Protecting Labour: Carrie Hall and the Master and Servants Act
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On 21 April 1891, a domestic servant named Carrie Hall appeared before two Perth magistrates charged under the Master and Servants Act with deserting her master's service. Her 'master' or employer was Richard Septimus Haynes - lawyer, Perth City Councillor, political radical and co-founder with John Horgan of Western Australia's Eight Hours Association. Haynes had taken Hall and a fellow servant, Kate Brown, before the Perth Police Court on similar charges; but whereas Kate Brown was discharged with a caution, Hall received a fine or one month in Fremantle Gaol in default. The wages which Haynes had offered Hall were £2 a month; the fine was £4. Hall had been in the colony for a matter of days, having arrived, like Brown, as an assisted immigrant on board the Gulf of Martaban earlier that month. She was quite unable to meet the fine, as was evident from her circumstances as a newly arrived single female immigrant, and the magistrates' ruling effectively amounted to a term of imprisonment.

The Carrie Hall case led to a flutter of correspondence in the pages of the West Australian, with local residents eager to have their say and with Haynes, the Act itself, and the people who implemented it thoroughly savaged. Just nine months later, the Western Australian Master and Servants Act was rewritten to bring it into line with the less coercive acts already in place in the other colonies. The new Act at last transformed the breach of contract between employer and employee into a civil disagreement. Frank Crowley pointed out that it 'was designed to place the master and the servant on a footing of absolute equality'. In fact this was not the intention behind the new Act because it still permitted the imprisonment of male employees and, as Crowley himself indicated, workers were much less likely to be able to pay their fines than were their masters. Nonetheless the Act represented a significant advance on earlier regulations.

Most of the amendments introduced in the new Act of 1892 had been foreshadowed in a Bill presented to the House in 1884 but were thrown out on that occasion. However one significant advance on the 1884 proposal was the incorporation of a clause abolishing the imprisonment of women under the Act. In moving this amendment before the Assembly, M.F.A. Canning of East Perth argued that imprisoning women and girls was unduly severe and would result quite simply in the Act becoming inoperative for women workers, since magistrates would refuse to inflict such a penalty. Since 1840, the possibility of imprisonment
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of women had been gradually written out of the Master and Servants Acts of the other colonies, with Western Australia the last colony to do so. Canning argued, however, that regardless of the English law on which the Western Australian legislation was modelled, social matters made outlawing the imprisonment for women for breach of their employment contract imperative.

The circumstances of this colony, and indeed of Australia, are very different from those of the mother country. There they have, I believe, something considerably over a million more women than there are men; here we know the preponderance is quite the other way. Again, without taking a sentimental view but a practical view of the matter, we know very well that if a magistrate awarded a punishment of imprisonment to any girl or woman for a breach of contract, it would not be carried out. We know that perfectly well.

If he was aware of the Hall case, Canning was not acknowledging that the prospect of imprisonment had been used as a very real punishment so recently.

The Carrie Hall case and the subsequent amendment of the Act have significance which goes beyond an illustration of the outdated legislation used in Western Australia into the 1890s to enforce the discipline of master over servant. Canning’s argument for the abolition of imprisonment of women under the Act dealt with the issue of the colonial sex ratio and suggested that in terms of chivalry alone the protective instincts of a male bench and the predominantly male community would preclude imprisonment. Appeals to masculine chivalry were no basis for satisfactory employer/employee relations and, as the Hall case showed, Canning was mistaken in his assumption about magisterial chivalry; but, in fact, chivalry on the part of the general public had prevented Hall’s imprisonment. One correspondent to the West Australian, 'Indignant', described the process:

Fortunately a number of people were in Court, and these evinced their sympathy practically by subscribing the amount of the fine and within five minutes of her removal to the cell the unfortunate victim to an antiquated and barbarous law was released. As an instance of the popular opinion respecting the working of the Masters and Servants’ Act, I may mention that in several hotels and business houses subscription lists were opened and freely contributed to. Two instances I can mention, viz.: The Australian Hotel, where when the report was read out nearly £2 was raised in a few minutes; and the Sydney Coffee Palace, where six persons alone subscribed 30s, at the tea table.

