

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 28th October, 1925.

	PAGE
Bills: Land Act Amendment, 2s.	1600
Newcastle Suburban Lot S8, 2s.	1600
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2s.	1601
Racing Restriction Act Amendment, 2s.	1602
Labour Exchanges, 2s., rejected	1604

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

BILL—LAND ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.34] in moving the second reading said: Section 105 of the Land Act provides that any description furnished by an applicant for pastoral land may, if found to be wrong, be rectified, if practicable, by approved application in such manner as not to disturb the boundaries of another lease previously granted. It has been legally contended by the Solicitor General that "approved application" means the approval of the amended application which, of course, may be many years after the original application was approved, as well as applications for adjoining leases. Consequently, the section in the Act which was intended to serve the purpose is practically ineffective to enable a lessee to have his boundaries amended to include improvements that have been inadvertently effected outside the boundaries. The amendment now proposed provides that such an adjustment of the boundaries may be made by the Minister so as to include the improvements to the lease to which they belong, and that alternatively the adjoining lessee shall pay the fair value of such improvements under the provisions of Section 148 of the Land Act should such value not be otherwise agreed upon. In the pastoral areas it has been extremely difficult for a lessee to be sure of the boundaries of his lease owing to the absence of natural feature surveys, and even when those surveys have been effected, the lack of information as to the intervening country. While the lessee defined his boundaries as nearly as possible without resorting to survey, which was extremely costly, and proceeded to effect improvements, it naturally

followed that there was a danger of such improvements being outside the actual boundaries of his lease. For many years there were no surveys of pastoral leases. During that period, of course, many improvements such as fencing were effected on what the occupier regarded as his lease. Subsequently, I understand, surveys have been made and it has been discovered that improvements have been effected on pastoral leases occupied by other lessees. The intention of the Government is to have power to deal with such a position when it arises. I understand the Pastoralists' Association have given their approval to the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—NEWCASTLE SUBURBAN LOT S8.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.39] in moving the second reading said: The lot referred to in the Bill is described in the survey of title as Newcastle Lot S8. Therefore it must be described in that way in the Bill, although Newcastle has been renamed Toodyay for some years past. The land was transferred from the original holder to Mr. J. T. Monger, the Rev. Charles Harper and Mr. W. J. Clifton in trust for a mechanics' institute, library, etc., with power to mortgage. Two of those trustees are dead, and it is impossible to locate the surviving trustee. The building erected on the land was principally paid for by public subscriptions. As no one can be found who would have any legal control over the land or premises, the Bill provides that the land be revested in His Majesty, to the intent that it may be granted to legal trustees. It is impossible to deal with this matter otherwise than through the instrumentality of the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [4.40]: There is only one point to which I would call the Minister's attention. At the end of Clause 2 we find these words: "to the intent that such land may be granted to new trustees." It does not state for what purpose, or upon what trusts that

land will be vested in the new trustees. Am I to take it that the land will be vested in the new trustees on similar trusts to those on which the previous trustees held it?

The Chief Secretary: Yes. It is fully set out in the schedule.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: But that is the schedule. The operative part of an Act is its sections. It is the section that would control the power, and the section, in this instance the clause, simply states "to the intent that such land may be granted to new trustees." I think there should be added to the clause words to the effect "upon the trusts set out in the schedule." But this position may arise: it may be desirable to enlarge the trust. From time to time we find that so in respect of mechanics' institutes. Therefore I suggest that the matter be further inquired into.

The Chief Secretary: I do not propose to take the Bill into Committee to-day.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [4.43] in moving the second reading said: This is a very simple Bill in which it is intended to allow municipal corporations, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to close certain roads within the municipality and lease those roads, the proceeds to be applied to the council's funds. It is introduced largely to get rid of the cumbrous method of dealing with road closures by a special Act for each road it is intended to close. The Bill was introduced by the member for York (Mr. Latham) for the reason that at present it will principally affect that town. There is in York an area of about 100 acres. This land has been subdivided into town lots, and is interspersed by a number of streets. The streets are enclosed within the boundary fence, and the owner of the land is receiving the benefit of them as grazing areas. It is intended to give power to the York municipality, and other municipalities similarly situated, to close any such streets, with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, and to apply the revenue received to

municipal purposes. York is not the only municipality that will benefit by the Bill for any that are affected will derive a benefit from it. If these streets were to be permanently closed some objection might be raised, but it is proposed to close them only temporarily so that they may be reopened by the council at any time upon giving ordinary notice. Clause 2, Subclause 1, of the Bill says that it must be shown that a street or way is not required for any public purposes, and it must also be shown that it will be expedient to close such roads and that this will not be detrimental to any person or persons. The second subclause says that the council must give notice of the closure and give reasons for making the closure, and that notice must be published in the "Government Gazette" and in a newspaper circulating in the municipality for four consecutive weeks before the closure is effected. This is designed to give publicity to the intentions of the municipality to close such road or street. In order that those people concerned shall receive due notice, the council must serve a copy of the notice upon the occupiers or owners of land that abuts on the street or way, so that these people also will be given a month's notice of the intention of the municipality. In Subclause 3 power is given to the council to lease the land comprising the streets, just as they would do with any other land that is vested in them or has been acquired by them. It gives municipalities the same rights that are at present enjoyed by road boards. Seeing that the road boards have this privilege it is only right that it should also be given to municipalities, especially to those that are outback and where the roads are often unused, and could be used to advantage by the municipality. The Road Districts Act, Section 151 gives this power. It has been said that a time limit should be placed upon the leasing of these roads. Provision has been made for this, as will be seen from Section 210 of the Municipalities Act, where the period laid down is three years. Under that section the right of the public will be safeguarded. The Bill does not introduce any new principle, for it merely gives to municipalities the power that is now held by road boards. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. J. Holmes, debated and adjourned.

BILL—RACING RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [4.52] in moving the second reading said: This Bill seeks to amend the Racing Restriction Act, 1917, which restricts racing in the metropolitan area. The Act provides that no galloping races shall be held unless they are licensed by the W.A.T.C., and that no trotting meetings shall be held unless licensed by the W.A. Trotting Association. The Act also limits the number of racing dates that may be allotted by these two bodies in the metropolitan area. The W.A. Turf Club has the right to conduct 76 meetings a year, and the Trotting Association may conduct 35 meetings in a year. Each party has a right to conduct five further meetings for charitable purposes. All the dates allotted to the Trotting Association, the 35 and the five charity dates, are held on the one ground at East Perth. The galloping meetings are divided between the headquarters of the Turf Club and other racecourses in the metropolitan area. In the case of the galloping, most of the racecourses are conducted by proprietary organisations. The Trotting Association, however, is a non-proprietary organisation. All the profits from its operations are used to improve the sport in any given direction. The Bill is intended to increase the number of trotting dates allotted to the metropolitan area by allowing an additional 10 racing dates for Fremantle. Because of the Act no race meetings of any kind are allowed in Fremantle or district. Prior to the passing of that Act we had a racecourse in Fremantle, and races were conducted there for many years.

Hon. J. Cornell: Of a world-wide notorious character.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: That may be so. Fremantle was thus the only part of the metropolitan area in which race meetings could not be conducted.

Hon. J. Cornell: They were cut out because there was no club operating there.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: It is within the area prescribed by the Act.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Yes. The Fremantle district forms a considerable portion of the metropolitan area. The population is over 50,000. It is unfair that such a district should be debarred from participating in sport of this kind, when other parts of

the metropolitan area and the country can do so.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is only debarred because the central body will not give up some of its dates.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The people of Fremantle claim that they have as much right as any other district to hold a limited number of trotting meetings in a year. Apart from the 10 trotting dates specified in the Bill, it provides that the district shall have the right, with the permission of the Treasurer, to conduct not more than two other meetings for charitable purposes. The record of the Trotting Association is a very good one. The organisation has at all times been prepared to do its utmost in the interests of charity, and during the last few years has raised a considerable sum of money towards this object.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is its shop window display.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I am merely stating a fact. That record would more than hold its own with that of any other club or association in the State or Commonwealth. The sport is one that demands consideration. No complaint can be lodged with regard to its conduct. Of recent years it has attained a popularity such as has not been accorded to any other sport here.

Hon. J. Cornell. It is a business, not a sport.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I call it a sport. No one who has any knowledge of different classes of sport can point to any that is conducted on better lines than trotting is conducted.

