pared to back up their monopoly with money. I have a sample of their propaganda, of which I suppose every member has received a copy. Fortunately my Bill was in print before I went to the Eastern States. I hope members will support me in my endeavour to clean up a pernicious evil that should have been attacked long ago. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 14th September, 1938.

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

QUESTION—POPULATION, DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. HILL asked the Premier: What is the population—1, of the whole State; 2, of the metropolitan area; 3, within one hundred miles radius of Fremantle; 4, on the goldfields?

The PREMIER replied: Full information regarding the population of the State is contained in pages 16 to 20 inclusive of the Pocket Year Book which is supplied to all members. In case the member for Albany has not received his copy, or has inadvertently mislaid it, I attach one for his use.

QUESTION—RAILWAY, DENMARK-NORNALUP.

Transport Board's Report as to Closure.

Mr. HILL asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has the Transport Board finished its report on the closure of the Denmark-Nornalup railway? 2, If so, will he make the report public?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, The report is now being considered by the Government.

QUESTION—PRISON REFORM.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary: 1, Has the Chief Secretary detailed advice of the recent prison reforms effected in Britain? 2, Is any similar action contemplated locally?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLIES.

Reduction of Goldfields Pumping Cost.

Hon. N. KEENAN asked the Minister for Water Supplies: 1, Is it a fact that in the Goldfields Water Supply scheme water is pumped to a height which is subsequently lost by gravitation, necessitating repumping of the same water? 2, Has he been approached by Mr. Nat Harper regarding the desirability of reducing the cost of pumping by decreasing the number of pumping stations and eliminating the loss of pressure due to gravity?

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES replied: 1, No. 2, Not to my recollection.

BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Justice and read a first time.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, State Government Insurance Office.

2, Mullewa Road Board Loan Rate.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 31st August.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. F. C. L. Smith—Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [4.37]: This measure should have the support of every member. It proposes to amend Section 126 of the Local Courts Act dealing with the goods a bailiff may seize under warrant of execution, and cause to be sold in pursuance thereof. This provision has been in the Act since 1904. The Act is rather an ancient one, and may be said to bear upon it the polish of antiquity. The section in question provides for the protection of certain property against seizure by a bailiff. The hon. member who introduced the Bill desires to protect it in a more liberal fashion. In respect of wearing apparel—exempted under the Act—the Bill effects no alteration. The present Act provides that a debtor's wearing apparel shall be protected to the extent of a value of £5, to a similar value on account of his wife's apparel, and to a value of £2 on account of each other dependent member of his family. Under the present Act bedding and a few tools of trade are also given protection. The sponsor of the Bill desires to extend that protection to furniture, which I think members will agree is desirable; to some household appliances, which is also essential, and, further, to increase the value of the tools of trade in respect of which protection will be provided. The value of the bedding that is now protected under the Act is £5, with an additional £1 worth for each member of the family, while implements of trade to the value of £5 are also protected. That is a niggardly provision that must have caused a great deal of hardship for those so unfortunately placed as to have orders of the court issued against them in the local court, as a result of which warrants of execution have been granted. The member for Canning, in moving the second reading of the Bill, pointed out that similar Acts in the Eastern States contained provisions that were much more liberal, and it will be agreed that the alterations sought in the Bill are not over-liberal. The hon. member drew attention to the fact that a sewing machine might be worth much more than £5. Such a machine could not be purchased to-day for less than £26.

Mr. Sampson: Yes, it would cost that at least.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: When I was a boy in Victoria, a bailiff could not seize a sewing machine under a warrant of execution, and therefore it will be seen that protection was afforded many years ago. The proposal in the Bill is to extend the value of furniture and appliances that will be protected to £25, and that increased value will also apply to tools of trade. Members will agree that debtors who have to face such adverse circumstances, should be left with something more than bedding. They require some household furniture and appliances that are essential for reasonable existence. A strong case can be made out in favour of increasing the value of tools of trade that will be afforded protection. A carpenter, for instance, could not possibly continue in his vocation with tools of trade valued at £5 only. There are many tradesmen who have to provide their own tools in order to secure employment, and they would be faced with much the same difficulty. The value of tools necessary for those tradesmen to continue in employment would represent much more than £5, and £25 would not represent an over-estimate of their value. If the tradesmen's tools were seized under an execution of warrant, he would find himself not only deprived of those tools but confronted with the necessity to replace them before he could secure further employment. The Bill submitted by the member for Canning is worthy of support because it will have the effect of protecting the bare necessities of a household and the tools of trade with which a debtor may earn his living. I support the second reading of the Bill.