Beyond the issue of male chivalry and the need to protect the weaker sex, however, was another theme, not recognised by the immediate protagonists in the Carrie Hall case but nonetheless fundamental to the whole issue of the conditions of female workers in the colony: the need to protect the sought-after and scarce supply of female domestic servants. The intention in this article is to examine the Western Australian government’s efforts to introduce a reliable supply of single female domestics, focusing in particular on the programme adopted in
the 1890s, and to show the lengths to which the government would go to maintain this by improving the conditions of reception and employment for the single immigrant women who largely comprised the colony's domestic servants. This was not paternalism or benevolence on the government's part but was simply a pragmatic response to the demands of one woman in Britain, Mrs Ellen Joyce, who directed single women domestics to the colony at the government's request but had the power to direct them elsewhere. In examining the Carrie Hall case, it will become evident that the government altered its actions and policies to adopt a more protective attitude to single women workers only where Mrs Joyce insisted. In other instances beyond Mrs Joyce's watchdog gaze, the government and its agencies were happy to allow and even to cooperate in the victimisation of a particularly vulnerable category of worker, the immigrant domestic, as the aftermath of the Carrie Hall case shows clearly.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, introducing a regular and reliable supply of labour had been a dominant concern of both the Western Australian colonial legislature and of private employers. Meeting the clamour for domestic servants to work in middle-class homes necessitated government intervention in the process of attracting female labour to the colony for, although Chinese labour bridged some of the gaps in the market for paid domestic labour, the primary and preferred source of domestic labour was single women. The method adopted by all the Australian colonies in the nineteenth century to meet the need for paid domestic labour was to establish extensive programmes of assisted immigration aimed at offering very cheap or free passages to single British women, preferable those with some experience as paid domestic servants. In all the colonies except Queensland, over the period 1850 to 1900, government schemes introduced larger numbers of single women than any other category of immigrant.7

Carrie Hall came out as a government-assisted immigrant under a scheme set up in 1888 to introduce a regular supply of domestic servants to the colony from Britain, as part of the colony's largest and most ordered female migration scheme that century. Aged between 16 and 30, the women were to be 'carefully selected both with regard to character (,) health and capabilities', and country women would have preference.8

This was not the colony's first attempt to introduce a reliable supply of paid domestic labour. Two other large government-controlled schemes had operated since 1850 in addition to a number of small private schemes managed by middle-class employers.9 In 1848, in tandem with the British government's introduction of male convicts to the colony, the Western Australian colonists agreed to accept British immigrants equal to the number of convicts introduced and most of these immigrants were single working women.10 When that scheme was wound up in the early 1870s, rising wages for domestic servants and petitions from
country residents calling for the introduction of coolie labour to meet this gap in the labour market induced the colonial legislature to set up further programmes to introduce single female domestic servants.\textsuperscript{11} Under this scheme single women were selected in Britain at colonial expense by a range of British agents. The shipping firm Felgate and Co. selected single women in the late 1870s, and the colony's own Crown Agents in London and independent selection agents in Ireland selected them in the 1880s.\textsuperscript{12} In addition to the selection of single women for free passage to the colony, the colonial legislature assisted the introduction of other forms of labour which were also in short supply. Nomination regulations were introduced in 1873 which enabled colonial residents to nominate healthy able-bodied workers and their families, belonging to occupations in demand in the colony, by depositing £4 for each adult.\textsuperscript{13} Single female domestic servants, often sisters or cousins of colonial residents, were a popular choice as nominees and also had the option of travelling free as selected immigrants.

Changing colonial fortunes from the late 1870s produced shifts in the government’s assisted immigration policy and a withdrawal of assistance at times over the next decade but by the end of the 1880s the continuing high demand for an uninterrupted supply of female domestics could no longer be ignored. Assistance could not be reintroduced until colonial finances began to improve but when this occurred, meeting the demand for paid domestic labour took priority. In March 1889 the Board decided to send for 60 single domestic servants to augment the colony's supply under an arrangement which continued until the end of the century.

