps to make the Lower Canning Bridge Road practicable for traffic between Perth and Fremantle.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) replied: The Government have, for several years past, provided funds on the consolidated revenue Estimates for the purpose of continuing the construction of this road from both ends. The length of road still to be constructed is $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles. If possible a special grant will be made as usual this year to the local boards to construct a further section, but the Government cannot see its way to take immediate steps to complete the work.

QUESTION—INTRODUCTION OF GOATS AND TICK IN KIMBERLEY.

MR. A. FORREST, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Crown Lands, Whether it was true that goats were about to be introduced into West Kimberley from East Kimberley; and, if so, whether the Stock Department would take precautions against the introduction of tick.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. G. Throssell) replied:—I have been informed that 100 goats are to be introduced from Hall's Creek to West Kimberley. The Stock Department has no power, under existing regulations, to prevent their introduction.

QUESTION—NEW WHARF SHEDS FOR FREMANTLE.

MR. HUBBLE, for Mr. Higham, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works whether it was the intention of his department to at once construct the wharf sheds along the river wharf at Fremantle.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) replied that it was not the intention of the Government to at once construct the sheds; but the whole question of arrangement of wharfage at South Quay, which included provision for sheds, was being considered.

QUESTION—WORKS AND RAILWAYS REPORT.

MR. ILLINGWORTH, by leave and without notice, asked the Director of Public Works when he would be prepared to lay upon the table the annual report of the Works and Railways Departments.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) replied: The full report is completed, and is being indexed to-day. I hope to be able to lay it on the table of the House not later than Thursday next.

EMPLOYMENT BROKERS BILL.**COMMITTEE, PRO FORMA.**

On the motion of Mr. BURT (in charge of the Bill), the House went into committee for the purpose of adopting, *pro forma*, certain amendments prior to discussion, and for having them printed in the body of the Bill.

Bill reported with amendments, and ordered to be reprinted.

INDUSTRIAL STATISTICS BILL.

COMMITTEE. PRO FORMA.

On the motion of Mr. BURT (in charge of the Bill), the House went into committee for the purpose of adopting, *pro formâ*, certain amendments prior to discussion, and for having them printed in the body of the Bill.

Bill reported with amendments, and ordered to be reprinted.

CEMETERIES BILL.

AMENDMENT ON REPORT.

On the order of the day for adoption of the report from committee,

Mr. BURT (in charge of the Bill) moved, as an amendment to clause 33 (penalties for malicious injury to vaults, monuments, &c.), to insert after the word "cemetery" the words "or who wilfully defaces or obliterates any device or inscription in any cemetery."

Put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

New clause:

Mr. BURT moved that the following new clause, to follow Clause 38, be added to the Bill:—

The Governor may order the exhumation of any corpse for the purpose of examination or identification, or for the purpose of its being buried elsewhere in accordance with the wishes of the deceased or of his family; and such exhumation shall take place accordingly.

Put and passed.

Bill reported with the further amendments, and report adopted.

SALE OF LIQUORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill further considered in committee.

New Clause:

Mr. LEAKE moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill:—

Section 32 of 44 Vict., No. 9, is hereby repealed, and the following substituted in lieu thereof:—If such licensing magistrate shall, at any quarterly licensing meeting, have refused any application for a publican's general license, or for a provisional certificate, such application shall not be renewed until 12 months after such refusal.

He said the thirty-second section of the principal Act provided that an application

for a license, if refused at any licensing meeting, might be renewed at the following meeting. The object of the new clause was to stay for twelve months the renewal of any refused application, and thus prevent applications which were really of a speculative nature. An applicant perhaps knew there would be opposition, and anticipated refusal, but might try, by persistent application, to wear out the patience of the licensing justices and ultimately get a license. The effect of the new clause would be that a person would apply for a license only when he could show necessity for a license for the particular premises in which he was interested. Repeated applications were, in many instances, a great nuisance. Within the last two or three days he (Mr. Leake) had had a private communication from a well-known magistrate in the country commending the new clause, and pointing out that repeated applications for licenses were really a source of great annoyance, and only wasted the time of the court. Licenses were refused on good, solid grounds; but magistrates had no power to "send the applicants down," as it were, for a term. It might be thought, perhaps by some, that the term of 12 months was rather too long. He (Mr. Leake) did not think so; but, rather than lose the clause, he would be disposed to adopt a shorter term. Unless urged to that end, however, he certainly would press his proposal as now drawn. The new clause did not involve any important principle, and required no particular advocacy. Such a provision would materially assist those who had to administer the licensing law.

Mr. BURT (late Attorney General) said he did not quite understand whether the new clause meant that the person who had made the unsuccessful application should not himself renew it, or whether the application in itself for a particular house was not to be renewed for 12 months.

Mr. LEAKE said he desired the new clause to apply to both applicant and premises.

Mr. BURT: The clause, at first sight, might seem somewhat desirable, but at the same time there were several provisions in the principal Act that proved rather inconvenient to people making applications for licenses. There was a

clause providing that a license could not be transferred till it had been held three months. That clause had been repealed, because it was found very inconvenient. It seemed to him that the licensing bench should be able to make short work with applications coming too frequently. There might be cases in which it would be very desirable to renew a license before the expiration of 12 months. An application might have failed owing to some technical point; the applicant might not have had his plans complete, and his application might have been refused, although the bench might have considered the applicant a proper person, and might be willing to grant the application if made at some future time. Moreover, at the rate we were going at present, there was no reason, in some cases, why a license should not be granted three or six months hence. To debar the premises as well as the applicant for twelve months would, in his opinion, be going too far. The member for Albany had an amendment coming on dealing with deposits, that would do a great deal of good in the way of stopping bogus applications. The bench should know a bogus application when they saw it: everybody outside seemed to know bogus applications when they saw them. The matter ought not to give much trouble. He frequently heard the subject discussed, and a bogus application and a genuine application were known immediately. This amendment went too far; and the other intended amendment, providing for a sum to be deposited, would meet all the requirements of the case.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: There were some cases which would not be met by the amendment as to a deposit. A license might be resisted by people in a certain district going to considerable trouble and expense to oppose it, because, in their opinion, it was undesirable that another hotel should be located in their midst. As soon as that feeling had been allowed to die out, and while the people in the district thought the license had been refused, the applicant stepped in quietly at the next quarterly meeting of the bench, and no objection being then made to the same application, because the people were taken unawares, the license might be granted entirely against the wishes and against the knowledge of the

people. There was something of the local option principle in the Act—a considerable amount of it, if only it were put in operation. It was too much to ask the people to come up at every quarterly meeting to oppose a license. He knew cases in which applicants had determinedly set themselves to have a license, for which they had applied and been refused three times previously, and they proposed to apply at every quarterly meeting of the bench. If a license was refused, it should be quite sufficient for the people to again express their feeling at the end of twelve months. He hoped the member in charge of the Bill would accept the amendment.

MR. HUBBLE: Did the proposed clause refer to public-houses that had held a license for a length of time, or only to new houses?