MR. SHEARN (Maylands) [4.46]: I agree entirely with the sentiments expressed by the Minister for Justice. I consider, as he does, that the object of the Act is really to check up on those individuals who may choose to exercise their rights under this antiquated legislation. In the majority of instances, any creditor with a sense of rea-

sonableness and of justice as between individuals, would not be affected by the restrictions imposed by the amending legislation. Every now and again some less generous individual displays no consideration whatever for the interests of the debtor and his dependants and causes hardships such as have been indicated. For the reasons given by the Minister, all of which I regard as perfectly worthy of endorsement, I consider every member can, with justice, support the second reading of the Bill. It will represent an act of equity in the interests of the community respecting whom it is our duty to pass laws that shall be applicable with due consideration to the rights of all concerned. I support the second reading of the Bill and trust it will have a speedy passage through the Chamber.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

BILL—COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 31st August.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [4.52]: I support the second reading of the Bill, which is divided into two parts, one relating to the conditions that should govern the issue and distribution of a prospectus on a proposed flotation of a company; and the other relating to the prohibition of canvassing shares from place to place, or from house to house. As to the first part, no objection can be taken by any reasonable person. For a long time past, the need has been felt for some tightening up of the law with respect to the canvassing of shares, especially by foreign companies, with which the Bill seeks principally to deal. A better opportunity should be given to people who are desirous of investing their money in companies of knowing exactly the nature of the business proposed to be carried on by the company and what its financial obligations are by agreement or otherwise, so that there may be no possible doubt as to the bona fides of the company. I do not intend to dwell on that part of the Bill, because no exception should be taken to it by any reasonable person.

With regard to the part of the Bill which proposes to restrict canvassing from house to house, I submit the need for some amendment of the measure is evident if we are to accept that principle. It may be said that the prevention of share-hawking is absolutely necessary. I recognise that unrestricted share-hawking is liable to and does injure people who invest their money in companies. We had before us last year the report of a select committee which inquired into affairs of a certain company and the report convinced us, beyond any shadow of doubt, that some companies seeking to do business in this State ought to have the tightest rein kept upon them. Other companies have, however, been floated in this State, the capital being subscribed locally. To give an example at a moment's notice of such a company is not easy, particularly an example of a company carrying on a large business; but I have in mind at present a company that would never have been floated and would not have been able to carry on its business as successfully as it has during the past 10 years, had those interested in its promotion, as well as in the progress of the town and district, been prevented from canvassing the shares so as to obtain an amount sufficient to go to allotment. I refer particularly to the Katanning Flour Mills, Ltd. I know of other companies in country districts and in the metropolitan area that have been floated privately by people with the best intentions, and with no idea of defrauding or injuring investors. The proposals have had to be explained to the various investors before their support could be obtained, and very often individual investors subscribed but a small amount of the capital. I know sufficient about the company to which I have referred to be able to say that had the shares not been canvassed, the chances are that the company would never have come into existence. It is to-day occupying a very satisfactory position indeed. The same company controls the electricity supply at Katanning. The company could not possibly have been floated had the shares not been canvassed, or unless the capital had been subscribed by total strangers, a course not desirable from the point of view of the district.

When the Bill reaches the Committee stage, my intention is to move an amendment giving the Registrar of Companies power to grant a certificate of exemption. I do not suggest that is the only amendment that might be made to solve this difficulty, but at least it will enable members to discuss the point raised and possibly bring forward a better suggestion. My proposal is that the Registrar of Companies should be permitted to grant a certificate of exemption to any company in Western Australia allowing that company, for special reasons satisfactory to the Registrar, to canvass shares either in a specified area of the State, or over the whole State. I trust that my proposed amendment will receive support. I believe the second reading of the Bill will be passed by a substantial majority of members. I trust the member in charge of the Bill will see the necessity for some such exemption as I have suggested. Other than that, and speaking in general terms, the Bill seems to me to be satisfactory. It is in the interests of the public, particularly that section of the public that is unable to withstand the wiles of the too talkative salesman and that does not understand fully the ramifications of companies and their methods. Those people will receive some protection if the Bill passes. For those reasons I support the second reading.