Most of the women despatched under the colony's new selection scheme were chosen through Mrs Ellen Joyce of the United British Women’s Emigration Association (UBWEA), as it was then known. (The UBWEA later became the British Women’s Emigration Association and will be referred to here as the BWEA.) The British government's Emigrants' Information Office recognised the BWEA as the chief British female emigration agency and other emigration societies also directed female emigrants through that channel. Mrs Joyce was the head of the Girls' Friendly Society (GFS) emigration department and she also drew on the resources of the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, and the Young Women's Christian Association in selecting potential emigrants in Britain. Further, she had the blessing of the Anglican church through her work with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, a British organisation which took an interest in protecting women in transit to the colonies.\textsuperscript{14}

In entering into an arrangement with Mrs Joyce and the BWEA to select single women for domestic service in the colony the Western Australian colonial legislature tapped into the most reliable supply of prospective single female emigrants available in Britain. But they also took on Mrs Joyce's preconceptions about how the migration process should be implemented. In
her negotiations with the colonial government Mrs Joyce wielded a great deal of power, derived from her monopoly of the supply of domestic labour which the government and middle-class employers thought fundamental to the colony's wellbeing. Much of the remainder of this article will illustrate the extent of Mrs Joyce's power, and the measures the colonial government adopted, at her instigation, to protect its supply of domestic servants.

The foundation of the BWEA's work with female emigrants was their understanding of the need to protect single working-class women who had left the 'natural protection' of their families. The Association's scheme for 'protected emigration' was based on the principle of careful selection of emigrants, close protection on the passage out and adequate reception in the colony. Reception involved the provision of a safe immigrants' depot, control of the hiring process and some continuing care and interest in the immigrants once they entered employment in the colony. In providing protected emigration, Mrs Joyce and the BWEA worked closely with middle-class women in the colonies such as Mrs Parry, the wife of Bishop Parry, and Mrs Salter of the Girls Friendly Society, who provided 'that personal + individual interest in the young women which must always be woman's part of the work'. However, though the BWEA saw this local care as indispensable, it was still viewed as secondary to the government's responsibilities. Mrs Joyce regarded reception as part of the government's obligation towards the women introduced and those who had sent them, and a complement to careful selection and protection. Thus a satisfactory reception procedure became the lynchpin of the emigration process. Without it, Mrs Joyce refused to select domestic servants for the colony.

Through the 1890s immigration programme Mrs Joyce exercised tight and restrictive controls over the single women selected for free passage to the colony. Mrs Joyce and the BWEA believed that close policing of emigrant women was justified in fairness to the colonial authorities, since the colonies required and paid for migrant women with both domestic skills and with proven good character. The women's acceptance of Mrs Joyce's controls was a mark of their good character. In return Mrs Joyce argued that, since the women she despatched were of good character, they deserved the best protection the colony could offer. Hence she policed the activities of the colonial government as closely as she policed her selected emigrants.

From the arrival in 1889 of the first 85 women selected under the new scheme, on board the Nairnshire and the SS Wilcannia, Mrs Joyce asserted her authority on the implementation of the colony's female immigration programme. Depot facilities were inadequate, she said. The Reverend Canon Watkins had complained to the Board that the arrangements made for the care and proper supervision of the domestics at the Fremantle barracks where they were lodged
on arrival were unsuitable, and in Britain Mrs Joyce later heard reports of 'girls...allowed to
go about the town or receive outsiders at the Depot'. At her request, Western Australia's
governor Sir William Robinson undertook to have the colony's reception arrangements
improved and a new depot established in Perth. Sir William also suggested to the Colonial
Secretary that the matrons who supervised the women on board ship remain with them after
they had been transferred to the depot, as much to continue their supervision as to deflect the
suggestion that trouble only occurred once the immigrants were entirely in the hands of the
colonial government. This simply duplicated Mrs Joyce's own stipulation.

