

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 26th July, 1898.

Papers presented—Question: M'Phee v. Commissioner of Railways—Question: New Guinea Land Alienation, and Protests by Governments—Lodgers' Goods Protection Bill, third reading—Prevention of Crimes Bill; motion for recommitment—Rivers Pollution Bill; in Committee, clause 2—Early Closing Bill; second reading, Division (casting vote)—Supply (Revenue and Loans) Bill, £850,000; first reading—Shipping Casualties Inquiry Bill, first reading—Interpretation Bill, first reading—Crown Suits Bill, first reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY:—1, Correspondence re Loan of £20,000 to Perth Municipal Council, as ordered. 2, By-laws of the Coolgardie, Fremantle, and Perth Municipalities. 3, Postmaster General's Report, 1897. 4, Statement showing estimated and actual Revenue and Expenditure, and a comparison between the estimated and actual expenditure from General Loan Fund, for the year ended 30th June, 1898. 5, Victoria Public Library, Report for 1897-8. 6, Agricultural Bank, Report of operations for 1897-8.

Ordered to lie on the table.

QUESTION: M'PHEE V. COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS.

HON. F. T. CROWDER, on behalf of the Hon. H. G. Parsons, asked the Colonial Secretary,—1, If it was a fact that a person named M'Phee recovered a judgment in the court at Coolgardie against the Commissioner of Railways, some few weeks ago. 2, If the judgment had been satisfied. 3, If it had not been satisfied, what excuse was there for refusing to pay.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) replied:—1, Yes, it is a fact.

2, Yes, the judgment has been satisfied.
3, See replies to questions 1 and 2.

QUESTION: NEW GUINEA LAND ALIENATION, AND PROTESTS BY GOVERNMENTS.

HON. F. M. STONE, on behalf of the Hon. A. G. Jenkins, asked the Colonial Secretary,—1, If the Government had taken any steps in joining the Governments of Victoria and South Australia, in protesting against the proposed handing over by the Administrator of New Guinea of 250,000 acres in that colony to an English syndicate. 2, If not, was it their intention to do so.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) replied:—1, The Government have not taken any steps thus far. 2, The Government do not, as at present advised, intend to do so.

LODGERS' GOODS PROTECTION BILL.

Read a third time, on the motion of Hon. F. M. Stone, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

PREVENTION OF CRIMES BILL.

MOTION FOR RECOMMITTAL.

On the order of the day for the third reading of the Bill,

HON. F. M. STONE moved that the Bill be recommitment for the purpose of moving an amendment in clause 1, in line 5, that the word "seven" be struck out, and the word "two" inserted in lieu thereof; also in clause 2, that after the word "jurisdiction," in the third line, the words "and a previous conviction and sentence of imprisonment in the colony of not less than two months be proved against him" be inserted.

HON. W. T. LOTON asked that the amendments be placed before hon. members in print before being discussed. This was an important Bill, and it had not had a long consideration. There was no particular necessity to hurry the measure, and, personally, he would like to see the amendments before they were proposed.

HON. F. M. STONE, by leave, altered his motion to read, "That the consideration in Committee be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House."

Put and passed.

RIVERS POLLUTION BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Consideration in Committee resumed.

Clause 2: Prohibition as to putting solid matters into streams:

HON. F. M. STONE: When this Bill was under consideration in Committee previously, the Hon. J. W. Hackett suggested that the definition of the word "stream," in sub-clause 7, might prevent the refuse from steamers being thrown into the river at Fremantle. He (Mr. Stone) now moved, as an amendment, that the following words be added to the sub-clause: "and shall not include that portion of the River Swan between North Fremantle Bridge and the sea." That would exclude the harbour at Fremantle from the operation of the Bill.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There were other points involved, to which attention was drawn when the Bill was previously before the Committee. One of these had been met by Mr. Stone, but there were some others left unsolved. The estuary of the Swan River presented difficulties of a pressing character, both in regard to its condition now and the improvements and developments which would be needed at no distant date. The object might be best served by reporting progress, and he moved accordingly.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) said he did not understand the drift of the amendments. It was extremely undesirable to allow people on ships to throw rubbish into the harbour at Fremantle. Provision ought to be made to land all rubbish on the wharves, and then have it carted away; otherwise, an injurious state of things would arise in the harbour, especially where there was very little tide, and this state of things might prevail to such extent as to require further dredging.

HON. F. M. STONE suggested that the Bill might be considered in Committee as far as clause 7, on which the question raised by Mr. Hackett could be threshed out. He made this suggestion with a view of meeting the objections raised by Mr. Hackett, although he (Mr. Stone) was rather in favour of the Bill as drafted. Otherwise it would be found that the harbour at Fremantle would be used to such an extent, in the way of throwing rubbish

into it, that there would have to be a special Bill.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It would be within the recollection of hon. members that he had drawn attention to the case of watercourses which were nearly dry in all parts of the year, but from which much water from the mines and water other than that raised by drainage was allowed to flow; also, the drainage from farms and stockyards and the washings from scourings of wool would be prohibited by the Bill as it stood. It was to allow members time to consider these matters that he had moved for progress to be reported.

HON. F. M. STONE said he had no objection to the whole matter being threshed out thoroughly, and that could be done on clause 7. He would ask Mr. Hackett to withdraw the motion.

Motion—that progress be reported—put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

EARLY CLOSING BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed on the motion of the Hon. A. B. KIDSON for the second reading of the Bill.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I desire to congratulate Mr. Kidson on the able way in which he has placed his side of the question before hon. members. At the same time, I regret exceedingly that the ability he displayed on the occasion was not kept for a better cause. To my mind, this Bill is a gross interference with the liberty of the subject; and, moreover, is class legislation of the worst kind. When a similar Bill was under consideration during last session in this House, I moved that it be read that day six months; and that Bill, after debate, was thrown out. I take exception to the principle of this Bill, as I did to the principle of the former one; and, seeing that the principle of a measure cannot be altered in Committee, I intend to move later that the word "now" be struck out of the motion and "this day six months" inserted in lieu thereof. I trust members will give most careful consideration to the arguments I intend to bring in support of my contention, and I am sure if