MR. STUBBS (Wagin) [4.58]: I intend to support the measure. I have reasons for doing so, because at least 20 letters have reached me, some from the farthest corner of my electorate, during the last fortnight or three weeks in regard to the Bill. The most astounding thing about the letters is the fact that they are couched in the same language and in almost identically the same words. If my memory serves me rightly they start by saying that they have listened to a broadcast on a Sunday evening by a gentleman who, in the course of his remarks, suggests that this is not the time to amend the Companies Act. His objection is that an amendment of the Act should not go through in the closing stages of a dying Parliament. I have felt that there has been something behind the letters that have reached me, and when I examined the measure and conferred with other members, I came to the conclusion that the protests that had been made were genuine in every respect. They all came from honourable people who were not in the habit of writin such letters merely for the sake of writin them. I have in mind the case of a farme in my electorate who in the last two or thre years has been deliberately robbed. He wa induced to purchase some property and rosy picture was painted to him that th land he was being offered was capable o producing vegetables and other produc that were required in the metropolitan are The land was at Osborne Park, and co sisted of five or six acres. My reason fo quoting this particular case will intere members. The land was worth probably £3 at the most. How much do you, Mr. Speake think this unfortunate or foolish man wa asked to pay? No less a sum than £65 and the amount was to be paid in insta ments extending over two or three year While he was paying off the purchase pric he was being constantly reminded by th Perth Road Board that the rates on the lan had not been paid by the person from whor he had bought the block. The farmer file all those letters, and in the end a final notic was sent to him to the effect that it was in tended to put up the block for sale by auc tion in the following week, and a cuttin from a newspaper containing an announce ment to that effect, was sent to him. Th farmer carefully filed that also. The lan was auctioned in the Perth Town Hall. A I said, the land was worth probably £3 but it was sold by auction for 30s. I cam into the picture when the Crown Law De partment requested the farmer to return th Crown title. I made inquiries and foun that everything connected with the sale wa quite in order, and I handed over the titl to the land. I have no hesitation in sayin that the unfortunate farmer was robbed o between £500 and £600. If the Bill now be fore us will have the effect of preventin unscrupulous dealers from canvassing town in the country for the purpose of sellin land or shares in companies, both of whic may be worthless, the House will not hav passed the legislation in vain. I am a hun dred per cent. behind the proposals con tained in the Bill, and I hope the House wil agree to the measure going through.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [5.5] The object of the Bill is to amend the Com panies Act, and it is perhaps pertinent t remark that our Companies Act is a docu

ment of extreme antiquity. It was passed in 1893, and most of its provisions were copied from an English statute that was passed in 1862. A number of amendments have been passed since, but they have all dealt with trivial points. The time has well arrived for a complete overhaul of our Companies Act; in fact, I hold the opinion that there should be a uniform Companies Act for the whole of Australia.

The Premier: That was agreed to.

Hon. N. KEENAN: But it has been a failure. In our own interests we are bound to take steps to amend the Companies Act to fit in with the conditions of things as they exist in our own State.

The Premier: The Act I referred to contained 12 amendments.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Nine to be exact. The Bill has been copied from the Imperial statutes and also from parts of the statutes adopted in the other States which also have been taken from the Imperial statutes. The Bill is mainly directed towards one part of our Act that requires amendment, and it might be that that probably will be looked upon as an objection because we are once more tinkering with the law instead of completely amending it. But this tinkering happens to be exceedingly important at the moment, undoubtedly because of the absence of provisions affecting parties who may be attempting to float companies for wholly illegitimate purposes. There have been abuses by those who are always prepared to take advantage of loopholes in our statute. There is force in what the member for Katanning (Mr. Watts) said regarding the provisions of Clause 5 as affecting the flotation of local companies. Any danger, however, can be removed by allowing the Registrar of Companies to grant a certificate of exemption. The main provision, and it is a most admirable provision, is that which will compel a prospectus to be signed by the directors of companies about to be formed outside as well as within Australia, companies whose shares are offered for subscription within the State. That prospectus will have to be filed with the registrar, and the date of registration must be shown on the prospectus to be issued in the State. In this way the parties will be tied down to the statements contained in the prospectus, because under the Companies Act the directors will be liable for the statements put forward. Thus we shall have the definite signatures of the parties responsible for the statements. So I find I can support the Bill although, as I stated, it is only tinkering with a subject that is so wide and so pressing for amendment. Seeing that there is no possibility of dealing with a comprehensive measure, we should pass the Bill to deal with the evils that exist.

On motion by the Minister for Justice, debate adjourned.