Mrs Joyce also influenced the conditions of employment of domestics in Western Australia. In
February 1891 she argued that new arrivals should not enter service in public houses straight
out of the depot since only those 'used to the ways of the Country... [were] able to insist upon
their self respect being preserved' in such jobs. This ruling had not previously prevailed in
Western Australia and it took some time before it was fully effective. In December 1891,
despite Mrs Joyce's wishes, the immigration agent William Dale recommended a female cook
for Mrs Bell of the Railway Hotel in Katanning. The following year immigrant Martha
Scammett was engaged by Mrs O'Connell of Fremantle, but was in fact passed on to work
with Mrs Armstrong of Armitage's Hotel. Once this was realised, however, the immigration
authorities told Maria that if she wished, she could return to the depot and a new post would be
found for her. Similarly in March 1894, Dale was forced to make 'private and confidential'
enquiries concerning Mrs Connor, wife of the Member of Parliament for Wyndham, who had
engaged Lilly Gardner off the Port Victor, as it was feared she intended taking Lilly back to
Wyndham to work in Connor's hotel. Fortunately the emigrant ship matron Mary Pittman
Monk was able to mediate for the government in this delicate matter. By this time, Mrs
Joyce's desires had become commands.

Despite the regular supply of Mrs Joyce's single women, middle-class demand for domestics
and interest in their immigration was unquenched and each advertisement of the imminent
arrival of a further selection of domestics provoked a flood of applications, both to the
government immigration authorities and to Mrs Salter of the Girls' Friendly Society. Regular
requests came particularly from country residents asking that domestics be selected and
forwarded to them by the immigration agent. Such a procedure was not generally possible, as
domestics could be engaged only by personal application; but after the first rush of employers
any remaining women might be despatched to the bush. Mrs J.E. Leary of Talbot House,
York, offered 30/- per month to a general servant, 'one that has been used to the country
preferred (sic)', but none of the four women remaining from the Port Phillip would accept the
offer, and the immigration authorities did not insist.
Through Mrs Joyce's selection and her concern with imposing rigorous reception standards, the primary elements which characterised the BWEA's notion of 'protected emigration' were virtually established. Inevitably there were hiccoughs. In 1893 Alice Hamilton, a hospital nurse assistant from New Cross, London, arrived in the colony pregnant. Mrs Joyce was very grieved at the news, for Alice's references had been good, and she hoped that 'her after conduct may in time restore her to respect'. Mrs Salter also provided Alice with some support. The Gulf of Siam which reached the colony late in 1894 contained a number of women who, though selected in line with the usual strict procedures, turned out badly, according to Mrs Joyce and colonial authorities. Two sisters, the daughters of a dissenting minister and thus, Mrs Joyce concluded, 'unused to self discipline', had asserted their intention to enter domestic service but were found to be quite unfit for it and were also 'most insubordinate and offensive'. Another woman, a young widow who had seemed respectable, turned out 'infamous and abandoned'.

Women the colonial authorities judged to be disreputable immediately on arrival very often settled down to official and colonial satisfaction and the government's ongoing commitment to Mrs Joyce's selection, the colonists' satisfaction evident in the lack of obvious complaint and the clamour to employ the domestics testify to the general success of the scheme. Following the problems with the Gulf of Siam in 1894, however, Mrs Joyce henceforth required all members of her Western Australian parties to sign a set of rules and agree to obey the shipboard matron and surgeon-supintendent absolutely. In other cases, the period at the emigrants' home where the emigrants assembled before embarking was sufficient to detect an undisciplined emigrant: thus Elizabeth Quinn was refused passage on the steamer Port Pirie, on Mrs Joyce's instruction, as a result of her 'disobedience' and 'insubordinate behaviour' at the Blackwall Home. Because of her vigilance in policing the behaviour and morality of her selection, the colonial authorities continued to express great satisfaction with the women Mrs Joyce despatched.