Hon. J. Cornell: I never know who is winning.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The Trotting Association have a very strict rule which prevents any person under 18 from being admitted to the trotting grounds.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is more honoured in the breach than the observance.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not agree with the hon. member. The rule has been enforced as far as it is humanly possible.

Hon. J. Duffell: They are mighty strict about it.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Whilst I am not a regular attendant at the meetings, I have been there on quite a number of occasions during the last 18 months or two years, and I have gone there for the express purpose of noting how the sport was conducted. I cannot say that I have ever seen any indi-

vidual there who appeared to be under the age of 18.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: How can you tell the age?

Hon. J. Cornell: The length of the skirts is no guide these days.

Hon. A. Burvill: For what reason are children under 18 excluded?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Because it is not considered advisable that children under that age should be encouraged to indulge in betting. I have attended galloping meetings in the metropolitan area and throughout the State generally, and I have seen a far greater number of young people at those meetings than I have ever seen at the trots. Consequently, from the point of view of the conduct of the sport, there is no room for complaint in that respect. The Trotting Association will have placed at its disposal a ground at East Fremantle, a ground that is most suitable for the purpose for which it is intended to use it, and if the Bill be passed, the ground will be improved in the best possible way for the conduct of the sport.

Hon. E. H. Harris: What is the size of it?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I cannot tell the hon. member, but I know that it is large enough. I live very close to the ground and I know it quite well.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: It is less than half a mile round.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It can be made a most suitable ground for the purpose of trotting. The position is that the Trotting Association guarantee to put the ground in proper order for the conduct of the sport on proper lines.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: Has a referendum of the people of Fremantle been taken?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Yes, it was taken some time ago and resulted in favour of the sport being permitted.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: But why is the proposed course to be at East Fremantle?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Because the site is the most suitable to be got. So far as the people of Fremantle are concerned, if they desire to take part in a sport of this kind, it is necessary for them to travel to the eastern side of Perth. This remark also applies to galloping.

Hon. H. A. Stephenson: Shame!

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It is a shame. Fremantle is the chief port of the State and it is the only port of any size in the Com-

monwealth that has no facilities of this kind to offer its people. Why should the people of Fremantle be debarred from having a trotting course of their own if they wish to have it?

Hon. J. Nicholson: What is the position in Melbourne with regard to the Williamstown course?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Melbourne has its racecourses and trotting courses and all are located away from the metropolitan area. Coming back again to Western Australia, even Albany has its racecourse, and racing facilities are offered at places such as Bunbury, Geraldton and Carnarvon. In fact, every small township in the State has its galloping course or its trotting course. Throughout the agricultural areas one finds that clubs are established and in some instances the trotting tracks are only a few miles apart. No objection is raised to the people in the country enjoying this sport, but when it comes to the metropolitan area we find it said that Fremantle must not be given the opportunity to conduct ten meetings a year.

Hon. J. Cornell: They have had the opportunity for the last 50 years.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: They have not had anything of the kind.

Hon. V. Hamersley: How many members are there in the Trotting Association?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I should say over 2,000. During the last month or two I have discussed this matter with quite a number of representative people, and all express surprise at its not being possible for Fremantle to hold trotting meetings without getting special permission. The ordinary racing clubs are permitted to conduct considerably more meetings per annum than the Trotting Association, and that being so, it is considered only fair that the trotting branch of the sport should be given somewhat similar facilities. We are not asking that we should be given the same number of dates as is allotted to any one club; we are asking that the number of dates be increased so that Fremantle may be allotted ten. It is estimated that something like £300,000 is now invested in horse flesh in connection with the sport in this State, and at Fremantle quite a number of people are actively interested in it. Galloping has been described as the sport of kings. If that is so, I would describe trotting as the sport of the working class. I have no desire to speak at greater length on this matter; I only wish

to point out that we think it unfair that Fremantle should be denied these facilities. I trust the House will agree to pass the Bill so as to enable Fremantle to secure ten racing dates. It is also desired that two meetings be held for charity, of course, with the permission of the Treasurer. I commend the Bill to the House and have much pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, debate adjourned.

BILL—LABOUR EXCHANGES.

Second Reading—Amendment "Six Months"
Carried.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. R. BROWN (North-East) [5.10]: In supporting the second reading I have no desire to take up much of the time of the House, because the Bill should commend itself to every member here if he has gone into the question of employment bureaux. Last night Mr. Yelland made statements to this House which, to my mind, are misleading. He said that good farmers are paid at the rate of £4 a week and that they are provided with a house, a cow, a pig, and poultry. It is not the general opinion that farmers are so liberally treated. Perhaps the hon. member was referring to those who are employed as managers.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is that in the Bill?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: No, but I am contending that what the hon. member said last night is not correct. We believe that there may be managers who, having served a lengthy apprenticeship, may now be getting £4 a week and the perquisites referred to. But if those conditions applied to farmers generally, we would find everyone leaving the metropolitan area and looking for such posts in the country. The desire of the Government is to get away from private agencies. Private agents have been a menace to the working class, and, having had a free hand, they have done exactly as they liked. They have been able to put up any charges they liked; there has been no limit to those charges. It is possible for them to say, "We will charge you what we like for finding you a job, and those charges have got to be paid." Let me inform members what these private agents do. They send people to a job to-day and send another man to the

same job to-morrow. The second man, of course, on arrival finds that the place is filled, and he has to wander back. Private agents have been known to do that kind of thing even a third time. When I was secretary of the Barnmaids' Union in Kalgoorlie such an instance came under my notice. A barnmaid was sent by one of these welshers, or I might call them fleecers, to a position in Kalgoorlie. It was supposed to have been at a first-class hotel, but when she got there she found it was conducted by a lot of "dings."

Members: Who are they?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: "Ding-bats," if you like, or perhaps "dagogs." This barnmaid came crying to me for her fare back to Perth. We had to make a tarpaulin muster and in that way we got her back to Perth. That is one of the chief reasons why I am supporting the Bill. Members can rest assured that if the State Labour Exchange is established, six people will not be sent after the one job, and no charge will be made.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Can you point to one instance where six people have ever been sent to one job?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: I did not say that six men had been sent to one job. What I said was that with the State Exchange, it would not be possible for that to occur. But I know of cases where two and three men have been sent to the one job.

The PRESIDENT: I ask members not to embarrass the speaker.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: They are not embarrassing me, Mr. President. If the Government have control of the Labour Exchange, we shall not have men running here, there and everywhere after jobs, and no charge will be imposed for finding positions for unemployed. A man will be sent to a job according to his merits. There will be some organisation to ascertain whether a man is suitable for the job offering. It would be of no use sending a butcher to do a lawyer's job on a farm, even a hush lawyer's job. If the Bill is agreed to, the Government will be able to regulate the business properly. I do not see why members should have any objection to it. It is in the interests of the workers and it is designed to minimise the unemployed difficulty. We should no longer permit these welshers and fleecers to run their businesses as they have been doing, charging what they like and sending men to jobs where the conditions are totally different from what they were led to believe they would find.

HON. J. E. DODD (South—on amendment) [5.16]: I hope the amendment will not be agreed to because it implies that there is no necessity for the Bill. I cannot agree with that idea. There is a vital necessity for the basic principle contained in the Bill. If members would keep that in mind, they would allow the Bill to go into Committee. I am not so much concerned with the other parts of the Bill, but I am concerned about the basic principle that free employment agencies should be established and that all agencies charging fees should be abolished. We are under a very solemn obligation to consider that recommendation. I do not say we are compelled to pass it, and I do not say that we should approve of everything contained in the Bill, but regarding that one recommendation from the International Labour Office we are under a solemn obligation to consider it and do the best we can according to our local conditions to give effect to it. We should remember that we are parties and signatories to the Peace Treaty. The delegates to the Peace Treaty established an International Labour Office in order to give effect to the articles of the Treaty. When we realise that the Peace Treaty is one of the most momentous documents in history and was conceived and drafted by the world's most able statesmen, we should not lightly pass an amendment implying that there is no necessity for the recommendation made by the International Labour Office. I ask members to consider whether, when jobs can be purchased, labour is not regarded as a commodity? Look at it any way we may, when we say that a man can purchase a job at an employment broker's office, we cannot deny that labour is a commodity. It is a commodity offered for sale.

Hon. J. R. Brown: And always was, too.