they do that they will be found voting on my side in the division. Mr. Kidson said it was utterly impossible to obtain the relief sought for in any other way than by the Bill he proposed. I was greatly struck by the remark, and after careful consideration I came to the conclusion that Mr. Kidson had allowed his kindness of heart to warp his better judgment. What does Mr. Kidson ask for? His contention is that assistants in shops work too long hours, and to get over that he brings in a Bill to close shops irrespective of whether those shops employ assistants. With all due deference to the learned member's opinion, the proper way would be to introduce a Bill limiting the hours of labour worked by employees in shops. There is a great deal of difference between the two proposals. In the first instance, the Bill introduced by Mr. Kidson distinctly says to the shopkeeper "You are deterred from using the brains and energy with which the Almighty has endowed you; no matter whether times are hard and you are unable to pay your rent, still you must close, because the wealthier shopkeeper does not desire competition." Now my proposal would be to say to the shopkeeper: "You are at perfect liberty to use what energy and brains the Almighty has endowed you with, but, when it comes to a question of using the ability and energy of other men, then you shall only use the energy and ability of these men for a certain number of hours per day." I feel sure members will agree that my proposal is the most proper one, and offers the most dignified way in which the House can legislate on the question. This Bill to my mind is one of social legislation. The Legislative Council of this colony is not the place in which such a Bill should be originated. Being social legislation, the measure should have originated in another place. Mr. Kidson, during his remarks, called attention to the petition that he laid on the table of the House. He was very pronounced in stating that the signatures to that petition represented—I hope members will remember the words—the unanimous opinion of people in Perth and Fremantle that the Bill should become law.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I said the petition was unanimous.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The petition is nothing without the signatures.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I only want to call your attention to the point. I could not make such a foolish remark.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I am only quoting a remark which appeared in *Hansard*, where the hon. member is reported as stating it was the unanimous wish that this Bill should become law. I ask hon. members to analyse for a moment what that unanimous wish is. In the first instance, this petition, representing Perth and Fremantle, is signed by 687 signatories. There are in Perth and Fremantle at the present moment, so far as I can gather from careful inquiries, something like 850 shops, employing thousands of assistants. Of the 687 signatures only 70 are *bona-fide* signatures of shopkeepers, merchants, and others. That was the result of eight months of hard labour and the holding of meetings.

HON. W. T. LOTON: What are the other signatories—employees?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Employees who have arrogated to themselves the signing of the petition. It is very hard to find out from the petition who are business men and who are assistants.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I would point out to the hon. member that the two petitions are totally distinct, and purposely so.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: There is nothing in the petition showing whether a man is an assistant or not. Each man signs himself as a grocer or an ironmonger or something else, and it is not said that he is an assistant. So far as I can find out, there are only about 70 *bona-fide* signatures of shopkeepers and storekeepers; and of the 70 signatures over 40 are the signatures of merchants and well-to-do storekeepers, who do not in any way desire competition. I therefore ask hon. members to put the signatures out of mind altogether. Mr. Kidson further on said he had made a careful study of the Bill, and that from the knowledge he had gained he was perfectly prepared to say that the measure was one which could be worked beneficially by any class of people, and one which the House would be thoroughly justified in passing. I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman,

and say that the knowledge he has gained could only have been gained in a high-class solicitor's business, such as the hon. gentleman represents. If this Bill is passed, the hon. gentleman will see that it will close shops irrespective of whether the owners of shops employ labour or not, and it will ruin scores of shopkeepers. Not only does the Bill close shops at 6 o'clock, whether the shopkeeper employs labour or not, but it will close shops for half a day on one day of the week. I claim to have a better opportunity and a better chance of knowing the wishes of business people in connection with the Bill than the hon. member, and I ask hon. members of this House to believe me when I say that the provisions of this Bill, if they come into force, will do a great amount of harm. I will ask my hon. friend, who is nothing if he is not just, whether he considers it is fair and straightforward to thousands of people who have invested their all in taking up a shop on the understanding that they could trade as long as they liked, provided that they kept within the four corners of the law, to spring upon these people this Bill. These people are not lovers of hard work, but they keep their shops open because they cannot live without the long hours. Is such a measure fair and just to them? The hon. member must be aware that on the goldfields the whole of the mines are working for 24 hours—they work by shifts of eight hours each. According to my friend's argument, it is impossible to work for more than eight hours a day, and, if that were so, all these mines would have to be closed down at 6 o'clock. But what is carried out in connection with mines can be carried out at Perth and Fremantle in regard to shops. As to this Bill, I do not know where my friend took it from, but, as far as I can find out, there is only one Australian colony and New Zealand where such a Bill is in force. So far as the New Zealand Act is concerned—and New Zealand is the home of social legislation—

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Progressive legislation.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The New Zealand Bill practically says, if it is desired that shops should be closed, let us close them all; and the Legislature there has closed all the shops indiscriminately, ex-

cept chemists' shops. Clause 3 of the Bill before us says:—

The provisions of sections seven to ten of this Act shall not apply to shopkeepers of shops, or to shops or premises included in the First Schedule to this Act.

And the first schedule in this Bill mentions chemists' and druggists' shops, tea and coffee houses, fish and oyster shops, shops for the sale of toilet and medical and surgical requisites, confectioners' shops, licensed tobacconists, restaurants, news agents, stationers, and booksellers' shops, undertakers' shops, florists' shops, and hotels. To show what class legislation this Bill is composed of, this measure distinctly says that the trader who employs assistants in his shop, who, I contend, are not in any way overworked, shall not remain in his employ after 6 o'clock; yet the Bill provides that the owner of a tea and coffee house, or a confectionery shop, where a large number of females are employed, can be kept open for 18 hours a day. If assistants in drapers' shops are not allowed to work more than eight hours a day, then why should assistants be allowed to work for longer hours than in the shops enumerated under the first schedule? The New Zealand Act went straight to the point, and closed all shops, but my hon. friend has given us in the schedule here a dozen different businesses which are not bound to close at 6 o'clock. The latter part of clause 3 provides that—

If any shopkeeper shall in any such shop also carry on any such business of the class usually carried on in shops not so included, then in every such case the provisions of this Act shall apply to such shop.