The strongest testament to Mrs Joyce's influence on the colonial government was her successful intervention in the Carrie Hall case, which came as the culmination of two years of her work to improve reception arrangements for single women arriving in the colony. The case provides evidence not simply of Mrs Joyce's all-pervading influence on conditions of domestic employment but also of the value which the colonial legislature placed on introducing a supply of carefully-selected domestic labour, and the extent to which the government could be pressed to modify its behaviour to retain it.

Anne Atkinson's work on Chinese migration to Western Australia has shown that this was not the first instance of government intervention to protect a valuable supply of immigrant labour. In 1879, for example, Governor Ord had instructed resident magistrates to exercise
some clemency with Chinese immigrant labourers brought before them under the Master and Servants Act, to avoid jeopardising an important source of cheap labour. Some of the colonists who expressed their outrage at the treatment Hall received clearly did so with an eye to the more lenient treatment supposedly dealt out to Chinese immigrants, probably as a response to Ord's directive. As one correspondent wrote,

This sentence differs somewhat in its magnitude from those which have been awarded in this colony to Chinamen for similar offences, but it is one of the glorious signs of our advanced civilization that we love the Mongolian, even better than we do the Caucasian, and, perhaps, in no surer way do we show it than in our dealings, through the law, with them...(T)o impose so harsh and rigorous a sentence upon a penniless, sick, young English girl for an offence for which more than one healthy Chinamen has got off scot free, merely upon promising to go back to his employment, is not calculated to convey a very high opinion of the colony, its law, or the latter's agents.

Once Mrs Joyce became aware of the Hall case, it was inevitable that she would create havoc; it was equally inevitable that the government, which had already acted so often to meet Mrs Joyce's demands, would respond to her demands again. Like the supply of Chinese labour, the supply of domestics had to be protected at any cost.

The colonial government did not advise Mrs Joyce of the Hall case but by May 1891 she had heard independently and wrote a letter of bitter protest to the crown agent in London, E.E. Blake.

There appears to have been no one to whom this young woman had a right to appeal or who was prepared to protect her. This is not what I understood by the promises of care being taken of these young women...

All I can say is that if respectable servants cannot withdraw themselves from a situation without rendering themselves liable to go to prison and undergo a months imprisonment I shall not feel inclined to recommend them to select Western Australia as their future home, unless the Masters and Servants' Acts is modified.

Mrs Joyce was particularly incensed at the use of imprisonment to punish women whom she had personally vetted as respectable. In her character reference Hall's previous employer had stated

I can give her an excellent character. She is very respectably connected and an upright truthful girl. She thoroughly understands her work and is quick and clean in dispensing it. She is good tempered and an excellent needlewoman. I could say more but probably this will suffice.
As Mrs Joyce pointed out to the colonial authorities, 'the amount of the fine is nothing compared with the degradation to a respectable servant of being sent to prison'.

In addition to Mrs Joyce's threat other agents in Britain also warned the colonial government of the ripples spreading from the case. A Perth report of the court proceedings described how the young woman was removed to the cells 'crying'; by the time the news reached Britain, a press account there described Hall 'weeping piteously' as she was led away. As the crown agent E.E. Blake admonished the Board of Immigration,

the publication in this Country of this case will necessarily have a very deterrent effect upon the Emigration of further young women and ... unless some very satisfactory explanations can be given of the circumstances of C. Hall's case, ... all the best Women's Emigration Societies in this Country will decline to assist ... Emigration to the Colony.

Given Mrs Joyce's threat and the crown agent's warning, the immigration authorities established an inquiry into the Hall case in July 1891. In a lengthy document 'in explanation of the heavy sentence passed on Caroline Hall', presiding justice J.C.H. James argued that the minimum possible punishment was imposed, to operate as 'a punishment and a deterrent', and that the two justices had had no choice under the Master and Servants Act. James also claimed Hall was never in the cells, before or after conviction, and in fact was seen to smile with relief when her punishment was announced, as it was less severe than she had expected. Under attack, James defended the actions of the crown, but he himself agreed that the Masters and Servants Act was a hard one, one-sided in application since it gave servants no recourse in the event of wrongful dismissal, and inappropriate in dealing with the civil offence of breach of contract under a criminal statute.