MR. LEAKE: In the case of premises previously licensed, the application would be for the renewal of the license, whereas the proposed addition applied only to entirely new premises not already licensed.

MR. GREGORY: If the term were reduced to six months instead of twelve he would support the amendment. There might be reasons for refusing a license at a certain time in one of the outside districts, and there might be reasons for granting it at the end of three months.

MR. WOOD was in favour of the amendment as it stood. The local option principle in the Act was a dead letter entirely. They had tried in West Perth to stop the granting of a license, and because every ratepayer did not sign the petition, the magistrate granted the license. He (Mr. Wood) was more inclined to support the amendment than to reduce the term.

MR. RASON was in favour of reducing the period to six months. A twelve months prohibition might inflict great hardship on the rapidly changing gold-fields; as it certainly would, for example, at Kanowna. Imagine a magistrate dealing with a license two or three months ago! It might have been argued then that there was no room for more hotels, whereas within this short period a great demand had arisen for increased accommodation. There being nothing against the character of a previous applicant, the bench might be disposed to grant him a license; but, if the proposed

amendment became law, they could not do so, whereas a mere stranger would be able to make an application and get a license.

MR. JAMES preferred the amendment, rather than any suggested alteration. He could say, from personal experience, that there was an evil which could be remedied only by the proposed proviso. The object of the amendment was to prevent applicants from rushing before the magistrates on the mere chance of getting their applications granted. If they did not succeed, they frequently put up somebody else to apply for the license; and, if this nominee of theirs were successful, they got all the benefit of it. If magistrates said to-day that there was no need of any additional licensed premises, why should a special benefit be given to an applicant because something might happen to-morrow which that applicant could not have foreseen? He should be judged by the circumstances existing at the time that he made the application. Kanowna had been mentioned, but Kanowna would not be prejudiced by this amendment being adopted. The amendment merely provided that, if a person put people to the expense of resisting an application for a license, he should not be allowed to come before the court again for another twelve months.

MR. VOSPER: A change in the direction contemplated by the clause was desired. At the same time, all goldfields members, and those acquainted with the goldfields, who recognised that sudden changes of population took place, would see that some modification was necessary; but he did not think the object sought to be attained would be met by reducing the term from twelve months to six months. The new clause might be altered so as to make the matter optional with the magistrates. If the magistrates thought the application was *bonâ fide*, they could decide that the applicant could come again in three or six months. There might also be cases in which it would be desirable to refuse an application from a person for twelve months.

MR. WOOD: The new clause might be altered to make it applicable to the requirements of the goldfields.

MR. LEAKE: The clause might be altered so that, in no circumstances, should an application be renewed for six

months, but it might, at the option of the magistrates, be permitted to be renewed in twelve months.

MR. DOHERTY: According to the clause, only the individual was to be prevented from applying again.

MR. LEAKE: It was proposed also to meet the case in respect of the premises.

MR. MITCHELL: If the hon. member brought the time of renewal down to six months, he would receive the support of the majority of hon. members.

MR. BURT (in charge of the Bill): There was no trouble in regard to the individual, but there might be trouble in regard to the piece of land or the premises in respect of which the application was made. People might not desire to have a license in a particular locality; but if the piece of ground or premises were to be licensed at all, the persons opposing the license might not care who held the license, the objections being generally directed to the locality. The new clause might be limited so that the application could not be renewed in respect of the same piece of land. It would be well to add a proviso excepting the goldfields from the operation of the clause.

MR. VOSPER: The goldfields did not require that. The same nuisances that occurred near the coast occurred on the goldfields. They had the speculative license-monger there.

MR. ILLINGWORTH hoped the committee would adopt the suggestion to except the goldfields altogether. The new clause would then meet the wishes of the committee.

MR. DOHERTY: How would it be possible to deal with a rush from one part of a goldfield to another, where it was necessary to have a way-side house, or a house of accommodation for people travelling?

MR. VOSPER: There was no possibility of obtaining freehold land on the side of the road on a goldfield. A man had to take out a business license, and if he could not obtain a liquor license for the piece of land in respect of which his business license was taken out, he could get another piece of land a dozen yards away and apply again.

MR. BURT moved to amend the new clause by striking out all the words after "renewed," and inserting the following

words: "In respect of the same premises or any part thereof, until six months after such refusal, and, if the licensing magistrates so order at the time of such refusal, until twelve months thereafter."

Amendment put and passed, and the new clause, as amended, agreed to.

New clause—Serving drink to young person:

MR. LEAKE moved that a new clause be added to the Bill as follows: "Section 12 of 50 Vict., No. 26, is hereby amended by striking out the words '14 years' and inserting '16 years.'" He said the amendment would raise the age in the Act from 14 to 16 years.

MR. MONGER: Was the hon. member never inside a hotel before he was sixteen? The principle of the amendment was ridiculous.

MR. QUINLAN: Some provision should be made to punish parents who sent their children to hotels at that age. The later a person learned to drink, the better.

MR. WOOD: How would this clause affect boys employed in hotels?

MR. VOSPER: The employment in hotels of boys under sixteen ought to be prevented by law.

MR. HUBBLE: A boy staying with his parents in a public-house might be affected under this clause.

Put and passed.

New Clause—Deposit on application for provisional certificate:

MR. LEAKE moved that a new clause be added to the Bill as follows:—

Whenever any application shall be made for a provisional certificate, the applicant shall deposit with the licensing magistrates a sum equal to Five pounds per centum of the estimated cost of the building proposed to be erected and licensed, which said sum shall be repaid to the applicant on the completion of such building, and the performance of such conditions as may be imposed by the licensing magistrates; or if the said building is not commenced or completed within such time as the licensing magistrate may prescribe, the said deposit shall be forfeited.

Hon. members would notice that the clause, as drafted, provided for the deposit of a sum equal to five per cent. of the estimated cost of the building; but he was not wedded to any particular sum, nor would he insist on five per cent. being deposited, though it appeared to him that this percentage was perfectly fair,

as it was equivalent only to an architect's commission. The clause could hurt nobody; for it merely ensured that, when an application was made and a provisional order granted, the applicant must proceed with the work forthwith, or forfeit the deposit. He had known several instances where licenses had been hawked about; and, when the successful applicant found himself unable to sell his land with the provisional license attached to it, he had abandoned the idea of erecting a building. The deposit would ensure the *bona fides* of the person acquiring a provisional license, and would prevent the practice of speculating in such licenses. It was well-known that the applications for provisional licenses were growing more numerous at each successive licensing meeting, and half of them were not *bona fide*. This was unfair, not only to the publicans already in business, but also to the public.

MR. LYALL HALL: This new clause appeared to be rather ambiguous. Did it mean that, so long as the building was commenced within the time specified, the deposit would be returned? The clause read: "If the said building is not commenced or completed," &c.

MR. LEAKE said his intention was that the building must be completed.