Hon. J. E. DODD: That was the principle laid down by the Peace Treaty for the guidance of the International Labour Office. Can we say that a worker is being paid the basic wage if a charge is made for work found for him? I do not think we can. We have laid down the principle in the Arbitration Court that each worker shall be paid a basic or living wage. Yet if we say that a worker must pay one-half of that wage every few months or every year or whatever time it may be, simply to get a job, we cannot contend that he is being paid the basic wage. I urge the House to consider the Bill, not in the light of what is contained in other clauses, but from that

viewpoint alone. If we say this Bill shall not be considered in Committee, there is only one alternative—before the session is over, to carry a motion telling the Commonwealth that we have no faith whatever in the League of Nations or in the International Labour Office. If we do that and abandon it, we shall be saving our money and we shall also be saving our reputation.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Surely that is not logical.

Hon. J. E. DODD: I cannot see why we should send delegates to these conferences and spend the money we are spending if we do not even consider a measure that embodies some of the conference recommendations. It has been urged against the Bill that if an award was given by the International Labour Office against the workers of any particular country, they would not abide by it. Suppose we applied that argument to all our proposals, where should we get? We should get nowhere. If that is the attitude to be adopted, we should never have passed the Arbitration Bill; it should have been thrown out on the second reading. Members should have maintained there that if an award was given against the workers, they would not accept it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Cannot you quote cases where they have?

Hon. J. E. DODD: I know there are times when employers as well as employees have not accepted the awards, but suppose we applied that argument against all measures, we would get nowhere at all. I think Mr. Lovekin and Mr. Holmes agree that no fees should be charged to employees for the finding of employment. Suppose the Bill was taken into Committee and amended in that direction so that only the employer should pay a fee for a man engaged through an employment bureau, we would be showing that we had made an effort to comply with the recommendation. There would be a free employment bureau, free as regards the workers, and we should be making some effort to comply with the recommendation. It has been said that the recommendation is not legally binding, but let me point out that there are many things that are not legally binding and yet we are in honour compelled to adopt them. I can justly claim that this recommendation is one of those. Although we are not legally bound to accept

it, we are morally bound to consider it and do the best we can to comply with it. There is another aspect worthy of consideration. In the days to come this House will have to fight for its existence. I think there is no question about that. Are we going to put into the hands of the opponents of this House a boomerang that will rebound upon us? That is what we shall be doing if we refuse to consider this recommendation. It has been said that we have only to study our local conditions. Let me remind members that we are more intimately connected with world affairs to-day than ever we were before, and we shall be more intimately affected by them as time goes on. The war showed how intimately we were affected by world affairs. Surely this country is not going to send to the international conferences delegates having around their necks the millstone that nothing has been attempted and nothing done. That will be the position if we agree to the amendment. I hope members will do nothing that will prove inimical to the deliberations of the conference, but will do all that is possible to give effect to the recommendation. Clause 8 of the Bill prohibits the carrying on of a business as an employment broker for fee or reward. I would point out to the Honorary Minister that if the Bill is passed in the form in which it is printed, and if the policy of the Government is adhered to that unionists will receive preference of employment, that clause will need to be very much widened. A man in a Government Labour Office is not the man to say who is a unionist and who is not. If the Government are not going to take any gratuities or rewards the provision will have to be extended to more people than are provided for under the Bill. I hope the House will not accept the amendment, but will make an effort to put the Bill into such a form that it can be accepted by the Government.

HON. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.27]: I have not heard anything during the debate to show that there is not already established in Western Australia a State Labour Bureau. It cannot be gainsaid that the bureau has been in competition with private registry offices operating in Perth. Looking into the history of some of those private agencies, I find that no fewer than four of them have been established in Perth for over

20 years. The Honorary Minister quoted instances of people having been charged more than a fair thing for positions secured by private registry offices. So long as the system is in vogue, there will be instances of undue advantage being taken for special positions secured for individuals. The State Labour Bureau has been in vogue for a good many years and it is strange that the greater number of positions have been procured through the private agencies. A person seeking work is prepared to pay some consideration for a job.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Why should he?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: But side by side with the agencies that charge is a State institution where a man can register his name and through which he may obtain employment free of charge, but still people in search of employment avail themselves of the private offices and pay the fees prescribed by regulation. I have yet to learn that the private registry offices are out to victimise their clients. On the other hand, we find that greater satisfaction, generally speaking, is obtained by employers from the private registry offices.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Not by employees, though.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The employers obtain greater satisfaction as regards suitability of applicants. We have also to bear in mind that a private registry office can thrive only as the result of success in finding positions for clients.

Hon. J. R. Brown: No. Their success is due to the large number of persons seeking employment.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Further, it must be borne in mind, once more speaking generally, that those who find employment through private registry offices do not pay the whole of the fee. The practice in vogue, I believe, is that the employer shall pay half and the employee the other half.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Why should the employee pay the other half?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: The employees are the best judges of that. If they prefer the State Labour Bureau, it is there for them, and they can avail themselves of its services without fee or price. But, evidently, greater satisfaction is derived from the system now in vogue. Naturally I have perused the Bill with care, in the endeavour to ascertain what is the aim of its sponsors in seeking to close

up all other channels through which employment may be found.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is a national obligation.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Did not we have an instance of a national obligation a few weeks ago in this fair city of Perth? I am inclined to think there is something behind this Bill, something of far greater importance than finding work for the unemployed. We learn from the Bill that the Government, in addition to establishing a State Labour Exchange, are prepared to pay the travelling expenses of men going into the country ostensibly to look for employment.

Hon. J. R. Brown: The money has to be refunded.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: There are other things to be taken into consideration. Only recently we have had instances of men perambulating about the country for some reason or other, which I do not think was to look for employment. Their expenses were being paid by somebody. The Bill provides that men may go into the country ostensibly for the purpose of seeking employment, and that if they cannot find employment there, they may go somewhere else and do other work in the meantime. They may be agents for insurance companies, or travelling for some other business. We cannot tell. This Bill is a dangerous instrument to place on the statute-book. It proposes to close up private registry offices for the ostensible purpose of finding employment without fee or reward for the unemployed. For this reason, and for reasons previously expressed, I shall vote for the amendment.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [5.35]: I support the Bill, and am somewhat surprised at the remarks of one or two members, at the insinuations and aspersions cast by them on the integrity of Government officials and also of members of the Government. The Bill has come forward chiefly as a result of the deliberations of the International Labour Organisation. In this connection I would point out that the workers of the world obtained very little as a result of the great war, but that one of the few things they did obtain was the establishment of this International Labour Organisation with a view to rendering more uniform throughout the world the conditions under which the workers are employed. As a result of the deliberations of that organisation

at various conferences held since 1919, many recommendations have been made, though but few of them have been dealt with by either our own Parliament or the Commonwealth Parliament. Effect has been given to some minor recommendations, but generally speaking no official recognition has been extended to the decisions of the various conferences of the International Organisation.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Does not that apply to other countries?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It should not apply in this particular instance. A genuine effort has been made by the International Labour Organisation to bring about various reforms. While in some cases we already have legislation covering the recommendations, yet in other cases, where it is possible to bring the reforms into being by legislative action, we have been very slow to make an endeavour to do so. Here we have an instance where the Government are desirous of putting into operation a recommendation of the International Labour Organisation. I am quite in agreement with what Mr. Dodd has said on the subject. In his remarks I think we can perceive evidence of a great deal of study of the subject, not only from a local standpoint but also from an international point of view. I would recommend members of this Chamber to take to heart some of the observations made by Mr. Dodd on this measure. Let me repeat what Mr. Dodd said with regard to the worker having to pay a fee in order to obtain employment. He described the system as immoral and pernicious. I go even further, and say that the language is not strong enough. Every man and every woman has the right to work, and it should not be necessary for any person at any time to have to pay a fee, either large or small, for the privilege of working for some other individual.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But applicants are not required to pay at the State Labour Bureau.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: They have to pay at the private registry offices.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But they need not go there.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The hon. member knows quite well that in some cases the worker is compelled to go to a private registry office because the particular kind of work he seeks is available only through private registry offices. I could quote scores and scores of cases of that kind of thing