This really means that the proprietors of one-half those shops mentioned in the first schedule will have to dispose of the best paying portion of their business. Take, for instance, a tobacconist: he does not rely on the sale of cigars and tobacco. Anyone who likes to look in at a tobacconist shop will see that there are offered for sale knives and cutlery, and various classes of goods, which will come under the provisions of this Bill. This portion of the business will have to be disposed of, or the shopkeeper will have to say that he will not sell these goods after 6 o'clock, and we know what this means. Clause 5 gives the Governor power to define other districts besides the metropolitan districts of Perth and Fremantle and Cool-

gardie and Kalgoorlie, as districts wherein the Bill can come into operation. I say that I strongly object to that power being given to the Governor—I know it means Governor-in-Council. If the Bill is to deal with any districts at all, let it deal with the three districts named herein only. If other districts are to be included afterwards, a short measure can be introduced so as to include them in the operations of the Bill. This measure gives power not to include fresh districts, but the Governor may proclaim certain districts and grant different hours, and, if it is so desired, the Governor can allow shops in newly-proclaimed districts to be kept open from 6 o'clock in the morning till 7 o'clock in the evening. May I tell hon. members what took place in Adelaide nine or ten years ago? It was voluntarily agreed by shopkeepers in the leading streets of Adelaide—they were then keeping open until 9 o'clock in the evening—that every six months they would reduce the time by half an hour until they reached the hour of 6 o'clock; they did this, and brought the hour for closing to 6 o'clock. You have only to say to an Englishman "You shall not have this," or "You shall not have that," and he will long for it. You have only to say "You shall not trade after six o'clock," and he will do so. The English people will do here what some of the good people did in Adelaide. They went into the suburbs, and although the main streets of the city were discarded in the evening, the trade still went on in the suburbs just the same, and there was a promenade there. The rent of shops came down in the city, but that did not bring the trade back. A great deal of the trade that went to the suburbs remained there. This will take place as far as Perth is concerned. It takes threepence to ride to Subiaco. As a rule a wife desires to do her shopping in the evening, accompanied by her husband, and the evening is the only time within the 24 hours that a husband has to go out with his wife. The husband and wife will go to Subiaco to shop, and the trade of Perth will go to the suburbs. If the suburbs are included in the Bill, what is there to stop tradespeople going outside the city boundaries? What is to prevent their going to the other side of Brisbane-street, where the

roads are nicely macadamised and well lighted, and starting their business there? Clause 7 says:—

All shops within the Metropolitan, Coolgardie, and Kalgoorlie districts shall be closed every evening of the week at the hour of six o'clock in the evening until eight o'clock the following morning, and all shops within districts proclaimed after the passing of this Act shall be closed every evening of the week at the hour or hours fixed by the Minister, and proclaimed for such districts respectively, until eight o'clock the following morning; provided that any shopkeeper whose shop shall be closed on the half-holiday proclaimed under the provisions of this Act may keep his shop open on Saturday evenings up to the hour of ten o'clock.

I would like to point out—although this is only supposition on my part, but I think it will bear weight—what is likely to happen. We will take it that a man and his family have been away for a holiday; they arrive in Perth by the 6 o'clock train and the shops are shut; their house has been shut up for several weeks, and they find that they are short of candles and provisions, and, unless they can induce a shopkeeper to run the risk of paying a penalty of £10, they cannot get what they want. I cannot see how this Legislative Council, which claims to be a conservative body, can pass such legislation.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: This is the most liberal Legislative Council in the world.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: It is if it passes this Bill. Clause 8 provides that "Every shop shall be closed for half a day at least on one working day in each week." Is not this class legislation? It does not state that every shopkeeper who employs labour shall close at 6 o'clock, but that shops must close at 6 o'clock every day of the week, and for half a day one day of the week.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It says a whole day, in the Bill.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The clause says "shall be closed for half a day at least on one working day in each week."

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It is badly expressed.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Clause 9 says:—

If any shop assistant be employed or allowed to be or remain in any shop on any day later than three-quarters of an hour after the hours fixed for closing by section seven of this Act, or by proclamation, or after the hour of one

forty-five p.m. in the afternoon on the half-holiday proclaimed as aforesaid, or, subject as hereinafter provided, earlier than the hour of eight o'clock in the morning, the shopkeeper shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five pounds for each offence.

I will ask those who are business men, if I am not correct in saying that this is the position in which the shopkeeper will be placed; that the Governor proclaims, say, Wednesday as the day on which the half-holiday shall take place according to the Bill; and the shops must be closed on that half day. Supposing, as often happens, that a traveller on the goldfields sends down an order to a business house, saying that the order must be shipped by such and such a goods train at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and failing that, the order will be off. It may be impossible to get the order ready by 1.45, the time at which the shop has to close.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Retail houses do not have travellers.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: That is all you know about it. The shopkeeper cannot say to his workpeople, "If you work this afternoon I will give you half a day to-morrow." He cannot do that, but must turn all his employees out or be liable to a fine of £10. Take another case: Steamers travel up the river with goods from Fremantle; a steamer arrives here on a wet afternoon, and the steamship owners give notice to a shopkeeper that a consignment of goods has arrived for him and is ready for delivery, or will be placed on the wharf. The employer cannot ask his men, except under the penalty of a fine, to take the goods from the steamer. The goods must stop on the wharf all the afternoon and all night in the rain and be destroyed. It may be said that the shopkeeper could employ a carter, but if a man employs a carter, how can he get his goods into the shop, if the shop is closed? The Bill is ridiculous. There is another thing I wish to point out in regard to the clause I was just speaking about, which says, "Provided that shop assistants engaged in or about dairies and butchers' and bakers' shops may be employed before the hour of 8 o'clock in the morning." If this class legislation applies to butchers and bakers, why should it not apply to fruiterers and vegetable shops? The vegetable man

and the fruiterer have to take orders in the morning the same as the butcher. The latter part of clause 12 says:

If any shopkeeper, hotelkeeper, or wholesale merchant, or commission agent shall not arrange for every such shop assistant, clerk, or employee to take one such half-holiday in any week, he shall be liable for every such offence to a penalty not exceeding five pounds.

Why does not my friend go further and include bank clerks?—not that I wish to insinuate that bank clerks should be included in the Bill—I say they should not. This House has no right to interfere with a Bank any more than with business shops and commission agents' shops. I may say here that this Bill provides for the employment of inspectors, which means more rosy billets for the friends of those in power; it also means a great deal more taxation for those who have to pay the taxes. This Bill gives power to examine orally any shop assistant, either alone or in company with the occupier or his agent; to enter, inspect, and examine at all reasonable times a shop when open for or apparently carrying on business.

I may be paying a man 1s. 6d. an hour, and an inspector comes along and takes this man away from his work, and examines him in my time when I am paying him this 1s. 6d. an hour. Then there is clause 17—poor shopkeeper!—it says:

In every shop there shall be kept by the shopkeeper a record of the trading name of the shopkeeper; a record of the hours during which the shop is kept open; a record of the hours during which the shop assistants are kept at work; a record of the extra hours worked under section nine; and a record of the day or days on which the assistants and employees are entitled to a half-holiday under the provisions of section twelve. Such records shall be exposed in some position visible and accessible to all employees and assistants.