MR. LYALL HALL: Instead of the word "shall," the word "may" should be substituted. They all knew how difficult it had been to complete buildings in the colony during the past two or three years; and a person building a hotel might, through no fault of his own, be unable to finish the building within the prescribed time.

MR. GREGORY: It would be better to strike out the words "commenced or," and to substitute the word "may" for "shall," so as to make the latter part of the clause read: "or, if the said building is not completed within such time as the licensing magistrate may prescribe, the said deposit may be forfeited." He knew there had been considerable traffic in provisional licenses, with a view to selling at an increased price.

MR. DOHERTY: The amount of the deposit should be 10 per cent. instead of five. The existing system, by which persons were asked to buy licenses and pay bonuses of one thousand to two thousand pounds, was disgraceful. A

deposit of 10 per cent. would be a guarantee of good faith.

MR. MITCHELL: Five per cent. ought to be quite sufficient; but the word "commenced" was rather objectionable, because a person might commence the building to-day and leave off to-morrow. He should be compelled not only to commence, but to finish.

MR. LEAKE: The object of the clause was not only to force the licensee to complete the building if he did commence it, but also to compel him to commence it within a certain time, so that there should be no unnecessary delay. The clause was double-barrelled, and not merely alternative. The license was to be forfeited if the building had not been commenced; and the license could also be forfeited if the building was commenced and not completed.

MR. RASON: Whatever the amount of the deposit, it would be an addition to the cost of the building.

MR. LEAKE: No. It would be returned.

MR. RASON: The licensee would be deprived of the money in the meantime. A deposit of 10 per cent. would undoubtedly be a hardship, and he would oppose any increase beyond 5 per cent.

MR. EWING: According to the principal Act, as interpreted in cases which had come before the Supreme Court, the licensing justices could not fix a time for the commencement of the building of premises provisionally licensed. Their power was limited to the dimensions and the materials of construction, and no conditions as to time could be imposed. The Act specified twelve months as the period within which the licensed premises must be completed, and the judges held that the licensing justices had no power to impose any condition as to time. The limitation now proposed as to the commencement or completion of a building should make the law clear on this point. If the committee desired to amend the existing Act as to the time of commencing or completing the building of licensed premises, such amendment should be made directly, and not be left to be gathered by implication.

A MEMBER: The committee were making law.

MR. EWING: Then the committee ought to make the law clear. Otherwise

the clause would only promote litigation and the piling up of costs. The clause, as worded, would lead magistrates to believe they had a power which really did not lie with them.

MR. LEAKE thanked the hon. member for the Swan for his suggestion. The difficulty, however, might be met by affirming the principle, and, as the Bill had to be recommitted, further provision might be made to meet the objections raised.

MR. BURT: The new clause provided that the deposit should be repaid under certain contingencies as to the commencement and completion of the building; but, if the man did not get the license, there was no provision for the return of the money.

MR. LEAKE: The clause would also have to be altered slightly in other respects, and that could be done on re-committal. In the meantime he would re-draft the clause.

MR. WALLACE: The trafficking in licenses was such that he supported the suggestion to increase the deposit to ten per cent.

MR. KENNY: A great deal of trafficking had been done in provisional licenses. He had in his mind a case where a man procured a provisional license, and having failed, after hawking it all round, to get his price, he simply prevented others erecting a hotel in that particular district. When the twelve months were up this man renewed his application, and at last, after two years, he sold the right to the license without the proceedings having cost him sixpence. The deposit ought certainly to be increased to ten per cent.

MR. BURT suggested that the hon. member for Albany should bring up a re-drafted clause on the report.

MR. LEAKE asked leave to withdraw this new clause for the time being, in order to afford him an opportunity of proposing a re-drafted provision on the report of the committee.

Clause, by leave, withdrawn.

New clause—Female serving liquor.

MR. LEAKE proposed the following new clause:—

Any licensed person who shall permit any woman or girl to sell or serve liquor on his licensed premises shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £50.

This clause, he said, might introduce debatable matter. The proposed pro-

vision had the merit of novelty. That was no reason, however, why it should not be discussed in order to ascertain the views of the committee. The effect of the new clause was to prohibit the employment of barmaids in the public bars of hotels; and such a clause would be for the benefit, not only of the barmaids, but of the general public. He did not know whether the clause would affect the publicans, but no doubt those engaged in the trade had some advocates in the committee. But so far as he understood from conversations and inquiries, the publicans themselves were evenly divided in opinion on this question. The new clause, as worded, would appear to prohibit any woman under any circumstances serving liquor in a hotel. The clause would not, however, apply to a woman who held a general license; at any rate, it was not intended to so apply. An unmarried woman might, under certain circumstances, hold a license, and it was not meant that such a woman should be prohibited from serving liquors in her own hotel. First of all, a general license under the principal Act enabled a licensee to sell liquor in any quantity on licensed premises, and the new clause would not, of course, negative that provision; nor would the new clause extend to the wife of any licensed person.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the daughters of licensees?

MR. LEAKE: It was just as well to keep the daughters of licensees, as well as other ladies, out of trouble. It ought to be clearly understood that in moving this new clause he made no attack whatever on that particular class of persons known as barmaids. So far as he knew, they were, and always had been, ladies entitled to the respect of the community; and he was happy to say that, in the majority of instances, they were treated with respect. This new clause was brought forward as much in the interests of the barmaids as in the interests of any other persons. The terms of the employment of barmaids forced them into surroundings which were hardly fit for any woman, whether she were of good or bad character. It was not desirable to see women, who should be respected, liable to anything like an affront or insult.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the extension of the franchise to women?

MR. LEAKE: It was not desirable that the discussion should be led into any side issue, such as that of the women's franchise. At the present time there was no limit whatever to the age at which women might be employed in this peculiar capacity of barmaid. If the vocation were restricted to women of a certain age, objections might not be raised. Girls of tender years, as well as women of maturer years, might be, and were, employed in serving liquors behind bars. This was not an ennobling occupation. It surrounded women with men in various stages of intoxication, and forced those women to listen to conversations which might be loose or offensive. It was true that it was the business of barmaids, when anything unpleasant took place, to close their ears and take no notice; but circumstances did arise when undesirable remarks must be forced on their attention. The desire was to place women beyond the possibility of affront or insult. The number of young ladies employed in bars was not so large that the clause would do any very great injustice, nor were they necessarily debarred from employment in other capacities. It was open for those ladies to take other occupations in a licensed house. Matters of housekeeping could be looked after by them, and there were such positions as that of housemaid open to them. The clause did not altogether exclude women from licensed premises, but simply prevented them from dealing out liquors. Ladies had, for some men, attractions which in many cases were irresistible. He did not wish in any way to place a bar upon those attractions when exercised in a proper and legitimate manner or place; but he did not think it was a nice idea to have women in a public room to be looked at, and to be treated in the off-hand manner which ladies in that position had often to submit to. [A MEMBER: Withdraw.] He would press this matter to a division; and, if he had not intended to do so, he would not have brought it forward. It was not a subject to scoff at or play with in public. He knew some hon. members would like to laugh this subject out of the House, but he challenged them to try and do it. They were