BILL—FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Order of the Day read for the resumption from the 31st August of the debate on the second reading.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [5.10]: I move—

That the consideration of this item be postponed to a later stage of the sitting.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [5.11]: Before the hon. member's motion is put, I should like your ruling Mr. Speaker, as to whether the Bill comes within the Standing Orders. It proposes to amend the Fisheries Act, and to give certain power to the local authorities. Those local authorities have not that power under their own Act, and they will be asked to accept a responsibility that it is proposed to give them in the Bill. Therefore I do not consider that it can legitimately be said that the Bill comes within the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the second reading of the Bill was moved, I questioned whether the Bill was strictly in accordance with the Standing Orders and the Constitution. I made representations to the Crown Law Department and received certain advice. I have discussed the position with the hon. member who has submitted the Bill, and suggested that he might interview the Crown Solicitor to see whether an alteration could be made; that is, of course, if an alteration were found to be necessary. The hon. member met me this afternoon—I am sorry to say it was late in the afternoon, principally because of the fact that I was not available at an earlier hour—and we discussed the position. There is still a difference of

opinion with regard to the Bill. The hon. member had no desire to withdraw his Bill, or to put it at the bottom of the notice paper. We thought, however, we might further discuss the position during the tea adjournment, with a view to seeing what could be done to put the Bill in order, that is, if it be out of order at the present time. There was no desire to penalise the hon. member by putting the Bill too far down on the notice paper. I suggest that the member for Murchison, who has raised the point, should not press it so that we might have an opportunity to go more deeply into the matter. Therefore I shall put the motion of the member for Katanning, that the consideration of the Bill be postponed to a later stage of the sitting.

Motion put and passed.

BILL—ALSATIAN DOG ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 31st August.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [5.15]: I listened attentively to the remarks of the member for Irwin-Moore (Hon. P. D. Ferguson) when he introduced the Bill, which I intend to support. I conscientiously believe, however, that we are unduly fearful of this species of dog on account of the history of its breeding. My experience of dogs has convinced me that in the main they all are, by nature, killers, with the possible exception of lap dogs. In any species there are individuals that will kill if the opportunity arises, but the history of the Alsatian is one that makes us unduly fearful about the breed. The Alsatian originated many years ago from the wolf. Consequently there is a desire, by legislative action, to prevent the propagation of the species in Western Australia. I agree that every precaution should be taken to protect the property of growers, and that is the principal reason why I whole-heartedly support the measure. At the same time, I believe we could introduce legislation that would be far more effective in protecting the flocks of growers than the present Act or the proposed amendment. By the introduction of other legislation we could also afford those that desire to breed this type of animal an opportunity to do so.

The member for Irwin-Moore said that one of this species got away and mingled with dingoes, and in consequence the progeny played havoc with the herds in and around that particular district. My opinion is that a sterilised animal could easily become a cover for one that was unsterilised. That is quite obvious. These animals are very much alike in appearance. I am doubtful whether I could tell one dog from another, unless I saw both of them together. The point I wish to make is that where sterilised animals gain access to country districts, they can easily become covers for unsterilised dogs by virtue of mistaken identity. In a particular community, people become aware of the fact that a certain man has a sterilised Alsatian dog, but as these animals bear a striking resemblance to each other, an unsterilised dog could be in their midst for some time without their being aware of the fact. Consequently, it would appear to be better for us to make sure that this type of dog is not introduced into country districts where it might play havoc with the herds. It would be more satisfactory if we entirely prohibited persons in country districts from possessing animals of this breed.

Mr. Stubbs: Why not cut them out altogether?

Mr. MARSHALL: I would support legislation to prevent anyone from having or transporting an Alsatian dog outside the metropolitan area. That would enable those that desire to rear these dogs in the metropolitan area to do so.

The Minister for Mines: They might "go bush."

Mr. MARSHALL: For a person to take an Alsatian outside the metropolitan area should be made unlawful—even though the animal was merely taken for a joy ride. That is a habit in which people with money often indulge. We frequently see dogs taken for joy rides around the hills, while there are so many unfortunate people looking for a meal within the city boundaries. To allow allegedly sterilised animals to get into country districts is to provide a cover for unsterilised animals of whose presence people would be unaware until they had done a good deal of damage. We should not permit Alsatian dogs either to live in country districts or to pass through them, but I consider that people

in the metropolitan area who fancy these animals should be given an opportunity to possess them.

Mr. Stubbs: They attack children at times.