which have come under my personal notice. For a few years I acted as secretary to a fairly large section of the Labour movement in this State, and during that period hardly a week went by without a man or a woman, or several men and women, coming to me to ask for assistance in the direction of providing the money to pay a registry office fee with a view to the securing of a particular position. In many cases I did assist. In some I assisted by paying the actual cash, and in others by giving a written guarantee that, in the event of the person not paying the fee demanded by the registry office, I would be responsible for the amount. Let me add that frequently the same person has come back looking for employment again within a fortnight or three weeks or a month, simply because the job he or she was sent to had collapsed.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Because the persons were unsuitable.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: No. Because the job was merely temporary. Yet the worker was charged one-half of the first week's wage for securing the position. I could quote individual cases where girls have been sent to positions in the country and found the conditions such that they would not stay any longer than they could possibly help. I have even had to provide assistance to bring back one or two girls to town, because when leaving to take up the positions they had only their railway fare and a few pence to take them to their destination. While such conditions prevail, one cannot wonder at organised Labour objecting to private registry offices. I do not, however, say that all the private registry offices are in the same category. Two or three of them have fulfilled a very useful purpose, but even in those cases fees have been collected from the employees while the employers have got off scot-free. Mr. Duffell said it was expected that the employer and the employee should each pay half the fee. I know the Act provides that that shall be done, but I also know that in a great many cases the payment by the employer is waived by the proprietor of the registry office. If we could only obtain accurate information regarding all the positions filled by private registry offices, we would find that in the majority of cases the employer paid nothing while the employee had to pay at least one-half of a week's wages. Such a condition of things should not be tolerated. Unfortunately we have periods of considerable

unemployment, and I have seen the spectacle of two or three hundred unemployed men in Perth, all of whom could not be placed by the State Labour Bureau. Private registry offices at such times have had certain positions available, but it was not possible for any of those men to take those positions, simply because they had not the wherewithal to pay, firstly, the registry office fee, and, secondly, the cost of conveying them to the destination if they succeeded in obtaining the positions. Consequently, it is absolutely necessary that, as proposed by the Bill, the State labour exchange should be empowered to pay the fares and expenses of men sent to positions in the country. A man who has been out of employment for some time, especially if he is a man with family responsibilities, does not possess an unlimited purse. If the position that he is seeking is a long way from the metropolitan area, he must be advanced the railway fare, and some additional money. If it had not been for the action of the Governments during recent years, in providing railway fares for men out of employment who were of the opinion that they could secure work in the country districts, many of our unemployed would not have been absorbed in the country. They would still have been in the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. Duffell: But the proposal is to abolish the private registry offices without compensation.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Of course it is.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They should have been abolished years ago.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I agree with the proposal to abolish them. If any hon. member in this Chamber has given any study to this question he must agree that private registry offices have abused their privileges in many respects during recent years. I do not say for one moment that all the private registry offices come within that category, but the fact remains that these abuses have existed.

Hon. J. Duffell: Some of them have been established for 30 years.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I have no objection to an individual obtaining employment through a private registry office, but I do object to him having to pay for it.

Hon. E. H. Harris: We can easily rectify that.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not know how it can be rectified. In common with Mr. Dodd I think we should make this work

of providing employment free so far as the workers are concerned. They should not have to pay for the positions they obtain.

Hon. J. Duffell: Would you turn the private registry offices into philanthropic institutions, and make them do something for nothing.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Make the bosses pay!

Hon. W. H. KITSON: One hon. member stated when discussing the Bill that the employers would have no objection to paying, and I believe that is correct. On the other hand I know there are some employers who would not pay a sixpence in in that direction, but would expect the employee to pay the full amount. It would be a step in the right direction if legislation were passed setting out that the worker could receive employment through the private registry offices without any expense to himself.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Why should we have to ask the general taxpayer to shoulder the cost of getting work for that man?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: Because, in my opinion, it is incumbent upon the State to provide employment for men who want work.

Hon. V. Hamersley: What about the men who do not want work?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: They are few and far between.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What about the position at Fremantle?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I am satisfied that the average worker would be quite prepared to obtain employment through any system of labour bureaux to be established, but, on the other hand, I claim that all these registry offices should be under the direct control of the Government. It must be remembered that at times when unemployment is very acute it is difficult to absorb those who are out of work. If the whole of the registry office activities were under the direct control of the Government, the unemployment difficulty could be dealt with more effectively than is possible to-day.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: How could they do that?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I recognise that, in order to achieve that end, it will be necessary to extend the operations of the existing Government Labour Bureau. At present, however, the Labour Bureau has no statutory powers but simply carries on from day to day and week to week, in a circumscribed manner. After the Bill becomes law it will

be necessary for alterations to be made. Regulations will have to be framed governing the work. If all the provisions of the Bill were put into force within the next 12 months it would be of advantage to the workers and to the State. I hope the House will pass the second reading. I trust that if hon. members do desire to amend its provisions they will allow the Bill to go into Committee and not at this stage sacrifice the whole Bill. If they adopt that course they will show some consideration for the recommendations of the International Labour Organisation of the League of Nations. The recommendations submitted by that body were not formulated by what I might term the Bolshevik element of the Labour movement, but by the most conservative representatives of some of the nations of Europe. I trust hon. members will give this aspect serious consideration and allow the Bill to go into Committee.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North—on amendment) [5.51]: I support the amendment. My reason for so doing is that I have looked through the Bill and I believe it will be beyond the powers of even a more brilliant assemblage than this to effect the necessary amendments in Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is much latent possibility in the Chamber.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The difficulty I see is the amending at all of legislation embodied in a Bill of this description, because if we amended it, it would not suit the objective of those who are behind it. I am at a loss to follow the contentions of Mr. Dodd. He urged the House to follow the wishes of the International Labour Organisation, and he argued that in the interests of the workers we should have free exchange of labour. Mr. Dodd knows that there is no such free labour associated with the proposal embodied in the Bill.

Hon. E. H. Gray: There is no black-legging associated with it.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: What do you mean by "free labour"?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The sponsors of the Bill have had the audacity to come to the House and ridicule and scandalise private employment brokers for accepting half the first week's wages from the men who have secured employment from them. The Honorary Minister, when introducing the Bill, said that before a man could get

employment through the organisation that is to be set up, he would not then have to pay half the first week's wages, but a portion of every week's wages, which would have to be paid into the union.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He did not say that.

The Honorary Minister: I did not say anything of the kind.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Hon. members must read the Bill in conjunction with the second reading speech of the Honorary Minister.

The Honorary Minister: Stick to my speech, and I will stand by it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Honorary Minister told the House that it was the policy of the Government that would be carried out by the so-called free labour exchanges.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He did not say that in his speech.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: He said that no non-unionist would get a job through the exchanges until all the unionists had been found employment. We know that once a man joins a union he must pay portion of each week's wages into the union funds.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is a good investment, too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We know, too, that these unionists will keep in office the men who are behind this Bill. Despite all this Mr. Dodd, one of the most brilliant men we have in this Chamber, can see his way clear to urge the House to accept the Bill as one providing for a free labour exchange between the employees and the employers, with no political party or other body butting in to get a portion of the weekly wages of the workers!

Hon. J. E. Dodd: That is not in the Bill.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have the second reading speech of the Honorary Minister to go on. When a Minister places a Bill before the House he is supposed to explain it in detail and tell us the objects of the measure.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You are knocking down bogies.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am not, and the hon. member knows it. What I am saying may hurt perhaps. When introducing the Bill the Honorary Minister told us that they were going to try to force all the people to secure employment through one channel, and that if vacancies occurred no non-unionists would get a job before unionists.

Hon. E. H. Gray: What is wrong with that?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Will Mr. Dodd agree that such legislation will provide a free labour exchange?

Hon. J. E. Dodd: The House can stop that by way of amendment.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The only way we can stop that is by—

Hon. J. Cornell: Cutting off its head.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The only way we can deal with the position is to agree to the amendment. The position can be dealt with by amending the existing legislation. If there is one objection that can be raised to the existing position, it is that the employee has been called upon to pay, instead of the employer. We do not require a Bill such as the one before us to bring about a reform in that direction. It can be done by way of a single amendment to the existing legislation. However, that would not meet the objective of the sponsors of the Bill as indicated by Mr. Hickey in his second reading speech. The Government do not wish to transfer the payment from the employee to the employer, but they want a Bill that will abolish free labour. Mr. Dodd desires free labour and yet he asks us to vote in favour of the Bill. It is a peculiar thing that people insist on going to the private employment brokers and are willing to pay half the first week's wages in order to get positions.

Hon. J. R. Brown: They will not pay if the private exchanges are not in existence.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That confidence has grown up as between the employees and the broker, and a lot of people will not accept a position unless it is secured through the brokers. The reason for this is that they know the brokers, and the employers do not know the employees. The employees, however, recognise that if the brokers send men to a job, they will be all right. There is nothing like experience in these matters. I wanted to secure a married couple last week and for three consecutive days I inserted an advertisement in the "West Australian."