in committee now, and he would meet the witticisms of hon. members with arguments. The worst principle in connection with the employment of barmaids was that, against their will and unconsciously, they were used as decoys; not perhaps to attract men of mature years like himself and those whom he saw around him, but young men who had perhaps just left school, young men who had just accepted some position of trust, young men in public offices and banks and so forth. If hon. members would carry their recollections back 15 or 20 years, they would remember what the susceptibilities of young men were, and how easily in certain circumstances they might be gulled—not gulled necessarily by the deliberate devices of designing females, but in consequence of their own inherent weakness. It was not pleasant, if one had to go into these public places, to see them filled with young men who had much better be at home with their mothers and sisters. He was not going to moralise: he did not want to take his stand on any false sentiment at all, but merely on the ground that such an amendment as he proposed would do good to the general community, and would possibly prevent the inordinate drinking that went on in Perth and in the colony generally. The incentive to drink was quite sufficient for the ordinary thirsty individual, without the further attraction which attended the employment of barmaids. It might perhaps be in the interest of publicans to employ young ladies as barmaids because they attracted men, and young men particularly, and enabled the publican to sell more drink than he otherwise would, and impelled men to drink more than they wanted. He did not wish to prevent drinking in moderation, and he was not a prohibitionist. They knew that many of these girls had to submit to many and great inconveniences; that they had long hours and small pay; and if hon. members were to canvass the public-houses in Perth, and could get accurate information from the barmaids, they would find that the hours were long and arduous, and that the girls were kept to their work not merely during those hours which were recognised as lawful for the sale of liquor, but, after the bar was closed, they were kept there attending to what might be called the

illicit sale of liquor, and they then became, unconsciously, agents for furthering breaches of the law.

A MEMBER: There was a remedy already for selling after hours.

MR. LEAKE: There was a penalty, but that was not a remedy. If females could be legitimately employed in other capacities about licensed houses, why should they not be so employed? He had brought the question forward with the intention of testing the feeling of the House on it, and he was going to press it to a division.

MR. RASON: The remarks just made reminded him of the old couplet:

He kicked them down stairs with such a sweet

They might ^{grace} think he was handing them up.

That couplet accurately described the attitude of the hon. member with respect to barmaids. The hon. member had assured the committee he had not a word to say against barmaids, and that his endeavour to take away their means of livelihood was only out of the kindest feelings towards them. The admiration and regard which the hon. member professed for females acting as barmaids were limited to the case of the young unmarried female who was paid to sell liquor in somebody else's house.

MR. LEAKE: The married woman, the wife of a publican, had someone to protect her.

MR. RASON: But there was no one to protect the single woman selling liquor in her own house. The young and helpless members of the male sex who were said to be decoyed by the attractions of barmaids, and whose helplessness so excited the sympathies of the hon. member, were well able to take care of themselves. There was no practical reason why respectable young women should be deprived of their means of livelihood in the manner proposed. While the hon. member would prevent them from serving behind a bar, he would allow them to act as housekeepers or servants on licensed premises, where they would be subjected to the same treatment as behind the bar. [MR. LEAKE: Certainly not.] The employment of barmaids rather lessened the evil to which the hon. member had drawn attention; for however low a man might have sunk, yet, in the presence of a female, he would be prevented, more or

less, from using such bad language as he might use unrestrainedly if only men were present. The member for Albany had insinuated that if barmaids were not employed, so much liquor would not be sold. But he (Mr. Rason) did not believe that the serving of liquor by bar-men would reduce the amount of drinking. No good could ensue from the motion if carried. The employment of barmaids, if anything, was a good thing. Barmaids certainly kept their bars cleaner and more respectable than the average barman. In this colony the average barman was one of the worst creatures he had come across. In the interests of the public, and the many females who gained a respectable livelihood as barmaids, he would oppose the new clause.

MR WOOD: The member for Albany had fully recognised the difficulty he was in, in dealing with this new clause. He (Mr. Wood) objected to the system of barmaids entirely; but a vested interest had grown up in this colony, and as there were now between 1,000 and 1,500 barmaids here, that number should not be thrown out of employment all at once. If the hon. member altered his amendment so as to make a limit of time in which to carry the clause into effect, he (Mr. Wood) would support it. The system of barmaids could not be defended on any ground whatever. The girls behind the bars had to listen to bad language used in the bars. He had not a word to say against the barmaids, who were what the men made them. On the question of long hours and the want of accommodation, he agreed with the member for Albany; for he knew that girls in bars had to work until one and two in the morning, and had to sleep two or three in a room. They were fed badly, having to sit down with the "boots" and the ostler to their meals. Their position was not at all a happy one. He did not believe that barmaids could always get other employment, after having been employed in a bar. Their own sex turned against them, which was the great difficulty they had to contend against.

MR. VOSPER was inclined to agree with the remarks just made, especially in regard to the limit of time. A similar clause to that proposed by the hon. member for Albany was passed in the

South Australian Assembly, although he believed it was rejected afterwards in the Legislative Council of that colony. What were hotels really intended for? They were intended as a place of accommodation for man and beast. Hotels were not regarded by the law as places for the dispensing and the sale of liquor; still less for pushing the sale of that liquor. In what way did the presence of barmaids contribute towards the better accommodation of any man or any beast, except the "beast" known as the bar-loafer? If a license was granted to enable a man to push the sale of drink, and drink only, there would be some reason for the existence of barmaids, because barmaids did help to increase the sale of liquor. Barmaids were certainly an inducement to many young men to go into an hotel, and were supposed to keep men in conversation as long as they could, so that the men might consume more drink. The barmaids acted as decoys in the first place, and they detained the customers in the second. The more liquor was consumed, the more crime, and lunacy, and disease would be in our midst; therefore, it was well within the province of Parliament to discuss this matter. He agreed that the associations of a bar were not fit for women. Some men frequented bars who were not fit to associate with any woman, and such men hung about bars and insulted the barmaids, who occupied a peculiarly helpless position. If a man insulted a barmaid openly, there was possibly someone amongst those in the bar who would protect her; but a man could lean across the bar and whisper the worst filth imaginable to a barmaid, and she had no protection. If she complained to the landlord about the treatment received, she would probably be told that she was too particular for the business, and had better go. The result was that she had to lose her bread and butter. He believed the majority of barmaids were decent, respectable girls. There were as many decent girls engaged in this trade as in any other occupation. He did not say barmaids were better than any other class. Some barmaids, and particularly those employed in private bars, were not of the most scrupulous character. Those who would stand most insults from the customers were probably the most successful barmaids. Hon. members should deal