Mr. MARSHALL: Any dog will do that at times; not any dog, perhaps, but an individual dog of any species will do it, while other animals of the same species are most affectionate towards children, who can do anything with them. That applies equally to Alsatian dogs that are very nice in the main, although some members of the breed are particularly vicious. I am doubtful whether we can discriminate in that regard. Kangaroo dogs are generally accepted as being most faithful house-dogs but I have known such animals to make most vicious attacks. The breed is not condemned, however, because of the behaviour of certain individual dogs. I know units of the same breed that are keen killers and if two or three of them are left together in a paddock where there are sheep, they will do a vast amount of damage. We do not legislate against the breed because of that. We are doubtless more fearful of the Alsatian because of his breeding rather than because of the actual damage that he has done over and above what is likely to be done by any dog, given the opportunity. Personally I have no love for the Alsatian; it is too massive for my liking and I do not admire it. I would prefer to have a Pekinese. At the same time I am not opposed to permitting those that do admire Alsatians to own them, as long as the dogs are kept in the metropolitan area. To legislate against the Alsatian in the manner suggested by the Bill will be to afford an opportunity for unsterilised Alsatians to be taken into districts where they will do a lot of damage before people are aware of their presence, in which case many growers will be heavy losers.

Mr. Watts: If people will break one law, they will break another. Even in the metropolitan area the law would be broken.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the law stipulated that no person, whether he be the owner or not, should have an Alsatian outside of the metropolitan area, there would be something to work on, because everybody that took one of those animals outside the city boundaries would be breaking the law. At present people are permitted to take out of the metropolitan area what are alleged to be sterilised animals, but who knows, without investigation or inquiry, whether those dogs are sterilised? It is assumed that they are sterilised because the law stipulates that they must be sterilised.

The Minister for Agriculture: The owners must possess a veterinary surgeon's certificate.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is when a person is definitely residing somewhere and has recognised control over the animal; but under the Act I would not be prohibited from taking possession of an animal and transporting it from one part of the State to another. I do not require to have a certificate to do that.

The Minister for Agriculture: If the dog is in your possession, you must have a certificate.

Mr. MARSHALL: Even though I am not the owner? I am doubtful whether the Act provides for that.

Mr. Patrick: It is difficult to establish who is the owner when the case is taken to court.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is so. I do not think the Act provides that anyone but the actual owner must have a certificate.

The Minister for Agriculture: No.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, that is the point. If I wanted to transport an animal from one place to another, I would not need a certificate. Under the pretext of removing a sterilised dog owned by the Minister, I could shift an unsterilised dog. The present Act prohibits breeding of these dogs in the metropolitan area, which I consider is an unfair handicap to place upon people who fancy this particular type of dog. I do not think we should be so hard on people who like these dogs, because the love of animals is inherent in human nature. We all have our particular fancy and I believe that so long as Alsatians are kept in the metropolitan area, it should be permissible for people to own them, because we would then be able to police the Act quite effectively. At present we cannot police the Act because, as I have pointed out, unsterilised animals can be transported from the city to other parts of the State, where they are able to do considerable damage.

I will always support measures of this kind because the growers have enough obstacles to face as it is. Nearly always they have bad seasons and low prices to cope with. Consequently they have a great struggle to exist, and we should do everything we can to

ensure that when they do succeed in producing something that is an asset, its destruction by Alsatians shall not take place. For that reason, I support the measure, though I do not think that it will be as effective as we desire.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne) [5.29]: If the Bill is accepted, no dog will be imported unless it has been effectively sterilised. At present a dog under the age of three months may be imported, and the idea of the hon. member who introduced the measure is to minimise the danger involved in the importation of puppies, namely, the danger that they will be overlooked when the time arrives for their sterilisation and the issue of a certificate to indicate that they have been sterilised. We have effectively controlled the requirements of the present Act, but there has been a danger in puppies being introduced overland from an adjoining State which has no legislation against dogs of this kind. As regards dogs of any age coming in by boat, or even puppies, we have an arrangement under which agents notify the department. We had some difficulty with dogs coming in by train, because we had no inspector to advise us; but now we have at Kalgoorlie an arrangement with an officer of another branch of the Department of Agriculture to inform us. Puppies have been brought in by aeroplane, and airways authorities also advise. In the case of puppies introduced overland—as some have been—considerable difficulty has been experienced in placing not only the people concerned, but the puppies after they have reached an age sufficiently mature for sterilisation. There is no doubt of the danger which these dogs present, especially if they become the parents of half-breeds. In discussing the matter with the officers of the Vermin Branch, I found them definite in the view that these dogs constitute a menace.