My friends, the Hon. G. Randell and the Hon. A. B. Kidson, both stated that this only meant the making out of a sheet once a week, and posting it up in the shop. The owner of the shop would have to make out a new sheet every day. A record of the extra work in every shop would have to be made out, and some assistant or other has to work extra hours daily, and unless a record is kept the shopkeeper will be liable to a penalty of £20. This is simply placing extra burdens on the shopkeeper. Clause 19 is another beautiful provision, and shows

to what extent my friend would carry this class legislation. It says :

No person, company, association, or partnership carrying on or conducting the trade or business of a barber or hairdresser, or in the charge or management thereof, shall employ or allow to remain in the shop or premises wherein such trade or business is carried on, any employee or assistant later than seven-thirty o'clock in the evening on the week days (except on Saturdays).

And so on. A barber can get rid of his assistants at 7.30, but the barber's shop can be kept open till 12 o'clock at night—all night if the owner likes—and the barber can keep on working. If it is right that a barber can keep his shop open all night, why not allow every shopkeeper who does not employ assistants to do the same? There is no reason whatever. If it is equitable that a barber should be allowed to dispense with his assistants at half-past seven o'clock, and to keep on working himself, surely the small shopkeeper, who does not employ labour, should have the same privilege. I hope the clause in reference to tobacconists will be withdrawn.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: You need not trouble about that.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I agree with my hon. friend that tobacconists should be licensed; and I hope he will bring in a Bill to enable this to be done. At the present moment, half the alleged tobacconists' shops are houses of ill-fame, and the other half are covers for "tote" shops, which induce boys and children to put their sixpences on races. I hope these tobacconists' shops will be licensed, so that only *bona-fide* tobacconists will be allowed to trade. Clause 22, sub-clause 5, says:

Where a shop assistant or employee is, in the opinion of the court, of the age alleged by the informant, it shall lie on the defendant to prove that such shop assistant is not of that age.

It seems that it will be necessary that before a shopkeeper can employ a shop assistant, he must demand that the assistant produce a certificate of birth. Passing away from the Bill altogether, and coming back to the reasons stated by my hon. friend in moving the second reading of this Bill, which was to stop the overworking of assistants in shops—

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I gave two reasons.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The true reason for bringing forward this Bill—and if hon. members will read through the hon. member's speech they will see it—is the desire of the large storekeepers to stifle competition and stop the Chinese from trading. I give no weight to the first reason, and I ask hon. members to do the same. Competition is the soul of trade, and by it the working classes in this colony are enabled to get the common necessities of life at a reasonable price. As to the shops kept by Chinese, I may say I have no more love for the Chinaman than any other hon. member has, but I will not go so far as to say that the Chinamen live on the smell of an oil-rag. That may have been their diet, with a few grains of rice thrown in, in the country they came from, but their mixing with Europeans has evidently increased their appetite. One of my informants tells me that the high price paid for fowls is due to the Chinamen requiring so many. I have no wish to see Asiatics brought into competition with Europeans in trade. Although I have no desire to see this competition, at the same time I shall ask hon. members, is it fair or just to bring in a Bill which will ruin no end of their fellow-countrymen, so that in a round-about way we may get at the foreigner? If the hon. member in charge of the Bill is earnest in his desire to deal with this question, let him bring forward a Bill to deal with the Chinese shopkeeper; let him bring in a Bill that in a certain time no Asiatic should be allowed to trade in Western Australia; let him say that in a certain time—after five years—no Asiatic should trade here.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Will you support it?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I will. I say that is the only honest way of dealing with the question. It will enable these shopkeepers to sell out. Asiatics no doubt should not compete with Europeans, but Europeans are so easy going that, if things are allowed to go on as they are going, in time the Europeans will be working for the Chinaman. If a Chinaman had to look for all his business to his fellow countrymen, the shops kept by Chinese would have been closed long ago. We should remember this when talking upon this subject, that the very people who

hound the Chinese down, and three-fourths of those who signed the petition in support of this Bill, support the Chinamen. Go to Barrack-street any day, and you will see the shops kept by Chinese crowded, and people waiting to be served.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Before six o'clock?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: At any time, and they are not poor people who go there, but the aristocratic people with their carriages waiting outside. Alongside those shops kept by Chinese are establishments occupied by Europeans, more pretentious, but you seldom see people in them. One of the main reasons which the hon. gentleman relied upon in support of this Bill was that in a former session a similar measure to the one before the House passed through another place without division. How many times have we heard the hon. member, when the Minister in charge of the Government business in this House has relied upon the same argument, point out that that was no argument in support of the particular subject then being discussed? Both the Hon. A. B. Kidson and the leader for the Government in this House made a touching appeal to hon. members who represent outside constituencies, not to vote against the Bill because it does not affect their constituencies. I am not going to be impertinent enough to tell hon. members what is their duty, but I may say that it is not the duty of this House to pass laws for any single constituency, but to pass them for the whole of the colony. Hon. members who have listened to the reasons given by the Hon. A. B. Kidson in support of the second reading of this Bill will have seen that this is the thin end of the wedge, and it will not be long before the leading cities in the different constituencies will be under the same ban, and then those hon. members will find how the Bill will work, and how their constituents like it. The same remark will apply to the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not consider that it was within my province as a member of an outside constituency to take the stand I had against the Bill. If the hon. gentleman does not know what is good for his own constituency, I think I know what is good for mine. I claim to know what is good for my constituency, and if the hon.

gentleman for a moment thinks that he is doing any good for the port of Fremantle, which he represents, by this Bill, I may tell him that he is making the biggest mistake he ever made in his life. If the Bill passes, the hon. member will find out what I say is true. Whoever knew of the chief port of a colony, with its shops closed at six o'clock in the evening? In New Zealand, the home of social legislation, the Legislature has not gone so far as that. There is a provision in the New Zealand Act which says it shall not be deemed an offence against the provisions of the Act if a shopkeeper employs any person or persons and keeps open his shop after the hour named in the Act for the purpose of supplying goods to ships. Steamers and ships are entering the port of Fremantle at all hours. Steamers come up to the wharf and discharge passengers, and the same thing will apply to the embarking of passengers. Only the other night I was at Fremantle, and 200 or 300 passengers were landed. All those persons require something. It means thousands of pounds in the course of a year which Fremantle will lose by the closing of the shops. Does the hon. member think that the steamers which are trading with Fremantle are going to put up with such legislation as this? Time is money to them; they come here late in the afternoon, and are away at daylight, and if they find the shops closed, we shall see they will bring their own supplies with them in the future, and Fremantle will lose the trade with the ships. The mere fact of the introduction of the Bill shows me that members have not truly and thoroughly considered all the difficulties of the proposed legislation. A Bill brought in to limit the hours of labour in shops would not have the evil effects to which I have referred. Under a measure of that kind a man could keep open to any hour he liked, so long as he did not work the people in his employ beyond the time prescribed. I consider it the height of madness for a member representing Fremantle to introduce a Bill closing shops at six o'clock. The Colonial Secretary, in a reference to the argument that the Bill was an interference with the liberty of the subject, stated—and I ask hon. members to carefully consider these