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Why did you not get the couple from the State Labour Bureau?

Hon. E. H. Gray: Why not from the Trades Hall?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I wanted people to work, not to agitate. If I wanted an agitator, I would send to the Trades Hall,

and if Mr. Gray were there I would probably engage him. Although I advertised for three days in the "West Australian" there was no response.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Perhaps they know you.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think I am known as one of the best employers in this State. However, on the fourth morning the position became desperate as the married couple were expected to leave by that night's train. I walked into a private registry office and explained the position. They found me a married couple, and the couple were on the train that night.

Member: I suppose they will be back next week.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That illustrates one phase of the position. Some of these people would not, presumably, go into the bush unless recommended by the labour exchange.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Perhaps the married couple were on the State Labour Bureau books as well?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If they were—

Hon. E. H. Gray: They would get the job as soon as they could.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not know about the present Government, but I know that in the past Governments have dealt with private employment bureaus instead of engaging people through the State Labour Bureau. Why has that been necessary? Because, presumably, there is no one available at the State bureau to suit the job. When one wants the right man, one goes to a private agency. One does not want anybody sent along who holds political views that suit the party who sent him. Such a man is no good for the job at all. I was amazed to think that Mr. Dodd should have referred to free labour, and what the International Labour Office wants. What they want and what they are going to get under the Bill I thought I should like to explain to him through you, Sir. There is nothing free about his proposal at all. Before a man can get a job he must be branded with the union brand.

Hon. E. H. Gray: A very good brand too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: So long as he carries that brand he will be found employment, but as soon as he ceases to pay a quota of each week's wages to the organisation to which he belongs, he will be referred to as a scab and will be placed under a ban.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: That is gross misrepresentation.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. J. W. Hickey—Central—on amendment) [6.2]: I hope the amendment will not be carried. I was interested in what Mr. Baxter had to say. I agree that extreme measures call for extreme remedies. However, no fair minded person can claim that this is an extreme measure. Mr. Holmes lashed himself into a fury in his attack on the preference to unionists principle. He dragged in quite a lot of issues that had no relation to the Bill.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I was following your second reading speech.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member's experiences as an employer have not been quite what he would lead us to believe. He confined his remarks to an attack on the Bill and on the policy of preference to unionists. I throw back the challenge issued by Mr. Duffell and Mr. Holmes respecting the officers who will be called upon to administer the Act, and any Minister who in future will have control of the State Labour Bureau. What Minister would dare to put into operation the policy suggested by Mr. Holmes and Mr. Duffell?

Hon. A. Lovekin: There is already the policy of preference to unionists.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: But that is entirely different from the suggestion made by Mr. Duffell and Mr. Holmes respecting the provision under which the Minister may render a little assistance to men out of work, assistance in the shape of railway fares and even feeds along the track. To-day we have power in respect of advancing railway fares. I say to Mr. Hamersley that the State has not gone broke over that policy of advancing railway fares. I have carried it out extensively, and I can say that 90 per cent. of the fares has been repaid.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The State lost £700 last year.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: But sooner or later it will all be collected by the police.

Hon. V. Hamersley: The police do not collect for the private agencies. That is another advantage enjoyed by the State bureau.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: The private agencies will not be out of their money very long. That is one of the objections we have to them. I hope members will vote against the amendment and allow the Bill to be discussed in Committee in order that, if necessary, it may there be amended. Mr. Burvill by interjection implied that I had

been dogmatic over the Bill. I am sorry he should have thought so.

Hon. A. Burvill: Your words were: "I would not tolerate private agencies."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I still hold that opinion, but that is not to say that I wish to force it upon others. Practically every Bill that comes before the Chamber lends itself to amendment in Committee. Some of the amendments now on the Notice Paper may, if modified, be acceptable. Mr. Holmes has had a long experience of unionists, and I am sure he has no cause to regret it. Almost all the men passing through the State Bureau are unionists. Still, it is not right to say that none but unionists shall be found employment there. During the unemployment season most of the Government work is manned through the bureau. That is done for better organisation and in order to have a better grip of the position. Surely hon. members would not require that unionists should be turned down and preference given to non-unionists!

Hon. A. Burvill: Ability should come first.

The HONORARY MINISTER: But when the available men are unknown, the only guarantee of ability is the union ticket. I do not think the hon. member would give preference to non-unionists whom he did not know.

Hon. A. Burvill: The best agricultural workers in the country are farmers' sons, who belong to no union.

The HONORARY MINISTER: But we do not find farmers' sons at the State bureau looking for work. I can say that the preference to unionists principle will not be allowed to operate harshly. All applications at the State bureau have had a fair deal and will continue to get it.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Would it not be harsh to ask a man to undertake to pay 25s. per annum to a union before he could get a job?

Hon. E. H. Gray: He is not asked to do it.

Hon. V. Hamersley: He will have no chance of getting a job otherwise.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No man is asked to pay 25s. per annum before getting a job. If a unionist happens to be there when a job comes in he will get preference—that is all. It is not insisted upon that non-unionists shall become members of a union. It has been said that under the

Bill the Government will have unionist emissaries going through the country. That is not right. Such men are paid by the unions.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Out of weekly contributions from your "free labourers."

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have tried to find out how emissaries from another political camp subsist. There are in this State men knocking about all over the place, not working, yet able to vote. One of them in particular, gets the ear of the Press occasionally.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The HONORARY MINISTER: One objection was raised to the Bill by Mr. Holmes in connection with the policy of preference to unionists. Most members recognise that this policy is not operating harshly upon any particular individual or set of individuals. Another objection raised by the hon. member was that the pastoral labour bureau would not be exempt. There is no provision for exempting any individual or combination of individuals or organisations. The hon. member is wrong in stating that I agreed that this bureau should be exempt because I recognised it was doing good work in the country. I said nothing of the kind. Whatever my experience of the bureau may be, this is not the time to refer to it. I said that the fact that the bureau was not in the business for profit or reward meant it would not come within the ramification of the Bill. Some doubt was thrown upon this statement. I have since secured the opinion of the Crown Law authorities which supports my statement that neither the pastoral bureau nor the R.S.L. bureau, neither of which is operating for profit or reward would come within the scope of the Bill.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Under the Bill the would not be allowed to operate.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Solicitor General says, "The pastoral association is not exempt, but to bring the case within the Act fees or charges must be made. If the association does business in negotiating employment agreements for fees or reward it will come within the Act."

Hon. E. H. Harris: Have you an opinion as to the interpretation of "employer or broker"?

The HONORARY MINISTER: There was no intention on the part of the Government to bring the pastoral labour bureau

under the Act, or to include the R.S.L. bureau, or similar bodies that are operating in the same way without fee or reward.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The pastoral bureau will come under it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Not according to the statement I have made, and which has been backed up by the Solicitor General.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They accept fees or rewards.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Not from the employee.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They accept fees from the employers, and would come within the scope of the Bill.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Or any person who keeps a register for employment.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We shall clear it up before we are done with it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: We are all prone to be more or less case hardened, but there is enough of the milk of human kindness in us to enable us to appreciate the viewpoint of others, and to believe, that the opinions they hold, they hold honestly. I am not dogmatic in my opinions, and in this case I have fortified myself with the opinion of the Solicitor General, as I have stated. If Mr. Holmes disagrees with the Solicitor General, I have nothing further to say. I am satisfied that the opinion is the correct one. If so, no objection can be raised to the Bill on that score. The same thing applies to the R.S.L. bureau.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Read line 6 on page 2 of the Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Holmes also referred to the rotary system. When unemployment was at its height last winter the Government had great objection to introducing the rotary system at the labour bureau. To every deputation that made this suggestion to me I said it would not find favour with the Government. An institution such as this should have for its object the bringing together of employer and employee, with the object of creating mutual satisfaction between the parties, such as should exist if the machinery is to work in the way we desire. I told the deputation it would be foolish to attempt to send a man out to a job who was unfitted for it. Employers send to the city for a man to engage in a particular occupation, such as clearing, dam sinking, or farm work. It would be foolish to ballot amongst the men and send to such position a clerk or a