with barmaids in the same way as they would deal with their own female relatives. Would any hon. member like to see his wife, daughter, or sister employed behind a bar? If he would not, then he should protect all women in the same way as he would protect his own relatives. It was the duty of the committee to legislate for others as they would legislate for themselves. A remark had been made that an attempt to pass this clause was an interference with the individual rights of women; in other words it was upsetting the theory of women's rights, because all occupations possible should be thrown open to women, and they should be placed on equality with men in every respect. But although women claimed certain rights which men were not disposed to give them, yet they did not forfeit the protection of men. The position of women in bars, in this city and elsewhere, was almost as degraded as that of the females formerly employed in collieries, though it did not look so bad to the eye. In regard to the long hours of labour in some of the hotels of Perth, the system was no better than disguised whiteslavery. There was a clear distinction between an ordinary barmaid and a landlady attending in her own bar. The latter was generally married, and thus had the advantage of a husband's protection. She could regulate and control the house, and could call on her servants to eject any person insulting her; whereas a mere dependant would not complain in such circumstances, lest she should forfeit her position. The member for West Perth (Mr. Wood) had said barmaids were frequently prevented from obtaining other employment owing to the objections which women generally had to them. That perfectly true statement was one of the best conceivable arguments in favour of the abolition of barmaids. This general objection to barmaids on the part of their own sex was a proof that women knew by experience or by instinct that the business of minding a bar was not a fit and proper occupation for a respectable girl to be engaged in. Of course the faults of the system were not fairly chargeable to the individual; but the fact that so many women looked with aversion on barmaids was a proof that there was something radically wrong in the system. He was

not in favour of the immediate abolition of barmaids. A fair method of dealing with them would be on the system proposed in the South Australian Parliament, by granting licenses to all barmaids engaged in the colony at the time of the passing of the Act, and to issue no further licenses whatsoever. Thus the existing barmaids would gradually die out, and their places would be filled by men.

MR. A. FORREST: The hon. member who spoke last had placed the subject before the House in a very one-sided way. One would think that the fact of a woman being a barmaid was a blot on her character. [MR. VOSPER said he had not said so.] The hon. member was strongly opposed to competition from Asiatic labour; yet he wished to drive some 1,500 or 2,000 white ladies out of employment. He appeared to consider also that ladies who served in bars lost caste; but some of the leading men in this colony had got married to women who were formerly barmaids, and very good wives they became. It was no discredit to a woman that she had to stand behind a bar and run the risk of being insulted. Their own wives and daughters could not walk the streets of Perth or of any other city without hearing things that they should not hear. There was no outcry against barmaids in other parts of the world, and it was a waste of time to discuss the question here. He would rather be served in a bar by a lady than by a man with a pipe in his mouth and his sleeves rolled up. The committee should resent this attempt to interfere with the liberty of the subject in Western Australia. He did not think the member for Albany (Mr. Leake) could be in earnest in proposing the new clause. Hon. members would not be led away by such clap-trap as the statement that a lady was not safe behind a bar. Why should women be turned out of employment in favour of men? The two sexes had an equal right to exist.

MR. LEAKE rose to explain that the new clause merely affirmed a principle. He had no objection to recognising existing contracts, if the House desired to do so.

MR. JAMES: The member for North-East Coolgardie had put the matter of barmaids in a very proper light. If

any of their own lady relatives were inclined to seek employment in a bar, hon. members would do their best to prevent it.

MR. A. FORREST: So they would if female relatives wanted to work in a factory.

MR. JAMES: And so they would if female relatives desired to take in washing; but members would struggle more strenuously to prevent their female relatives from becoming barmaids than from working in a factory or laundry. This suggested that there was something in connection with the occupation of a barmaid which did not commend itself to their judgment. No honourable man would say that every barmaid was a wicked woman; but any woman in the position of a barmaid was exposed to great temptations; and on that ground alone the committee would be justified in passing the clause. Having due regard, however, to the interests of those now following the occupation, he moved, as an amendment to the clause, that after the word "girl" there be inserted the words, "other than the holders of licenses hereinafter mentioned." His object was to give a license to everyone at that time employed as a barmaid, and to issue no further licenses. Women were employed in this capacity because they were more attractive than men, as was evident from the speech of the member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest). They acted, to a large extent, as decoys.

MR. A. FORREST said he had not said so.

MR. JAMES: The hon. member's speech had made it clear that such was the case.

MR. EWING: Credit should be given to hon. members for being serious when they brought forward a proposal, whether that proposal were differed from or not. While it was true that the occupation of a barmaid was one which men would not seek for their sisters or relatives, yet there were many occupations that would not be suited for sisters or relatives, although these were occupations which must be, and ought to be, allowed to those who chose to fill them. Was any serious wrong done to the community by allowing women to be employed in bars, if women desired to be so employed? Women were not subject to much worse

influences in bars than they were in many other conditions of life. Many women suffered in a degraded home life, solely on account of the men who were there. Instead of legislating for the abolition of barmaids, it would be better to legislate for improvement in the conduct of men, not only towards barmaids, but towards women generally. There were many good women in bars; and, in fact, the atmosphere of a bar was considerably purified by the presence of women, who checked a great deal of evil which would otherwise exist; a woman's presence being, therefore, not so much an evil as a blessing to the community.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): This subject was not very enticing; but, occupying the position he did, he could not remain silent in this discussion. While recognising a great deal of truth in the observations of the member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper) and of the member for Albany (Mr. Leake), yet he was not going to vote with those gentlemen when the division took place. He looked on this matter in a somewhat different light from that of those members, who were on the wrong tack in the mode of procedure they advised the committee to take. If the employment of barmaids was not as pure as it should be, the endeavour should be in the direction of altering that state of affairs, rather than in prohibiting women from engaging in the business. If it were admitted that in this colony there was allowed to be carried on a trade in which it was unfit for a woman to take part, it became the duty of Parliament to alter the conditions. Ever since he had anything to do with public affairs, he had objected to, or at any rate had not supported, legislation which found little or no place in the older, more civilised, more enlightened, and more cultured parts of the world. In the old country, which was the centre of our civilisation, where the arts and sciences flourished, and in all the great countries of Europe, with their thousands of years of civilisation, there was no restriction on women being employed in what we called "bars." Therefore, it was premature in this country to set up a standard which was not recognised by the old-established countries, nor even by our fellow citizens in the Eastern parts of Australia. During

his seven years of office as Premier, he had never had any complaint from barmaids that they were subject to any treatment which rendered it undesirable they should earn their living in a business which was congenial to them. He had travelled about the world, and seen barmaids almost everywhere; and he had never received anything but courtesy and civility from them. He never saw any action on the part of these ladies to which he could take any great exception. In years gone by, in this country, he had the experience of being served at bars by uncivil, half-dressed barmen; and he hoped he would never have that experience again. What ought to be done was not to drive these women out of their employment, but to so legislate that men should not be able to insult women. To drive out barmaids would be to drive women out of an employment which was congenial to them, and suited to their physique. The object should be to make men conform to what was decent, and not allow the brute in them to have dominance. It had been said that hon. members would not like their daughters, sisters, or relatives to be barmaids; but was there not a deeper reason than that suggested for the objection? Nobody liked the purveyance of liquor at all; and that was the real reason for the objection to the trade. Probably the same member who objected to his sister taking part in the trade would also object to his brother being similarly employed. The selling of drink was not considered one of the highest businesses in the land, and that was the reason why a great many people did not like to see their relatives so engaged. The member for North-East Coolgardie had said there were men engaged in the liquor trade who were, what he called, "sweaters" of women. Did it not occur to hon. members that the remedy was to drive those sweaters out of the place, and have decent men engaged in the business? If what the hon. member stated was true, the fault lay with the administration of the law—with the licensing bench in granting licenses to persons who were altogether unfitted for the responsible position they took up. Instead of women doing harm in a bar, they had a purifying influence. If men used indecent language, it could only be on occasions when they had too much