words as coming from the leader for the Government—

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What are you quoting from?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: *Hansard*, in which the Colonial Secretary is reported:—"If we cannot obtain the object in any other direction we are justified in taking this course." That is just the point. The Colonial Secretary says that if we cannot obtain the object desired in any other way we are justified in interfering with the liberty of the subject. I ask hon. members to carefully consider whether we cannot obtain the object desired in any other way. I say we can. The object is to limit the hours of labour—not to close shops—and that can be done. If hon. members agree with me on that point, then on the Colonial Secretary's own showing they are justified in voting for the amendment. I have already shown what is the unanimous opinion of those concerned. I have made a perfect study of this measure in all its phases, and how it affects all classes; and I make a most earnest appeal to hon. members not to do a great injustice to their own fellow-men, by voting for the measure, more especially when the object can be obtained in another way. A Bill could be introduced limiting the hours of labour in a way that could do no harm or injustice to any one, but would, on the other hand, increase trade and cheapen living, and be a means of affording further employment. I now move, as an amendment, that the word "now" be struck out, and the words "this day six months" inserted in lieu thereof.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I rise to second the amendment. I regret I was not present when Mr. Kidson introduced the Bill, but I had the pleasure of reading his remarks, and I must give him credit for having gone into the matter in a very thorough manner. There is no doubt Mr. Kidson fully believes that what he is advocating is just and right; but the more I look at the measure, the more I am convinced that it is class legislation, altogether unnecessary. Such legislation is hampering in its effects, and in all my experience I never saw a Bill bristling to such an extent with penalties. I really cannot see how a storekeeper is to get along

at all under a Bill, in nearly every clause of which is provided a penalty. A storekeeper would be liable to commit himself at any time, and eventually life would become almost a burden. I take it that the conditions embodied in the Bill are so injurious in their effects that they would eventually recoil on the employees themselves. Men would be content to carry on smaller businesses rather than be hampered with assistants who required so much law to protect them. And smaller shops, instead of decreasing, would increase, each man taking up a particular line. I have had fifteen or sixteen years' experience of storekeeping, and I know thoroughly just what it means. Mr. Crowder has dealt with the matter in an exhaustive manner, and I hope hon. members will give his arguments their gravest consideration. I myself cannot see, if such legislation is necessary at all, why the provisions of the Bill should not be extended to banking and other callings. For instance, Mr. Kidson has clerks in his employ, and I am sure these clerks are sometimes kept longer at work than 6 o'clock. I have heard that lawyers' clerks are kept till midnight sometimes, and this state of things must occur in all businesses where matters are pressing. If the Bill is necessary, it should be more sweeping in its character. But I see no necessity for the Bill at the present time. Octopus-like, it will spread out, and we will find it applying to the labour on farms. Any one who knows anything about farming life must know there are days and days when no work can be carried on, owing to unsuitable weather, and the hours lost have to be made up by overtime. The Bill will not stop the evil aimed at, and demands will spring up for similar legislation in other directions. The House should hesitate before passing legislation of this class. If such legislation be necessary, a Bill of five or six clauses may carry out all that is required. I myself think that a simplification of our statutes is needed; but instead of leading to such a simplification, this Bill simply makes matters more complicated than ever. I could bring my own knowledge to bear on what is required for shop assistants, and could propose clauses to meet their case where necessary. But there is really no need for such legislation. In all my six-

teen years' experience I never heard any assistants complain of their employers or of their hours of labour. Assistants have always been most willing to assist, knowing that very often there are hours when their labours are not taxed to any great extent. If a Bill of this kind be passed, we shall have a collar-and-tie bill, limiting the height at which assistants may wear their ties and collars. I should not be surprised if Mr. Kidson went a step further, and regulated the breathing of shop assistants. This coddling of a class of men who ought to be able to look after themselves can only end in creating a class who cannot think for themselves.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: I regret that I cannot be a supporter of this Bill, notwithstanding the eloquence of Mr. Kidson. I am quite sure that gentleman's constituency will give him every credit for doing the best for a bad cause. To pass this Bill would be legislating in a very undesirable direction. The Bill would be inquisitorial and arbitrary, and work oppressively on a good many who are now endeavouring to get an honest living by keeping stores and selling goods at hours convenient to others. This is a matter which ought to be left to mutual arrangement between shopkeepers and their employees, and it is very undesirable to legislate in a matter of this sort, particularly under existing circumstances. There are many ways in which this Bill would work very unjustly and very undesirably. It would necessitate the appointment of inspectors, who could at any time step into a shop and submit the keeper to very great unpleasantness, to say the least of it. It has been unnecessary up to the present time to legislate in this direction, and I fail to see that it is necessary now. The penalties under the Bill are very high. The object seems to be, principally, to exclude aliens, who are keeping stores in a small way, and who are a great convenience to the public. It is well known that if these aliens were prohibited from selling at certain hours, they would be obliged to close their shops, and in efforts to get rid of them, serious injury would be done to a large section of the community who are now endeavouring to get an honest living. The Bill is unnecessary, and

therefore I cannot support the second reading.

HON. W. T. LOTON: I had no intention of expressing my views on this subject, but as it appears a division is to be taken, I should like to make one or two remarks. It seems to me there are two objects which Mr. Kidson has in introducing the Bill. One object is the curtailing of the hours of labour. But I gather that there is another object, namely, to exclude as far as possible the coloured people in this colony who are engaged in commercial pursuits. My own view is that the latter is the first object of the Bill. I may say at once that I sympathise with the views of the hon. member in bringing forward this measure. I also desire that coloured people should not take the trade from the white people, and I sympathise with Mr. Kidson in his desire to curtail the hours of labour within reasonable limits. But if my surmises are correct, and it is desirable to deal with this question of reducing the hours of labour, I am rather surprised that Mr. Kidson did not submit to this House cases in this colony, or in particular parts of this colony, where he desired the Bill to take effect. No evidence has been given of cases where employees have been employed extraordinarily long hours day after day, week after week, and month after month all the year round. I am not aware that the hon. member gave us any instances of there having been any special cases of complaint in the colony, or in any particular part of the colony. I should have thought Mr. Kidson would have told us in what places in the old country a Bill of this kind existed, providing that shops should close at a certain hour every day in the week, and that there should be a half-holiday every week. The hon. member gave us no instances of the kind, and I am rather surprised at that, seeing he went so very minutely into the details of this question. I do not intend to follow all the arguments of Mr. Crowder, with whom I am in accord to the extent that I think the proposed legislation is in the wrong direction. If we want to reduce the hours of labour, let us meet this question in a straightforward manner. It may be difficult, but I think the first step to consider is as to the actual necessity for