Hon. N. Keenan: Are they the only dogs that constitute a menace?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: No; but as regards half-breeds we have the example recently given by the member for Irwin-Moore (Hon. P. D. Ferguson) of a dog which had done a tremendous amount of harm, and I am assured by the officer concerned in the trapping of the animal that it was definitely half-Alsatian. When the House decided, some years ago, that all Alsatians over the age of three months should be sterilised, the only reason for the bar of three months was the belief that effective sterilisation could not take place at an age of less than three months. To enforce complete sterilisation the term of three months was introduced into the Bill which was enacted. We know that in other States high registration fees are imposed for this class of dog, and that in States where municipalities and road boards register dogs the most rigid control is placed on them. I fear there is a definite danger from them which must be recognised. I have no objection to the Bill, and shall support it.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

MOTION—MINING ACT.

To Disallow Reserves 1027H and 1028H.

Debate resumed from the 7th September on the following motion by Mr. Marshall (Murchison):—

That the approval and conditions of temporary Reserves Nos. 1027H and 1028H granted in accordance with Section 297A of the Mining Act, 1904, and laid upon the Table of this House on the 30th August, be and are hereby disallowed.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [5.35]: I oppose the motion, and hope the House will disagree to it. One can admire the mover at least for his consistency. The hon. member makes no bones about acknowledging that he is opposed to the principle of reservations. Members who heard his argument last week will agree that his speech was directed more against the principle of reservation than against the particular reservations under discussion. He repeated time after time that he intended on every occasion when a reservation was extended, in the Murchison electorate particularly, to move to disallow it. Therefore I am disposed to think the hon. member is not so much concerned about these reservations, or to whom they were granted, as about reservation in principle. I do not intend to discuss the question of the principle of granting reservations under the Mining Act. That question has been debated here in many sessions. Last year the member for Murchison was instrumental in obtaining an Act limiting reservations to 300 acres, and imposing certain other restrictions; for instance, every reserva-

tion granted must be tabled. I hold, therefore, that the principle of granting reservations was decided by Parliament itself last session.

Mr. Marshall: It was decided by six men, not by Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was decided by Parliament in just the same way as many other important questions are decided by the Parliament of Western Australia.

Mr. Patrick: This House was against the measure.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: This House passed the Bill, which was sent on to another place. Parliament decided through its instrumentalities that the Bill should become law. Accordingly I shall not discuss the principle of reservation, not being greatly interested in it. Probably, if I made up my mind on the subject, I would be just as keen to get rid of reservations as the member for Murchison is; but I am in the position of a Minister who has an Act to administer, and that Act gives me certain discretionary powers.

The reservations in question were originally granted to Mr. Morton Webber in 1932, he having taken an option over Reedy's. He endeavoured, upon taking up the reservations, to interest American capital in the field. The company was unsuccessful, and therefore efforts in that district ceased. At that time two highly qualified American engineers visited the field, and upon their report the company then holding the reservations decided to discontinue operations. The next company shown by the file as being interested in the reservations was the Western Gold Mining Company, which ultimately formed the Triton Gold Mining Company to work the reservations. The Triton Gold Mining Company has spent £600,000 on bringing a mine into production, and now employs 236 men. Last year the company crushed 74,388 tons for 25,917 fine ounces of gold. The hon. member in his argument depended largely on the fact that the company had had ample time during the last four years to decide which way the reef was dipping or working, and that there was no occasion to grant it any further extension. There might have been some force in that argument were it not for the fact that the reservation for which the company has applied is to be used not so much to extend the company's area as for the purpose of ascertaining by deep diamond drilling whether there is any possibility of extending its mining activities in that vicinity. With that object in view it applied for, and obtained, an extension of the reservations.

Not only has the company brought the Triton mine up to its present position—I could understand the argument of the member for Murchison if nothing was being done on the reservations—but it has done extensive geophysical surveying and hundreds of acres of loaming, besides geological surface mapping, diamond drilling and costeening on the reservations. In fact, at this present time a diamond drill programme is being carried out on the reservations for the purpose of ascertaining whether there is anything in the deeper levels of that part of the company's area. I believe that in view of the work the company has done there, the continuance of the reservations is warranted in order definitely to decide by deep diamond drilling whether there is any lode at a greater depth. I understand there is nothing to warrant prospecting in that area, because of the big overburden. Incidentally I may remark that the number of men employed by the company on the reservations is sufficient to comply with the Mining Act for an area of 1,416 acres, whereas the company holds only 600 acres.