If the presiding justices had had no choice, Hall's employer Richard Septimus Haynes had chosen to exact the utmost from the law. Correspondents in the press had already found Haynes guilty - of hypocrisy and political expediency. In response to the many letters in the press immediately after the trial attacking the decision of the Bench, Haynes had written

the evidence showed that an agreement for service existed between me and the defendant, not terminable before the expiration of two months, and that the rate of wages was £2 per month, and that the defendant had unlawfully broken that agreement. Now, sir, had I sent the girl away without lawful excuse, I would have had to forfeit a sum of £4 at least, and why, may I ask, if the defendant chose to break the agreement should she be treated in any milder manner than myself?

Respondents to Haynes' letter suggested he should have known the answer to his own question. One correspondent wrote that the incident
serves as a gauge (sic) to his political consistency, for when he was before the electors last November, he promised the electors to strive for the abolition of the unequal conditions of the Master and Servants Act. Mr Haynes may expect, should he ever again seek the suffrage of the working men of Perth, to have some very awkward questions upon the subject put to him.45

Another writer, attacked by Haynes for the use of a *nom-de-plume*, sarcastically retorted that the use of a name in press correspondence revealed nothing about a writer's identity. Haynes, declared the anonymous writer,

has always posed before the public as a friend of the working classes. He was, at one time,...a President of some labour club or association of working men. As a friend of the working man he was prepared, he said at the hustings last year, to advocate the legislative enactment of eight hours as a working day. In fact, Mr Haynes had come to be regarded, as I once heard him say he was, as "a real working man", in the truest sense of the phrase, and, therefore, I cannot believe that the writer of the letter signed "R.S. Haynes" in today's paper, justifying the harsh sentence passed on a penniless, sick young English girl, belonging to the working classes, is Mr R.S. Haynes, the friend of the working man, and who laboured hard for the working man's vote before he failed to get in for West Perth.46

Haynes clearly emerged as the villian and his villiany did not stop there. The day following the trial, this 'friend of the working man' and one-time opponent of the Master and Servants Act wrote to the Colonial Secretary pointing out that under section 5 of the Act, the Immigration Board was liable to prosecution for 'harbouring' Carrie Hall, that is, allowing her to remain at the Immigration Depot after she had left Haynes' service.47 The immigration depot was the home where all single female immigrants were sheltered after arrival and until they found an employment situation it was the only home they had in the colony.

On receiving this letter, after hasty consultation with the Attorney General the Chairman of the Immigration Board notified Haynes that Hall had been told to leave the depot and advised to return to Haynes' service.48 Once again the Sydney Coffee Palace, where much of Hall's fine had been raised, intervened to rescue Hall. On 23 April proprietor John Musson wrote to the Board agreeing 'to take all risks and responcibility (sic) in reference to engaging Carrie Hall'.49 Musson thus left himself open to prosecution by Haynes; but at least Carrie Hall had a place to sleep short of the Home of Mercy.

Following the Board's inquiry into the prosecution of Carrie Hall Mrs Joyce continued selecting domestics for Western Australia and shortly afterwards the Master and Servants Act was amended along the lines she had indicated, with the imprisonment of women and girls expressly prohibited. But there is little doubt that if she had been made aware of the government's role in evicting Hall from the immigrants' depot she would have refused to continue acting on their behalf. She selected domestic servants for Western Australia until the
end of the decade. Haynes became mayor of North Perth in 1896. Carrie Hall's subsequent history is less easy to trace but the repercussions of the affair which brought her brief fame spread far beyond the colony. Mrs Joyce had the last official word on the matter. In a letter to the Western Australian authorities in February 1892, she pointed out with some satisfaction: 'I think it is instructive to note that I could not get a single emigrant from Devonshire or Cornwall as (the) Carrie Hall case was much circulated amongst those parts'.
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