such legislation at the present time. I would like hon. members to bear in mind that we have been progressing very satisfactorily in the direction of reducing the hours of labour of all classes of employed people during the last twenty years, not only in Australia, but in the old country. I know something about the work in shops, both wholesale and retail, because I have been through the mill myself. If hon. members will pardon me for a moment going back thirty or forty years, I can tell them that the hours of labour were, in my time, from 7 o'clock in the morning till 8 o'clock at night on four days of the week, and from 7 in the morning until 10 o'clock at night on Wednesdays and Saturdays. That is the kind of mill I went through when I served an apprenticeship in a large establishment in the old country. My hours were thirteen hours a day for four days of the week, and fifteen hours or sixteen hours for the remaining two days, and there were no half-holidays.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: What about Sundays?

HON. W. T. LOTON: I always had Sundays, and Sunday was a day I looked forward to with great pleasure. I formed one of the strongest resolutions of my life at that time. I made a resolution to rise earlier on Sunday morning than on any day of the week, in order that I might have a long holiday. It will be seen, therefore, that great progress has been made towards shortening the hours of labour. When I came to the colony some thirty years ago, the generality of shops, large and small, and even the largest, kept open from 7 o'clock in the morning till 8 o'clock at night. Years ago, without any legislation on the subject, a majority of the places began to close up at 6 o'clock in the evening, and to keep the hours which are laid down in the Bill now before the House. But there are times when it is impossible to cease work at a certain hour. If shops were closed always at the hours proposed, I am quite sure there would soon be an outcry from the people generally, who would not have the same conveniences as they enjoy at present. If a Bill of this kind were passed into law, the general body of people would not get supplied at as a cheap a rate as at present, seeing that competition would be

restricted up to a certain extent. We should be dealing a harsh blow against a large number of people who keep shops themselves and do not employ labour at all. I do not intend to deal with the question at any length. I have endeavoured to express in a few words my views, and I am with Mr. Kidson in saying it is desirable that people should not work more than a reasonable number of hours per day. There must, however, always be a margin given. The Bill would entail enormous troubles on the trading community who employ people. The technicalities to be observed are, I do not hesitate to say, ridiculous. In a shop which employed any number of hands, the Bill would necessitate the engagement of a clerk for an hour or an hour and a half every day to keep the records required. The first thing Mr. Kidson should have shown was that shop-assistants were employed an unnecessarily long time, or were complaining. I do not think that either has been shown. There may be exceptions, but as a rule there is no complaint of unnecessarily long hours. Shops, wholesale and retail, as a rule close at six o'clock every night in Perth and Fremantle, and many smaller shops also close at the same time. Mr. Crowder has pointed out that if the places were closed in town, the people would rush to the suburbs. Legislation of this description is not wanted at the present time.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: It is evident from the remarks which have fallen from hon. members that, while they oppose certain portions of the Bill, there is a very general admission that some legislation is required in this direction. I appeal most strongly to members not to support the amendment, because if they do, any further discussion on the Bill will become impossible. Members can take exception to clauses when the Bill is in Committee, and in that way might, and probably would, evolve a Bill which would be acceptable to nearly everyone concerned.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: That would not work.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: It is the principle of the Bill that is objected to.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: All these details can be discussed in Committee.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: It is my intention to vote for the second reading of the Bill. The object of the measure is to serve two classes of people, namely the shopkeeper and the shopkeeper's assistant, and that object is, I take it, attained in some degree. At the same time, I do not like class legislation; but I do not see how the object can be attained in any other way, except that proposed by Mr. Kidson. Shopkeepers and shopkeepers' assistants have been to me and strongly advocated the passing of this measure through Parliament. Then there has been long agitation going on, particularly amongst shop assistants, to get their hours of employment shortened. The whole House, I think, is agreed that the hours of shop assistants should be limited, but there seems to be a desire to do that in some other way than that proposed in the Bill. Mr. Kidson appears to have seen that it would be impossible to carry out the suggestion of hon. members. I intend to record my vote for the second reading, and I hope, as Mr. Matheson says, the Bill will be permitted to go into Committee, where we shall have an opportunity of threshing the question out, retaining only those parts of the Bill which will meet with the approval of the Council.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: How can you alter the principle of a Bill in Committee?
After a pause,

HON. E. McLARTY: Seeing some reluctance on the part of hon. members to rise, I should like to say a few words. Last year when a similar Bill was introduced I felt it my duty to oppose it. That measure was a much more objectionable one than the Bill before the House. But I have given this Bill a great deal of consideration, and I am not in the least influenced either by the mover of the Bill or Mr. Crowder. I do not think I have expressed an opinion on the measure to any member of the House. I have endeavoured to give it fair consideration, and to deal with it from an impartial point of view; and I am bound to say I cannot see any reason for legislating in the matter at all. It appears to me there are only a few persons affected, after all, and these are principally drapers and grocers. If we look at the schedule, there are ten or

a dozen trades excluded altogether from the provisions of the Bill. I cannot see where the necessity comes in for legislating expressly for drapers and grocers; and I do not think employees are unfairly treated or overworked. If they are, there is no reason why their complaints should not be remedied without legislation. The introducer of the Bill laid great stress on the fact that there had been largely-attended public meetings in Perth and Fremantle, and a general desire shown to have the Early Closing Bill passed. But it appears to me that those who are occupied in business, and who desire to have this Bill passed, are certainly in a minority. I notice in reading reports of these public meetings, that while some of the principal speakers, and some of those who conduct business in Perth and Fremantle, profess to have the greatest sympathy with employees, they do not carry into effect what they advocate on the public platform. There was one shopkeeper who strongly advocated the early closing of the shops, and expressed himself as having great sympathy with those employed in the different businesses. There are many ways in which shopkeepers can give relief to shop assistants without legislation. I know one person engaged in a certain business—I will not give his name—and he employs a young woman as a shop assistant, and that young woman receives for her labour the handsome sum of 5s. per week, without board and lodging. The principal of that firm attends public meetings to show his sympathy with the shop assistants, and says he is in favour of early closing. If employers have sympathy with their employees, they should first show it by paying them a rate of wages on which assistants can live decently. How can any employer expect a young woman to live and clothe herself respectably upon 5s. a week? I think it is simply disgraceful.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Is he English?