to drink. A man who had any manliness in him would certainly be respectful when in the society of women. If the abominable language, to which the member for North-East Coolgardie and others had referred, took place when women were present, some idea might be formed of the kind of language that went on when women were absent. No doubt the language would be less bad when women were present, than when they were absent. He did not mean to say that, if he had the selection of employment for those he had the greatest regard for, he would desire they should be barmaids. That, however, was not altogether the point. He would not like to have anything to do with the selling of liquor, not because of the fact that women were the sellers, but because he did not like the trade. He was not in accord with the member for East Perth and those who thought that Western Australia should take the lead in all social legislation. His idea was that, if we could follow at a respectful distance in the track of progress and civilisation, we should be doing all that could be reasonably expected of us. He did not expect, he did not desire, that we should try to strike out new paths for ourselves, far ahead of all other nations. We were, after all, a small, almost a primitive community, living in a far-away part of the world. We might depend upon it we were not the wisest people on the earth, more learned, more cultured, or more able than those elsewhere; and if we could only follow at a respectful distance in the path of progress, we should be doing all that we were legitimately called upon to do.

Mr. HUBBLE asked the member for Albany to withdraw the new clause. It was only in 1890 that barmaids were introduced into this colony. Hon. members who had been speaking on the other (the Opposition) side of the House had not so much experience of barmaids as he had; more especially the member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper), who had talked in a grandiloquent style of the way in which the girls were treated. He (Mr. Hubble) had travelled about from one end of the world to the other, and had been in as good company in the society of barmaids as in that of girls who had been earning their living in other walks of life. A great many

people who went into hotels did not know how to treat barmaids.

THE PREMIER: Those were the people we wanted to get hold of.

MR. HUBBLE: Yes; and he would certainly oppose the amendment with the utmost vigour, because a girl behind the bar was just as respectable as a girl in any other employment, whether selling ribbons or lollies, or any other commodity. It was unfair to the girls behind the bar, who were trying to earn a livelihood, to take that livelihood from them. He hoped the hon. member would withdraw the new clause.

MR. MITCHELL would strongly oppose the clause. If they took away the occupation of 1,500 to 2,000 girls, what were these girls to do for employment?

MR. SIMPSON: Nothing like that number in the country.

MR. MITCHELL: The only remedy was to bring in a compulsory marriage law. He did not see why they should make a distinction between girls behind the bar and girls behind a counter. There were good and bad in all occupations.

MR. DOHERTY: Why should a penalty be put on girls serving behind a bar, simply to protect the gentlemen? He would remind the Premier that while older countries were far ahead of us in arts and sciences, they were also far ahead of us in vice; and if we were to keep at a respectful distance from them in the one case, we should certainly try to keep at a respectful distance from them in the other. He would vote against the amendment in order to ensure to every woman the liberty of choosing her own employment. The committee could not legislate to make them good or bad. If a woman chose the bar for her occupation, she should be allowed to do so.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. G. Throssell): The object of the mover would not be attained if the new clause were agreed to as it stood; for, admitting that the evils of the drink traffic might be lessened by doing away with barmaids, yet the member for Albany might qualify his new clause by stating that, if a woman or a servant was specially hired for the purpose of serving out drinks, it would render the publican liable to a fine of £20. Hon. members in discussing the question

had only large towns in view. While he sympathised with the member for Albany, he thought many hardships would occur to people in the country if they passed the clause. If the hon. member pressed his clause to a division, he (the Commissioner) would vote with him.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The liquor business had in it something which appeared to him to be of a degrading character. At the very start they looked on it as a business which must be subjected to licenses and restrictions. It was not a free business, nor were the persons engaged in it permitted to be free in any respect. All countries regulated and controlled the drink traffic, so that it was lifted out of the sphere of those businesses in which absolute freedom was claimed. They looked on it as a dangerous business. It must be hedged round with restrictions of every kind, and the new clause only placed further restrictions on the business. They compelled the publican to build a certain house. They restricted his hours, and they dealt from the very start by restricting him in every way; and surely it was within the province of Parliament to further restrict persons engaged in the traffic. He had been a commercial traveller for many years, and positively lived for 10 years of his life in hotels of every kind and every class. He had had the opportunity at all hours of going into these hotels, and the opinion he had formed was that in bars they found the average woman. He did not think they had any reason to suppose that in this particular class of life there were more persons of an inferior character than in any other rank of employment. The question which seemed to press heavily on the minds of some hon. members was, what was to become of the barmaids? He had no particular liking for any occupation for ladies outside all homely pursuits, but the liquor business was about the last into which he thought women should intrude. If we took the women out of the bars, we would have to put men in to do the business; and if the publicans paid the men as they ought to pay them, the barmen would be able to marry the barmaids. He did not think it would be right to pass this Bill, and say that on the 31st December the barmaids should cease to be employed. There

should either be a time limit or a personal limit. What he meant by a personal limit was that the barmaids already engaged should obtain a license to remain in the business so long as they pleased, but that no further licenses should be issued to women to act as barmaids. The Premier had spoken definitely as to the practice in other parts of the world. If he (Mr. Illingworth) was correctly informed, there were no barmaids in the United States of America—at any rate, not in the saloons—and surely the United States were a good model for Australia in a social question such as this. He had travelled extensively on the continent of Europe, and never saw a barmaid; in fact, there were no bars there, as we knew them, for the hotels existed mainly for the accommodation of travellers; and even if they had bars, men and not women took charge of them. If, as the Premier had suggested, we should take a lesson from older countries, yet there were no barmaids in Paris, a place where ladies had a very special preference given to them. But this colony, and the Australian colonies generally, were in a position to lead the rest of the world on this question, rather than to follow. He knew the Premier was of opinion that no good thing could come out of Nazareth, and would not adopt a suggestion from the Opposition side of the House; but he (Mr. Illingworth) would nevertheless submit a few points from a paper which he had read at a conference on the liquor laws, held in Perth on the 25th April, 1895, which dealt with the whole problem, including the questions of barmaids and the adulteration of liquor. In arguing that the remedy for these evils was State ownership and State control, he had stated at the conference these points:—