The member for Murchison has said on many occasions that the same law should apply to all. I am not aware of any differentiation in the law. Sometimes, when listening to the hon. member, one might imagine that in the Mines Department it was a question of big companies versus what the hon. member calls the original prospector. As a matter of fact, there is no question whatever of company versus prospector. Anybody, whether it be a prospector with only pick, napping hammer and dish, or a company with tens of thousands of capital, can apply for a reservation under precisely the same conditions. Numerous reservations have been applied for by, and granted to, original prospectors. Every application is decided purely on its merits. There are many members in this Chamber who, although not actually representing mining electorates and probably never having been engaged in practical mining, are yet aware that the average prospector, not only of the present time but for years past, if he found

anything worth while of a show, would immediately—unless he had plenty of money of his own, in which case most likely he would not have been prospecting—look around for a company to finance the show.

Mr. Marshall: No. The company looks around for him.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Let me tell the hon. member that I was on the Murchison and on other goldfields just as soon as he was, if not sooner.

Mr. Marshall: You have not profited much from your experience.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have spent a lot of time amongst prospectors.

Mr. Marshall: You have not done much for their welfare.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have just as much time and admiration for prospectors as the hon. member has. He must not imagine, because he is obsessed with one idea, that any member not obsessed with that idea has not as much regard for prospectors as the hon. member has.

Mr. Sampson: If a prospector finds anything, is he not limited to submitting it to those who hold the reservation?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: That has nothing to do with the question. If a prospector finds something worth while he can apply for a reservation, under the Act sponsored by the member for Murchison, of 300 acres and it is just as reasonable for him to receive the reservation while he makes arrangements for exploiting the show or the reef or obtains capital to work it as it is for any company to receive a reservation for deep diamond drilling. That is all that has been done in this particular case. This is a piece of land that I am informed is of no use to the ordinary prospector because deep sinking is necessary to prospect it. There are hundreds of miles of such country, as the member for Murchison knows, and the prospector could walk over it year in and year out. Much time would be needed to get through the overburden and the various other stages to ascertain whether a reef existed on the property or not. But a company with capital, given the opportunity and having the aid of the latest scientific methods such as diamond drilling and geophysical surveys, can test out the ground in a way that no prospector could do.

I say quite candidly that when the hon. member talks about the Murchison prospectors being denied this, that and the other, it is so much humbug. For years these reserves have been open to the world, and I doubt whether he could name any prospector who ever sank a shaft on them. A great part of the reservations is in the township of Reedy, and obviously nobody could work that ground at a less depth than 50 feet. If I had an obsession against the granting of reservations, as the hon. member has, I would probably put up arguments somewhat similar to those he has advanced. This land was thrown open as recently as January last, and not a man troubled about it until the reservation was applied for. I do not know that there has been any great outcry about the reservation; the only outcry I know of is that created by the hon. member in moving his motion, and he has done it, I think, because he has become so obsessed against the principle of granting reservations and will do anything possible to prevent a reservation being granted on the Murchison.

The hon. member told us quite plainly last Wednesday that so long as I remained Minister for Mines I could prepare for a fight every time the Government granted a reservation on the Murchison. Well, I say now as I said then, that I have never shirked a fight, and that so long as I am Minister, I will grant or refuse reservations on the merits of the case, regardless of whether the applicant is a big company, or a prospector desiring a reservation until he is able to sell or work his show. That is the only consideration that will influence me. The hon. member also held up the Wiluna mines as an example of a mine that could be developed and worked without a reservation. Admittedly that is so, but the hon. member did not mention that the Wiluna mines would never have reached the present stage of production if they had not been guaranteed a sum of £300,000 in 1930.

Mr. Marshall: What did they do with the reservation?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I mention that to show that one company can obtain a reservation without asking the Government for anything but the 300 acres and bring the mine to the producing stage, while another company is unable to do it without a guarantee of £300,000.

Mr. Marshall: That has nothing to do with reservations.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member said that the Wiluna mines had not applied for a reservation. As a matter of fact, they did what the Triton company has done. They applied for a reservation on the 24th December, 1936, and it was granted.