HON. E. McLARTY: I do not know what he is, but he is a sympathiser with the early-closing movement. If the hon. member who introduced this Bill had inserted a clause in it fixing the minimum rate of wages to be paid, I for one would have supported it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: That can be done in Committee.

HON. E. McLARTY: It is absurd for a man to go upon a platform and advocate early closing, and express his sympathy with employees, when he pays starvation wages on which no one can exist. I fail to see why certain classes of business should not be shut up. Why not shut up every shop? I quite agree with the Hon. W. T. Loton, who said that there was no real cause for such a Bill, and that a great deal of inconvenience would be caused by it. I believe if the Bill is passed that less hands will be employed; that storekeepers will try to do with fewer hands, and that the general public will be inconvenienced, as well as the competition that now exists being done away with. The principal object in bringing forward this Bill is to do away with the competition of the Chinamen and Asiatics.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Unfair competition.

HON. E. McLARTY: Perhaps it is unfair, and on that I have certainly some sympathy with the European trader, but I cannot say that this will altogether stop the competition. I think some other measure will have to be resorted to. It has been said that country members either do not understand the subject, or have no sympathy with it. That I deny. Country members are prepared to give the subject fair consideration, and do what is just in the matter. Personally, this Bill does not affect my own district or many of my constituents very much; therefore I should have no reason to vote against the Bill if I thought there was any necessity for it. I am bound to say that there is no necessity, and that no good will be done by the passing of this measure.

HON. A. B. KIDSON (in reply): I do not propose to detain the House at any great length, but I should like to have an opportunity of saying a few words in reply to the Hon. F. T. Crowder. In regard to the Hon. C. A. Piesse, the seconder of the amendment, I am afraid I cannot say much, because I was quite unable to follow what was brought forward by the hon. member. He, in common with other hon. members, has spoken in favour of the amendment, and made a

number of bald assertions. I do not hesitate to call them anything more or less. One hon. member stated the effect of the Bill would be to ruin shopkeepers, and another hon. member said that it would be very injurious. I wish to say that it would have been much more to the point if those hon. members, instead of making assertions of that kind, had given us some other basis or reasons for making the assertions. Nothing is easier than to make broad and bald assertions, but it is not such an easy thing to give reasons in support of them: that is not what hon. members have done. In introducing this Bill I endeavoured, as far as in me lay, to give grounds and reasons for every argument which I brought forward. Whether I succeeded or not is a matter for hon. members to say. I brought forward those arguments to convince, if possible, hon. members; but when hon. gentlemen make bald and general statements, with nothing in support of them, it shows one thing, that they are general, uncompromising opponents of the Bill. The Hon. W. T. Loton stated in his remarks that I did not give instances, in moving the second reading, as to how employees would be overworked. I may point out that it was not my province to quote instances, and there was no need to do so. If hon. members had listened to what I said they would have found it was unnecessary. In speaking on the second reading, I gave as one reason for introducing this Bill that it was not that employees were overworked at the present time, but that employers of labour in Perth and Fremantle had given it out that, unless some such legislation as this was introduced, they intended to revert from the six o'clock hour to the same hour as was in force with other shopkeepers. That is one of the reasons for the introduction of the Bill. From the Hon. F. T. Crowder we received the same old stock argument which has been used on every occasion on which members have opposed the Bill; that the measure interferes with the liberty of the subject. We have heard that argument repeated over and over again. It is no interference with the liberty of the subject when both persons are agreed. Hon. members say that both parties are not agreed, but I

think my facts in support of the motion show that they are agreed. Large meetings have been held both in Fremantle and Perth, at which both sides have been represented, yet hon. members make the assertion that both parties are not in favour of this measure. Has there been any petition brought forward to show that both parties are not in favour of the Bill? Is there anything to support such an argument? Have meetings been held at which expressions of opinion against the Bill have been given? Yet hon. members make statements, and expect the House to believe them. Against that are the solid facts which I have brought forward. I do not think the House will be so foolish as to take bald statements. I gave facts and reasons. What did I say? I said there was no reason to doubt that the employers and employees of Perth and Fremantle were agreed upon the Bill. The Hon. F. T. Crowder stated that it was out of my kindness of heart, in order to assist the shop assistants, that I wished to penalise the small shopkeeper who keeps no employees. Does the hon. member forget that I said: "If you bring in a Bill to deal with the shortening of hours, then you have to penalise somebody else" and the question is which would be penalised most. If you bring in a Bill to shorten the hours, then the large shopkeeper would have to employ further relays of assistants. This penalises them at once with no gain, because they say that the trade which they do after six o'clock is no benefit to them, as it is only done out of laziness, and the shopping could be done before six o'clock. The Hon. F. T. Crowder also stated—I do not know that I should touch upon it, it seems so absurd—that the Bill should not have been originated in this House. I do not know why. I think that any legislation of this nature can be originated in this House, and why, therefore, make such a statement? The hon. member also said that this was a conservative House. It may be, in the hon. member's opinion. I do not think, if this is a conservative House, that that is any reason why this legislation should not be initiated here. I think all legislation of a certain class can be originated in this House, and I shall retain those views in spite of what the hon. member said. These were some of

the remarks which the Hon. F. T. Crowder made: "It would ruin shopkeepers," that was one of the bald statements; next, "it would do a great amount of harm," but he did not say how; he did not say how it was going to ruin the shopkeepers or what harm it would do. If, instead of bald statements, he had given something to go upon, I should have been in a position to answer the arguments. With bald statements it is almost impossible to deal: there is nothing to answer. There was another argument the Hon. F. T. Crowder used—I took his words down—he said: "Is it fair to inflict this Bill on the small shopkeepers?" I ask this: Is it fair to penalise the large storekeepers? That is what the hon. member wants to do. The large storekeepers are in the majority. Is the majority to be overpowered by the minority? We are here to legislate for the majority, and, unless the House is satisfied that this Bill is in favour of the minority, the House should pass this Bill. To my mind I have proved conclusively that the Bill is in favour of the majority. There is another argument which the Hon. F. T. Crowder used, that the tobacconists do a certain amount of trade in penknives, and that this was the best part of their business, and he went on to say that they would lose this business altogether. I do not see what he thought members were made of, to believe such an argument. I showed clearly that they would not lose anything at all, and the hon. member has simply made statements without thinking what he said. I mention this as a sample of the arguments put forward by the hon. member. He never showed the House how trade would be lost, but simply made the statement, and I defy him to show how trade would be lost. Shops would have to be closed at six o'clock, but that does not prove that trade would be lost. I will give another sample of the hon. member's arguments to show what they are worth. He said that the Bill should only apply to the three metropolitan districts. That is, he suggests the striking out of the clauses dealing with the proclamation of other districts. Then, on the other hand, he says that if the Bill passes at the present time, the trade will go to the suburbs. That only shows the inconsistency of the