My scheme is to my mind particularly applicable to Western Australia, in this its early history, with its vast future prospects. Though involving a great and vital change of policy, it may be expressed in a few simple propositions. (1.) The State to borrow sufficient money at 4 per cent., with a sinking fund of 2 per cent. This would pay off the loan in about 25 years (I estimate one million for Western Australia). With this money purchase all licensed houses at a fair valuation, to be fixed on an equitable basis by State valuers; and issue no more licenses. (2.) Establish a Government bond and an excise department with a Minister at its head, to control the whole traffic. All alcoholic liquors

imported to pass through this bond, and all liquors manufactured to pass under the surveillance of this department and to receive a special excise brand, which shall specify quality and guarantee purity. (3.) Make it a criminal offence to have in possession any liquor which has not received this excise brand and is not of standard purity. (4.) The excise department to take control of all existing hotels, and to open and maintain suitable houses for public convenience where and when required; such houses to pay not less than 10 per cent. on their cost over and above expenses; and to provide primarily suitable conveniences of food and shelter for man and beast. (5.) Wherever practicable, appoint present landlords as managers of the houses purchased. Make them, and all the necessary staff, civil servants. (6.) Make it imperative that every State hotel shall pay at least 10 per cent. upon its original cost, over and above the expenses of its management and the cost of its maintenance. This 10 per cent. to be allotted thus: 4 per cent. interest, 2 per cent. sinking fund, and 4 per cent. towards cost of excise department. All profits over 10 per cent. to be devoted to the maintenance of hospitals and benevolent institutions, or (if you will) to go into the general revenue. (7.) Close and sell every hotel which does not pay at least 10 per cent. Add proceeds to the sinking fund, or appropriate them to the erection of hotels in new districts. The failure to pay 10 per cent. to be deemed evidence that such hotel is not a public necessity. On the other hand, erect and open suitable houses when desired, and when the public demand seems to guarantee an income above expenses of not less than 10 per cent. Under this, the local option principle would have full scope. To close a hotel would be to cease to patronise it.

There could be only two reasons for the employment of women in bars. One was that their labour was cheaper than that of men, and the other that they were able to turn over more business. But the liquor trade, far from being deserving of encouragement at the hands of the State, was a dangerous business; and this motion proposed to take away one of its principal attractions. The fact that there was a license gave the right to restrict; and it was quite within the province of Parliament to restrict the trade in the way proposed.

MR. GREGORY: No doubt the drink trade to a certain extent had degrading results; but it was surely not intended by the member for Albany that the wife of a lessee should be prevented from serving in her husband's bar. The employment of girls had a refining influence on the trade. The bad language heard in bars

where men were employed was not heard in bars where women were engaged. Harm was done to a greater extent to girls employed in large factories than to girls employed in bars; and it was difficult to see what could be done with the barmaids if this clause were passed.

MR. KENNY: The question was simply whether the committee were justified in depriving a large number of female colonists from earning their living. He could not see that Parliament was justified in taking such a step although, he was in sympathy with the desire of the mover.

MR. SIMPSON: The Premier's suggestions were reactionary, as they usually were in regard to matters of domestic legislation. The Premier, however, was a little unhappy in his assertion about the United States, where there was in fact a combination to abolish the system of barmaids.

THE PREMIER said he had not mentioned the United States.

MR. SIMPSON: Surely the Parliament of this colony, composed of men gathered from all parts of the world, would not say that the pursuit of selling liquor improved a woman.

THE PREMIER said he had not stated that the pursuit did improve a woman.

MR. SIMPSON: If the pursuit did not improve a woman, what did it do?

MR. DOWERTY: It improved the purchaser.

MR. SIMPSON: There were many respectable women behind bars, and he had never met one of these who did not detest the traffic. The liquor trade was developing new features; and it might have a certain amount of political influence with the Treasury bench.

THE PREMIER: Bad motives should not be imputed.

MR. SIMPSON: A barmaid was a meretricious adornment to enable a publican to sell bad liquor, and to induce men to take more than they otherwise would. Girls were never found serving liquor in clubs, to which men went to satisfy their thirst, knowing they could get liquor of the best quality, and they then went about their business. The member for West Kimberley had said he looked upon women as quite as capable and courageous as men. That opinion

the hon. member would be asked to indorse when the question of women's franchise came before the House. The suggestion of the Premier, that the legislation now proposed had not been carried in other parts of the world, was no argument why it should not be adopted in Australia, where the ballot, the eight hours' system, and other reforms had been initiated. Up to the present, the Government benches, from which the opposition to this new clause seemed largely to come, had failed to adduce satisfactory reasons why this amendment in the law should not be carried. In many country places the wife and daughter assisted in the bar, and this was in certain cases necessary. Provision could be made in the new clause for permitting this to be done; but so far as the general proposition was concerned, he was of opinion that the barmaid difficulty, as it occurred in the large and populous parts of the empire, was a distinct menace to civilisation. In many cases barmaids were compelled to submit to a species of white slavery, by the exigencies of their position. He had no knowledge of the extreme evil life suggested by some extremely intemperate people associated with temperance societies; but he was satisfied, from his own experience, that in earning their living at this pursuit, the moral nature of these women was gradually depraved. While he was of opinion that barmaids should not be allowed in hotels, the existing contracts should be recognised, and the committee should not deprive a girl of the means of livelihood she at present possessed.

MR. CONOLLY: Full consideration had hardly been given to the fact that there was a great pressure felt for employment by women throughout the world. Women were competing with men in almost every walk of life, and in a large number of cases were being driven to employments infinitely more degrading than serving liquor. Then we had always to face the question whether, by preventing girls from serving behind bars, we would not be inducing them to take a lower step instead of a higher one. If it were intended to improve the status of women employed behind bars, this would be a benefit to the women; and it would be more to the point for the State

to appoint inspectors to go round the hotels and see the manner in which these women were treated by the landlords, and the accommodation that was provided for them. Furthermore, a measure might be introduced providing that these girls should be allowed to work only eight hours a day. Looking at both sides of the question, he would be inclined to support the new clause, provided it was modified to allow barmaids at present employed in hotels to retain their position.

MR. JAMES said his amendment to the clause provided for that.

MR. WALLACE: Looking at the question seriously, he could not understand how anyone with the experience of the member for Albany could bring such a motion forward. The remarks of the Premier went to prove that barmaids were necessary to attend to the comfort of people who sought accommodation at hotels. The member for Albany spoke of the demoralising influence the bar had upon women.

MR. LEAKE: Never said anything of the kind.

MR. WALLACE: Was there a greater proportion of bad girls in bars than in any other occupation? Bar girls had to work long hours, so had the girls employed in tea rooms and restaurants.