butcher. Judgment has to be used. If the rotary system were instituted it would act harshly and unfairly to both sides. The object of the Bill is to bring about a state of affairs that will give more satisfaction to both employer and employee. Mr. Holmes and Dr. Saw attacked the Bill from the point of view of compensation. Dr. Saw's main objection was that we were cutting out private exchanges without offering any compensating factor for so doing.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: I did not mention a word about compensation.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member stated it was wrong that these people should be deprived of their business without any redress or notice except the proclamation of the Act.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is what the Bill says.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Quite correct. It was said in connection with the Licensing Act that time compensation was given over a period of ten years. There is no connection between the vested interests in the liquor trade and vested interests in these private exchanges. In most cases the entire outfit of a labour exchange would not cost more than £20.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And there is about 20 years of business.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In many instances the work is not confined entirely to employment broking. Sufficient compensation would be given if these people had 12 months' notice after the passing of the Act. I agree that no provision has been made in the Bill for this, but the Minister for Labour has given the assurance, which I repeat, that the Bill will not be put into operation for 12 months.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Then we can well postpone it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The same argument would be introduced next session. It is not a good one. We should take things as we find them and deal with the proposition now. In 12 months' time the same story will be told again, the same argument will be used and we shall never get any further. The members of the Empire Press delegation who are at present in the State have their fingers on the pulse of the world. They will be aware of the recommendations that were agreed to at the International Conference, and they will know that the provision of State labour exchanges was included in those recommendations. That

being so, it will not be a very nice advertisement for Western Australia, if those gentlemen who are with us at the present time find that we are treating with indifference one of those recommendations. Those gentlemen represent the most influential Press of the Empire, and they will be bound not to view with anything like enthusiasm any untoward action that the Legislative Council may take towards the Bill we are now discussing.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Has Great Britain a Bill such as this?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think the delegates will be impressed with the position at Fremantle to-day?

The PRESIDENT: I do not think that can be discussed on the Bill.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think so either. The interjection is in bad taste. There are members in this Chamber who know what the position at Fremantle is, and how it applies to the Press delegates. The members of the delegation are also familiar with the position and therefore the least we say about Fremantle the better.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You were talking about what would impress the visitors.

The HONORARY MINISTER: A good deal has been said on the subject of compensation. Do not hon. members remember the position of the wheat buyers? They had a big industry to handle and machinery was created to deal with the position as it existed a few years back. Then, in the interests of the primary producer, and of the prosperity of the State, it was decided that those wheat buyers should be cut out.

Hon. V. Hamersley: When was that decided?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member was a party to the business and he should know all about it. No compensation was paid to those people.

Hon. V. Hamersley: They were given the whole of the handling of the wheat.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Hon. members are also aware that I have always been a supporter of the construction of agricultural railways.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is there anything in the Bill relating to railways?

The HONORARY MINISTER: On the goldfields there were men who owned teams and who used those teams for transport purposes. Then railways were constructed and the teamsters lost their employment. No compensation was ever asked for or thought

of in their case. Again, in connection with the extension of water supplies, individuals were concerned there as well, and when the Government stepped in to provide extensions again no compensation was offered to those who had previously undertaken the work. No great hardship will follow the passing of this Bill because it will not come into operation for a period of 12 months.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Where does the Bill say that?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Minister for Works has given an assurance to that effect. It has been said that the private exchanges fill a public want, and another argument used is that even with a State exchange, the private bureaux get a considerable amount of support. One reason for that is that some employers have a natural antipathy to anything State-controlled. In addition, they have it in their minds that they want a wider scope to enable them to play off one exchange against another. There are many good reasons why some employers do not utilise the State bureau. I have had investigations made during the past 12 months and I know that a big percentage of employers do not pay one penny to the private exchanges for services rendered.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The principal Act makes that an offence.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Are you administering the Act?

Hon. A. Lovekin: They should pay at least as much as the employee. Read the 1918 Act.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I know what the Act says, but unfortunately it is rather difficult to bring it into operation. From our investigations we know that many employers are not asked to pay any fees.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Then why are they not prosecuted?

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is difficult to prosecute them. We may be satisfied that we have a case against an individual, but it is difficult to get the required proof. An employer cannot be brought along to substantiate a charge of that kind. Let me give an instance. Recently a man was sent to a job. He paid the bureau 15s. It cost him 25s. to get to the job and on arrival found that the vacancy had been filled. It cost him £1 while he was compelled to remain there and then another 25s. to get back to town. He had no redress against the employment broker for the reason that the employer would not come down to assist to prove the

charge. Members should realise that there is room for improvement upon existing conditions, and that being so it is their obligation to see that opportunity is given to deal with the Bill in Committee. There is an amendment on the notice paper in the names of Mr. Stephenson designed to prevent the charging of fees to employees. I am prepared to discuss an amendment on those lines.

Hon. A. Burvill: Will you accept that amendment?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am prepared to consider an amendment on those lines.

Hon. V. Hamersley: If we pass this Bill, it will put back the hands of the clock a long way.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think it will. I should be sorry to think that any Bill of which I had charge would mean a retrograde step. One could not feel any elation over a piece of legislation that did not make for progress and improvement. Seeing that this Bill is based on a recommendation of the International Labour Office, members should give it more than passing consideration. Industrial peace is closely allied to the preservation of the world's peace. The adoption of this recommendation would mean the cementing of the relations between the nations—the goal that the League of Nations has in view.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It has nothing to do with the League of Nations.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Whatever our individual views may be we desire industrial peace. Here is an opportunity to further the interests of industrial peace. Here is machinery to give the State Labour Bureau statutory power which it has not enjoyed in the past. The measure would not operate harshly, but would have the effect of bringing employer and employee together and thus creating a better understanding between them. I appeal to members to take the Bill into Committee so that we may embody in it the proposal that the employer shall pay the employment fees. Any reasonable amendment will receive the best consideration.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It will help a lot if you will tell the House why the shearers are entitled to charge 25s. before a man can start, and the bureau which finds the job is not entitled to charge anything.

The HONORARY MINISTER: It is hard to reconcile the hon. member's objections.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is wrong for the bureau, but not for the union.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Knowing the hon. member as I do, it is hard to reconcile his objections. He knows the ramifications of the shearers' organisation as well as I do. He knows the shearers have no connection with the State Labour Bureau. No one knows better than does the hon. member that shearers are not engaged through the bureau. He knows that the men roll up and that there is a show of tickets.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I want to know why they charge 25s. before a man starts on the job.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In order that he may become a member of the union, but they do not charge 25s. before he starts.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Some of them wanted to charge 30s., and I would not let them.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member knows perfectly well—

The PRESIDENT: If the hon. member knows perfectly well, the Honorary Minister need not persist.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The hon. member has nothing to do with the constitution of the A.W.U. If they decided to charge 25s. for a ticket, his opinion would make no difference.

The PRESIDENT: The Honorary Minister cannot refer to that because he said no shearer is engaged through the Labour Bureau.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I agree that the employment of shearers is not under consideration. Few are engaged through the Labour Bureau.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Many of them are; I myself have engaged them.

Hon. V. Hamersley: So have I.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I have a list of the people engaged through the Labour Bureau and their occupations. Perhaps I am in a better position to say how many are engaged through the bureau and how many are not.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Not through the State Labour Bureau, but through private registry offices.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The number thus employed would not make much difference. If the Bill be taken into Committee we shall be able to make conditions much better than they are at present.

HON. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [8.15]: It is not my intention to address myself to the Bill so much as to the many and varied reasons given by the Minister when introducing the measure. Representatives at the Geneva Conference have been given credit for the introduction of the Bill, but I think we may give credit nearer home. I have before me an extract from the report of the Labour Congress held in July last, at which a resolution was carried to the effect that the Congress desired the abolition of private registry offices.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The Geneva Conference passed a similar resolution before that.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I think the pressure came from where the resolution which I have quoted was carried. At that congress Mr. Hickey stated that legislation in this direction would be forthcoming. Perhaps I had better read the whole of the resolution--

That this Congress desires the abolition of private registry offices; all labour to be engaged through the unions working in conjunction with the Labour Bureau.