hon. member's arguments. A good deal has been said in connection with keeping records. Some hon. members have suggested a Bill limiting the hours of employment in shops. Well and good; but I would like to know whether any hon. member, supposing that such a Bill was before the House could suggest any means of keeping a check on employes other than by record. If he could, I should be very pleased, because I myself know of no other means. Why, then, should not this clause be in the Bill? Then Mr. Crowder urged on hon. members not to ruin his countrymen. That was another of the hon. member's bald and broad statements. If it could be shown that this Bill would ruin my countrymen I would drop it quickly enough. That, however, has not been shown; but still Mr. Dempster makes a statement that the Bill would be most injurious, bristling as he said it was with bad points, although he did not mention one of those bad points.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: I said penalties.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Penalties, if the hon. member likes. I would like the hon. member to give some information as to how the provisions of the Bill are to be enforced without penalties.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: We don't want any Bill.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Mr. Crowder says that he does not want any Bill. I think he has just hit the nail on the head. I have shown that there is nothing in the arguments of hon. members who have spoken against the measure. They simply "don't want the Bill," and that is the bottom and top of their whole position.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: There would have to be a large staff of inspectors.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Never mind the inspectors. We cannot do without them. Mr. Piesse said something about farmers, but I do not know what farmers have to do with the Bill.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The Bill deals with the employment of labour.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: But the hon. member dealt with it from the standpoint of a farmer, and I thought I would point out that this is a measure which does not apply to farmers at all.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I said that it would, octopus-like, extend to farmers.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: It is not necessary for me to detain the House longer. I have endeavoured to point out as plainly as I can the attitude of members who have spoken against this Bill, to show clearly what their arguments are worth. I do not propose to go over the same ground that I did in moving the second reading of the measure, for on that occasion I went very closely into detail, and argued the matter as clearly as I could for the information of hon. members. But I must beg of hon. members to remember that there are only bald assertions from the other side that this Bill is going to be injurious. On the other hand, I have pointed out that there are two solid gains to be expected from the Bill. First of all, the hours of trading by aliens will be limited. That does not mean that trading will be stopped altogether, but simply that those alien shopkeepers will be brought into line with other shopkeepers throughout the colony who are willing to treat their employees fairly so as to avoid undue competition. The second gain is that a great boon will be conferred on a large section of the community, namely, the employes in shops. As against these two great boons, I fail to see any reason why the Bill should be thrown out. In conclusion, I should like again to draw attention to the inconsistency of Mr. Crowder. It will be within the recollection of hon. members that Mr. Crowder spoke at some length on the liberty of the subject. After he had finished dealing with this question of the liberty of the subject and other matters, he told us that if a Bill were introduced to stop Chinamen or Asiatics from doing any business whatever—mark the liberty of the subject!—he would assist the passing of such a measure.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: These are not subjects.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Plenty of them are naturalised, but Mr. Crowder would stop their trading, while at the same time he is against interfering with the liberty of the subject. I ask the House to pass the second reading of this Bill, reminding them that they are not bound to one single clause. They can reject every clause of the measure if they like.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: We do not approve of the principle.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I think hon. members are in favour of the principle.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Well, we shall see.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Hon. members can alter the clauses in any way they think fit. I beg them to support the second reading of the Bill, and confer a boon on a large section of the community.

Question—that the Bill be read a second time—put, and division taken with the following result:—

| | |
|-------|---|
| Ayes | 8 |
| Noes | 8 |
| <hr/> | |
| A tie | 0 |

| <i>Ayes.</i> | | <i>Noes.</i> | |
|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Hon. H. Briggs | | Hon. R. G. Burges | |
| Hon. D. K. Congdon | | Hon. F. T. Crowder | |
| Hon. J. W. Hackett | | Hon. C. E. Dempster | |
| Hon. A. G. Jenkins | | Hon. R. S. Haynes | |
| Hon. A. P. Matheson | | Hon. W. T. Loton | |
| Hon. G. Randell | | Hon. C. A. Piesse | |
| Hon. F. M. Stone | | Hon. F. Whitcombe | |
| Hon. A. B. Kidson | | Hon. E. McLarty | |
| (Teller). | | (Teller). | |

THE PRESIDENT: There being a tie, I will give my casting vote for the ayes, so as to allow of further discussion.

Amendment thus negatived by the casting vote, and the motion passed.

Bill read a second time.

SUPPLY (REVENUE AND LOANS) I

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES INQUIRY BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

CROWN SUITS BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

INTERPRETATION BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6.35 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 26th July, 1898.

Papers Presented—Question: Electric Light for South Quay, Fremantle—Select Committee on Assembly Buildings (additional), Report presented—Motion (urgency): Government Defeat on Policy, and the Constitutional Usage—Supply (temporary), Ways and Means—Supply (Revenue and Loans) Bill, £850,000; all stages—Crown Suits Bill, third reading—Jury Bill, in Committee—Land Bill, second reading (moved)—Motion: Return showing Export of Coin—Motion: Customs Report, supplementary—Motion: Coolgardie Water Supply Scheme; to construct and manage by Private Enterprise (debate adjourned)—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Agricultural Bank, Report for 1897-8; Postmaster General's Report for 1897; Fremantle Lunatic Asylum, Report of Inquiry into alleged ill-treatment of patients.

Ordered to lie on the table.

QUESTION: ELECTRIC LIGHT FOR SOUTH QUAY, FREMANTLE.

Mr. HIGHAM asked the Commissioner of Railways:—(1) When it was intended to extend the electric light service along the South Quay. (2) Whether in view of the increasing traffic to and from this quay, and the practice of passenger steamers arriving at and departing from this quay after sundown, the urgent necessity for this lighting was recognised.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) replied:—(1) The preparation of an estimate for the extension of the electric light service along the South Quay, with a provision for 12 arc lamps, is now in hand, and when funds are provided the work will be commenced. (2) Yes.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSEMBLY BUILDINGS (ADDITIONAL), REPORT.

HON. F. H. PIESSE brought up the report of the Select Committee on the question of providing temporary additional