MR. LYALL HALL opposed the new clause because it interfered with the liberty of the subject. This was a step in the direction of what was known as grandmotherly legislation. The desire of some hon. members to legislate in favour of some occupation or business seemed to be so great that we might well sometimes forget we were a free people living in a free colony. The fact of girls being employed in bars was an encouragement to men to visit hotels and drink perhaps a little more than they otherwise would do. But there were other considerations which had been fairly expressed already. Being in a bar did not tend to elevate a girl's mind. But whose fault was that? It was the want of legislation to stop men using filthy or foul language in bars. We ought to have legislation to put down filthy language in the streets as well as in the bars. If we turned out of employment all the barmaids, what were these women to do? The avenues of light employment were so

limited that he would not curtail that employment. Mention had been made as to limiting the time or the contracts. If that were done, he felt sure that on the following day there would be 2,000 or 3,000 more barmaids engaged at a nominal salary. He would like to see the hon. member for Albany withdraw his proposed new clause.

MR. MONGER: The hon. member for Albany had not submitted a reasonable argument in introducing his new clause. If this was a specimen of the kind of legislation which the member for Albany desired to place on the statute book, it was to be hoped that the elevation of that gentleman to the position of Premier of the colony would be long delayed. Was it not better to be waited on by women rather than by the class of men usually to be found in bars?

None ever yet despised the sex
Who had not wronged it first.

MR. VOSPER, in personal explanation, said the method of debate by misrepresentation was one of the lowest forms of discussion which could be adopted; and yet it seemed to be the stock-in-trade of those who opposed this amendment. He had been represented as having condemned the whole of the women engaged in bars; but nothing was further from his intention or further from his actual words. What he had said was that there were women in bars, as there were outside of them, who were good, bad, or indifferent; but that the tendency of the bar trade was to make most of them indifferent and many of them bad.

MR. QUINLAN: The member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper) complained of being misquoted, but was himself guilty of the same offence, as he had been the first to misquote in print what he (Mr. Quinlan) had said in the House a few days ago. When that misquotation was published, he (Mr. Quinlan) did not think it worth while to reply to it; but now that the hon. member complained that other members had misquoted him, this was a fitting opportunity for reminding him of his own offence in that direction.

MR. VOSPER: If that was the hon. member's reply, he was well satisfied with it.

Mr. WILSON: The principle of the new clause ought to receive support. It was the duty of members to give effect to any proposal which would tend to diminish excessive drinking, without inflicting any serious injury on the women engaged in the trade. Here, as in the old country, youths were attracted to hotels by barmaids; and the committee would be doing a good work by removing this source of temptation. He did not think any hon. member who supported this amendment would maintain that barmaids were necessarily bad women; but it was undeniable that their occupation did not tend to elevate them.

Mr. LEAKE: Some hon. members had not scrupled to misrepresent what he, and those who were with him, had said, by accusing them of stigmatising barmaids as a class of bad women. He indignantly denied the impeachment. No word had passed his lips which would justify any member in coming to that conclusion; and it was unmanly and unparliamentary to make such a suggestion. Had there been any doubt in his mind as to the necessity of the new clause, that doubt was now entirely removed by the arguments of those opposed to the new clause. Misrepresentation, when no other course was open, had been readily adopted by opponents of the clause; and while the clause had been treated as a matter requiring serious consideration, yet what might be called a demoralising argument had been used against it. It was said that if barmaids were shut out from their calling they would go a step lower. He had never made use of that argument, the benefit of which he left to those who had thought fit to put it forward. The most solid argument against the proposal was that, by its adoption, a certain number of persons would be deprived of actual employment. He admitted the force of that argument, and recognising its consequences, he accepted the amendment of the member for East Perth for recognising existing contracts, with a system of registration and license. This amendment to the clause would secure the support of the hon. member for West Perth (Mr. Wood) and the member for North Murchison (Mr. Kenny). None of the girls at present employed would be deprived of what was admitted to be a legiti-

mate means of livelihood. The majority of the girls were imported from other colonies, where they had been in the business. The new clause, as amended, could prejudicially affect only those girls who now contemplated coming to this colony for employment in bars. No solid argument remained against the new clause, now that existing contracts had been recognised. In submitting the clause, he was not attacking any class of women.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piessie): The new clause should be supported for the reason that, while very little good might be done on the present occasion, it was a step in the right direction. No doubt the adoption of the clause would mean hardship to several classes of people, and in the first instance to the girls who would be thrown out of employment. He agreed with the suggestion that some time should be allowed before the new provision came into operation. The clause would, no doubt, be rejected on a division, but there had been a public gain in the discussion of the question.

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

New clause (Mr. Leake's), as amended, put and division taken, with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	14
Majority against ...			5

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Conolly	Mr. Doherty
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Ewing
Mr. James	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Leake	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Throssell	Mr. Hall
Mr. Wilson	Mr. Hooley
Mr. Wood	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Vosper (Teller).	Mr. Monger
	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Hubble (Teller).

New clause thus negatived.

On the motion of Mr. LEAKE, progress was reported and leave given to sit again.

MOTION—PLANS AND REPORTS *RE* WATER SITE NEAR COOLGARDIE.

Mr. LEAKE (for Mr. Illingworth), in accordance with notice, moved, That there be laid upon the table of the House the plans and reports of a water site near

Coolgardie, prepared by Messrs. Noel Brazier, Grant, and Atkinson in 1894.

Put and passed.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

IMPORTED LABOUR REGISTRY BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

WIDTH OF TIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by MR. QUINLAN, and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER moved that the House, at its rising, do adjourn until the next Wednesday.

Put and passed.

The House adjourned at 11:27 p.m. until the next Wednesday (Tuesday being a public holiday).

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 10th November, 1897.

Message: Assent to Bill—Paper Presented—Question: Fremantle new Reservoir—Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill; first reading—Local Courts Evidence Bill; first reading—Dog Act Amendment Bill; second reading—Registration of Firms Bill; in committee—Companies Act Amendment Bill; second reading; Bill referred to Select Committee—Excess Bill, 1896; first reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE—ASSENT TO BILL.

A message from the Governor was received and read, stating that he had assented to the Perth Gas Company's Act Further Amendment Bill (private).

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER OF MINES: Report of the Education Department for 1896.

QUESTION—FREMANTLE NEW RESERVOIR.

HON. A. KIDSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines:—1. When the Government expected that the town of Fremantle would obtain the benefit of the water from the new reservoir; and 2. When the reticulation in connection with the new reservoir at Fremantle would be completed.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied:—1. The new reservoir having been completed, pipe laying will be well advanced and probably finished by end of January. 2. There may be some slight delay in the reticulation, owing to the loss of the ship "Helenslea," which had on board a consignment of valves and other fittings for the work, but a fresh supply was cabled for, and the makers state that they will expedite shipment.

BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1892, AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the HON. A. B. KIDSON, and read a first time.

LOCAL COURTS EVIDENCE BILL.

Introduced by the HON. A. B. KIDSON, and read a first time.

DOG ACT, 1883, AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): In moving the second reading of this Bill, few words from me will suffice to explain it. It is an exceedingly simple Bill, to amend the Dog Act of 1883. It is proposed that the Bill shall come into force on 1st December, 1897. The principle of the Bill is simply that, outside of municipalities, the roads board shall have the power of collecting the dog tax and using the fees for their own purposes. That is the gist of the