If we have a State labour exchange and the private labour exchanges are closed, the Government institution will have a monopoly; and then everyone seeking work will have to go to the State labour exchange. There he will be asked whether he is a unionist.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Where do you get that from?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: From the Honorary Minister's remarks. I made a note of his words, which were that he was solid on preference to unionists. That being so, if the Bill is carried, anyone seeking employment will be asked whether he is a member of a union. The Trades Hall people know their business; I give them credit for that. They will have an office next door to the State labour exchange, and the applicant who cannot produce a union ticket will be told that he can get one next door. In this connection I may instance something that occurred within the last few weeks on the goldfields. A man who has deliberately refused to rejoin an industrial union of which he was formerly a member, thought there was an opportunity of securing employment. I may mention that he parted from the union over a financial dispute. Because he declined to re-

join the union, the work that was available was given to what Mr. Brown this afternoon termed a "dago"; that is to say, a southern European. The "dago" stood up, holding in his hand a ticket like the one I have here, an A.W.U. ticket. The foreigner was given preference. So we find work going to foreigners instead of to Australians. This Australian says he will not rejoin the union until he gets his rights from them. In his case there is no other convenient union which he can join, and so he loses employment which he might get. I should be glad if the Honorary Minister would clarify his statement regarding preference to unionists. The phrase, as usually understood, means that preference is given to a man seeking employment if he is a member of a union. I want to know from the Honorary Minister whether that principle will be extended to the employer. If there are employers looking for workers, will preference be given to the employer who is a member of the Employers' Federation? If we are going to have preference to unionists, it should apply to the employer equally with the employee. According to what Mr. Gray has said from time to time, the employers are having a very fair run in the Arbitration Court. Now, if an employer is not a member of the employers' union, good unionists ought to say, "We will not work for that man, because he does not belong to the Employers' Federation. He should be in an organisation as well as we, so that if we have any differences with him we may settle them at a round table conference or, failing that, in the Arbitration Court." We have heard a good deal concerning the exploitation of the worker by the private registry offices. I believe there is a good deal of truth in much that has been said on that head, but I do not think we shall overcome the difficulty by mounting up further difficulties in the shape of a monopoly Labour exchange controlled by the Government. I would be unfair and unjust to say to the people, "You must subscribe to a union." If the unions were purely industrial organisations and existed for industrial purpose only, I would be much inclined to support the Bill.

Hon. A. Burvill: You have hit the nail on the head this time.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: We have proof that the funds of unions are utilised for many purposes with which members of those organisations do not agree.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Where is your proof?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I like to give a little proof occasionally, and I think I can oblige this time. I have here the annual report of the Western Australian Amalgamated Society of Railway Employees, in which the secretary, Mr. C. Haynes, says—

One of the direct results of preference to unionists is that the membership has increased to the extent of 450 over the figures for the previous year, this result in the main being attributable to the fact that the Government policy of preference to unionists is in operation.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Is there anything wrong with that?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The hon. member is asking for proof.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: I am not asking for proof of that.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The secretary points out that the policy of preference to unionists has brought in 450 members.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Men who have been evading their responsibilities in the past.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: If the hon. member likes to phrase it in that language, he may do so. The secretary got 450 additional members without running after them, which would have cost a considerable sum of money. If there is a State labour exchange with preference to unionists, I do not see why all the contributions of all the unions in Western Australia should not be collected in the office next door. The unions, which have so much control over their members in these days, might initiate a policy that no one would engage for employment except through the State labour exchange; and then the unions would have a record of every employee who had ever worked for a Western Australian employer. Such a position would not, in my opinion, be to the advantage of the State or the employee or the employer. A further proof of my assertion that men would be compelled to subscribe to industrial organisations registered under the Arbitration Act, is found in the "Western Worker" of the 9th October, 1925, where Mr. Barker is reported as saying—

The general committee of the Western Australian Amalgamated Society of Railway Employees at their last meeting decided to recommend the branches to vote £100 for the Federal election campaign.

Hon. E. H. Gray: What is wrong with that?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There is a good deal wrong with it, for the man who does not believe in the union being a political organisation, but is compelled to join it.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The majority of the members voted the money, and surely they believed in what was proposed.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It frequently happens that the majority do not vote the money. However, whether they do or do not, a man is told, "You shall be a member of this organisation," and the organisation says to him, "You shall subscribe to a newspaper," while he may have no feeling whatever for the principles advocated by that newspaper. The argument with regard to majorities can be carried too far. I listened attentively to Mr. Hickey's speech when introducing the Bill, especially to his reference to the abolition of private labour bureaux. Under Clause 9 of the Bill, "no person shall hereafter carry on business as an employment broker." The interpretation of "employment broker" speaks of him as one who "keeps any register of persons desirous of obtaining employment or of engaging employees." The interpretation further says, "and includes any person who for reward procures employment or provides labour." In the face of that the Honorary Minister says this evening that he has obtained an opinion from the Crown Law Department to the effect that certain bureaux now existing will not come within the scope of the Bill. I do not see how he can reconcile that statement with the provisions of the Bill. Moreover, the measure states definitely that there shall be only one labour exchange, the State labour exchange. Much has been said concerning the fees that are charged and payable. I agree with hon. members who expressed the opinion that the Government should tighten up the Employment Brokers' Act in that regard. It might be provided that the employer shall pay the whole, or the major portion, of any fee chargeable. It has been stated that half a week's wages, now charged, may be anything up to £1. The union ticket I have here, being a membership ticket, is for an amount of £1. It is a ticket dating back a year or two. There has since been an increase to 25s.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Plus 5s. for the Labour paper.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I do not know anything about the extra 5s. It is not much good arguing that the workers cannot afford

to pay 12s. 6d. or 15s. to secure a position, if on securing it they are called upon to pay £1 or more to their union.

The Honorary Minister: Sixpence a week is fairly reasonable.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: But the men do not pay 6d. a week; they have to pay the lump sum or they cannot become members of the union.

The Honorary Minister: That is not the position.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That question has been fought out and the Honorary Minister can find out the particulars for himself.

The Honorary Minister: You know the position is different from what you suggest, and it is no use arguing.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There is another feature about the question to which I desire to draw the attention of hon. members. In these days we see numerous institutions being declared black. If we are to drive, as Dr. Saw said, the whole of our labour through the bottleneck of the State bureau, and that institution should be declared black, the whole of the work of engaging employment throughout Western Australia will cease. When some institutions or organisations are declared black, there are others by which labour may be employed.

Member: Do you mean scab labour?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No, not scab labour. If, however, all labour is to be engaged through this one institution and that institution should be declared black, no further labour will be available for industries not associated with any dispute, industries that are removed by hundreds of miles from the point where the dispute arises. That phase is merely one of many that arise. In view of what has been said during the debate I support the amendment.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [7.32]: In view of the position that has arisen in connection with the Bill, it becomes necessary to look into the various clauses to see what is actually intended. It will be conceded that our first duty is to see that any law we support here is a wise one. It will also be admitted that the Bill has received an amount of attention that is probably unusual, because it has evoked great interest on account of some very important principles that are involved. When he introduced the Bill the Honorary Minister relied upon the fact that its presentation had been induced because of recommendations emanating from

one of the conferences under the auspices of the League of Nations. If the Honorary Minister's statement is correct, when he said that the Bill had been based upon the recommendations of the Washington conference, it behoves us to look into those recommendations closely. We have heard those recommendations and I ask hon. members to study them exactly to see what they mean. This is what Article No. 2 of the draft Convention states—

Each member who ratifies this convention shall establish a system of free public employment agencies under the control of a central authority. Committees, which shall include representatives of employers and of workers, shall be appointed to advise on matters concerning the carrying on of these agencies. Where both public and private free employment agencies exist, steps shall be taken to co-ordinate the operations of such agencies on a national scale. The operations of the various national systems shall be co-ordinated by the International Labour Office in agreement with the countries concerned.

The PRESIDENT: Do you think that applies to the abolition of local registry offices for that is really what the Bill is for?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: This is the recommendation which the Honorary Minister stated a few minutes ago was the basis of the Bill.

The PRESIDENT: But do you think it really applies to the abolition of local registry offices?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It does, because the recommendation proceeds as follows:—

The general conference recommends that each member of the International Labour Organisation take measures to prohibit the establishment of employment agencies which charge fees, or which carry on their business for profit.

The PRESIDENT: If you think it applies you may proceed.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Thank you!

Hon. J. R. Brown: That is not embodied in the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then the recommendation proceeds—

Where such agencies already exist, it is further recommended that they be permitted to operate only under Government license, and that all practicable measures be taken to abolish such agencies as soon as possible.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is definitely enough.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What is wrong with it?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I submit that the Bill before us, although purporting to be framed on the basis of this recommendation, is in no wise similar to it. If we have to rely upon the recommendation of the Washington Conference as the basis for the Bill, we can tear it to shreds.

Hon. J. R. Brown: You need not do that. The Bill is before the House without that.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If it is intended that free agencies are to be under the control of a central authority, is that really the intention, or are the free agencies to be under Governmental authority?

Hon. J. R. Brown: What is the difference?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There is a mighty difference.

Hon. J. Cornell: That is merely a legal technicality.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I will go further with the recommendations and show that it is not a legal technicality, but a point that strikes absolutely at the root of the whole recommendation. It is suggested in the Washington proposal that committees shall be appointed to include representatives of employers and of workers to advise on matters concerning the carrying on of the free public employment agencies. Where is there one clause in the Bill indicating that such committees are to be appointed? The Honorary Minister admitted in his speech that he is in control of this particular department and we recognise that the labour exchanges, which will be merely an enlargement of the existing State Labour Bureau, will be under the control, not of a central authority, but of the Minister. That is not in accordance with the recommendation which is said to be the basis for the Bill. If that is so, how can the Bill stand? Is that not an argument in favour of the amendment? Most unquestionably it is: it is the strongest argument we could wish for. However, this point can be taken a little further. I have pointed out that although the gatherings at Washington—

Hon. J. R. Brown: Oh, leave Washington out of it.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I will ask the hon. member to leave himself out of it. I can understand his wish that Washington should be left out of it when I point out the great dissimilarity between the Bill and

the Washington recommendations. It would be a good thing for the hon. member to learn something about Washington.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Have you no pity for the hon. member?

Hon. J. R. Brown: We don't get any pity here.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It goes on to state that where both public and private free employment agencies exist, steps should be taken to co-ordinate the operations of such agencies on a national scale; that the operations of the various national systems shall be co-ordinated by the International Labour Office in agreement with the countries concerned. I ask, has this Bill in any way passed under the purview of the International Labour Office, does it coincide in even one small respect with the later recommendations which state that each member of the international labour organisations shall take measures to prohibit the establishment of employment agencies that charge fees or carry on their business for profit, but that where such agencies already exist it is further recommended that they be permitted to operate under Government license?

Hon. E. H. Gray: If we were to carry out the recommendations of the International Labour Office in their entirety the hon. member would call it job control.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In one qualified respect the recommendation has been carried out, namely that by the Bill the Government are seeking to abolish the private agencies, which have been established here for many years and which have been rendering a great public service.

Hon. J. R. Brown: You would not think so if you went there for a job.

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member can make a speech without your assistance, Sir.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I point out again that Clause 9 of the Bill prohibits any other person from carrying on an employment broker's agency for profit.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you think that will stop the R.S.L. from operating?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think so. Unquestionably the Bill will have the effect of abolishing those businesses carried on for profit. The Bill goes into the realm of injustice, doing a wrong by seeking to deprive people engaged in lawful business from continuing their operations. There is no justification for it. There is less justi-

fication for it because of the recommendations of the Washington Conference, which definitely state that the private agencies already established should be permitted to continue to operate under Government license. We have as law here to-day exactly what the Washington Conference recommended. Since 1909, to take the later Act, we have authorised employment brokers to carry on business under license. That meets exactly the recommendations of the Washington Conference, which does not ask for the abolition of such agencies.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Why quote the Washington Conference?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Because it is the basis of the Bill. Perhaps you know the position better than the Honorary Minister. The Washington Conference recommended that existing agencies should be allowed to continue. In any event no good Government would talk of abolishing lawful occupations without some measure of compensation. There is a provision in the Act that any licensed employment broker guilty of any wrongdoing shall have his license cancelled. The Honorary Minister, in support of the proposal to abolish the private employment brokers, quoted certain acts of exploitation by those brokers. But under Section 25 of the Act of 1909 it is provided that for any such offence the employment broker shall be liable to a fine of £50 or imprisonment for six months.

The Honorary Minister: The difficulty is to prove these things.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It has been found to be impracticable. The section is of no use.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Well, then, surely it would have been much better to have introduced a short Bill amending the law, to make it practicable. That is all that is required. Is there any justification for bringing in a Bill to abolish a man's avocation? A great deal has been said about making a man's labour a matter of commerce. This is not a matter of commerce where the engagement of people is regulated by laws under license. If these people were not licensed the position would be entirely different. One thing that has been lost sight of by the Honorary Minister and Mr. Dodd is that the recommendations from Washington were prompted by the reason that in certain countries of Europe the condition of affairs is totally different from that prevailing here.

If our conditions in respect of employment agencies were as dark as they are in certain other countries, there might be reason for the Bill perhaps in a modified form. The Honorary Minister, speaking on the question of compensation, remarked that when the Government wheat pool was established no compensation was paid to the wheat buyers who previously had been engaged in business. Is that a fair comparison?

The PRESIDENT: I do not think it ought to come into it at all. It has nothing to do with the Bill.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I admit that the Honorary Minister was justified in bringing in what argument he could to support his case. He said the wheat buyers were not allowed one penny of compensation. As a matter of fact, they were allowed, as the Honorary Minister should recall, to join in the purchasing of wheat.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Five of the big firms were cut out.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I think they all got a share.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The biggest wheat buying firm in the world was cut out.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That, however, was not a fair comparison. Surely the position of the wheat buyer was not to be compared, under the conditions that existed, and the fact that the wheat pool was introduced as a war measure at a time of national distress, with the position of the proposed labour bureau.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think there is any analogy between the two. You need not discuss the matter any further.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I agree it is not a fair comparison. Reference was made by the Honorary Minister to the fact that certain fees were being charged unfairly by these employment brokers.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Quite right too.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: As a result of my inquiries I have learned that the Honorary Minister is hardly correct in his statement. I understand it has been almost the invariable practice for these brokers to collect, as provided under the Act of 1918, half their fee from the employers and half from the employees.

The Honorary Minister: I could have given you the proportions if you had wanted them. I have had a thorough investigation made.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The Bill will undoubtedly establish a monopoly in favour

of the Government, which, as other members have pointed out, may have certain bad results.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It could not have worse results than we now have.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is for us to consider whether it is wise to pass this Bill into law. What ought to be done is that the Government, if they find the present law is not sufficiently strong to prosecute with success in the case of these alleged offences, should tighten up the sections of the Act so as to prevent these occurrences.

The Honorary Minister: We could not get the witnesses.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It would never do to say that a man should be charged and convicted without a fair trial.

The Honorary Minister: Quite so.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Every man is entitled to a trial. We must not deny any man justice. We would be doing wrong in passing the Bill as it is. The only thing for us to do is to support the amendment.

Amendment (six months) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	10
Noes	9

Majority for .. 1

AYES.

Hon. J. Duffell
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. A. Lovekin

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. E. Rose

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. A. Burvill
Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. W. Hickey

Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. J. R. Brown

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.
Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. J. Ewing

NOES.
Hon. J. E. Dodd
Hon. T. Moore

Amendment thus passed; Bill rejected.

House adjourned at 9.3 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 28th October, 1925.

Questions: Stock train, Meekatharra-Midland Junction	Pa
Jury, Murder Trial	10
Stock Inspector, Appointment	11
Bills of Sale Act Amendment Bill, Select Committee, Extension of time	11
Motion: Parliamentary Allowance, to increase	11
Annual Estimates: General debate concluded	11
and items discussed	11

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—STOCK TRAIN, MEEKATHARRA-MIDLAND JUNCTION.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that the average time occupied by the special stock train from Meekatharra to Midland Junction is 36 hours? 2, If so, will he have investigation made immediately with a view to ensuring a more expeditious service?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, In the summer time-table which comes into operation on the 30th proximo, arrangements have been made for train loads of stock to be conveyed from Meekatharra to Midland Junction in 36 hours and 15 minutes.

QUESTION—JURY, MURDER TRIAL.

Hon. G. TAYLOR (for Mr. Teesdale) asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Is he aware that a section of the Press reported that cheering could be heard from the jury while they were considering their verdict at a recent murder trial? 2, If this is correct, will he arrange a long vacation for those present from again acting in a similar capacity? Will he endeavour in future to prevent such exhibitions in courts of justice at all events?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, No. 2, Whether the occurrence took place or not, in any event it takes about five years to exhaust the metropolitan jury list and then to return to the same jurors. 3, Courts of justice are held with proper decorum, but because as elsewhere nervous tension is, on exceptional occasions, liable to show itself. As regards the jury, on retirement to consider their verdict they are locked in the jury room