Mr. Marshall: Why, they started in 1928!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I repeat that the Wiluna mines did what the Triton company did, and that on the 24th December, 1936, they applied for a reservation south-east of the mine for the purpose of deep drilling with a view to determining whether operations could be extended in that direction. That is just what the Triton company has done; it is working on the big mine, employing 360 men, and application was made for the reservation in order to prospect by deep drilling to ascertain whether the mine could be extended in that direction. Perhaps the Triton company will find what the Wiluna mines discovered—that it will not be worth going on with. Therefore, I cannot see that any argument can be advanced in favour of the Wiluna mines as against the Triton company on the score of each having done its best. The Triton company has done a fairly good job in Western Australia. I hold no brief for the company; in fact, I know very little about it beyond what I have gathered from the file, but the company has spent on the reservations alone—that is, quite apart from the mine—a sum of £14,486. I put it to the House—is it not better to grant the 300 acres of reservation and have a sum of £14,486 spent upon it in the hope of finding something better, rather than leave the ground lying idle? To establish new mines in this State, the company has spent no less than £1,983,288—practically £2,000,000—and that is exclusive of operating expenditure on mining and treatment. Consequently, this is no blow-in company that has done nothing for the State. I trust the House will not agree to the motion. This House agreed to the principle.

Mr. Marshall: It did not agree to the principle.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Parliament agreed to the principle.

Mr. Marshall: It did not.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member can persist in repeating his statement, but every Bill of importance has been settled by a conference of managers representing the two Houses. Therefore, Parliament has decided and the law of this State, rightly or wrongly, has been determined. If the hon. member held a different opinion, why did he agree to the conference?

Mr. Marshall: A conference is not this House.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I say Parliament agreed to the principle.

Mr. Marshall: You said this House agreed to it.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Then I shall withdraw the word "House" and substitute the word "Parliament."

Mr. Marshall: And evade the point in that way.

The Premier: This House agreed to the report of the conference managers.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Of course it did.

Mr. Marshall: I will give you a reply presently.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member is always going to do something. I emphasise that every application for a renewal of a reservation on the Murchison—I am pleased that the hon. member has not gone outside his own electorate—will be granted provided the conditions warrant the adoption of that course. That is the only consideration that will influence me. This House should understand clearly just why reservations are granted. Only two reservations are involved in the motion before the House, and I say definitely they were granted to give the company an opportunity to undertake deep diamond drilling. The company has done that work and spent over £14,000 on it. Whether anything was discovered, I do not know. I venture to say that every unprejudiced member will agree that it was well worth while giving the company that right for 12 months. When a reservation is granted and an important discovery is made, it means that more capital is brought into the State, and particularly does it mean that more employment is provided on the mines.

Mr. Marshall: Oh! That is the same old tale.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Perhaps so, but the hon. member was careful to hold up the Big Bell mine as an example, and the Big Bell mine had a reservation. Before the hon. member ever saw Cue, I venture to say that the original prospectors had taken

hundreds of pounds' worth of gold out of the Big Bell, but they had not the money to work the mine as it is being worked now. The Chesson Brothers worked it for years. The Big Bell company is setting an example to the other mines of the State in the handling of low-grade ore. What is more, the company is so satisfied with the treatment received in this State that it is launching out into other parts. I suppose the hon. member would contend that the company was not entitled to deep drill on some of the shows that have lain idle for many years and probably would continue to remain idle until some big company took them up. That is the position, and I leave the decision to the good judgment of the House. If members are satisfied that the hon. member, obsessed with the idea that reservations should not be granted, should be allowed to prevent the exercise of any discretionary power by the Mines Department over vacant land not capable of feeding a sheep and to debar a company from deep drilling to ascertain what might be below the surface, that will be their responsibility. I trust members will not approve of the disallowance.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison—in reply) [5.58]: The only difference that has marked the discussions on reservations is in the personnel of the Minister for Mines.

The Minister for Mines: That shows that great minds think alike.

Mr. MARSHALL: We have heard the same old tale put up in the same old way. The Minister cannot see why reservations should not be granted; he cannot see any vital principle underlying the granting of reservations. In every respect he simply follows—as I fully expected him to do—in the same old groove that each and every Minister for Mines has followed for many years.

The Minister for Mines: Then we must all be wrong.

Mr. MARSHALL: To sum up the position, it is departmental control represented in Parliament by a Minister. I do not know how long the Minister spent on the Murchison.

The Minister for Mines: I was there before you were and made it possible for men like you to represent it.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister stayed long enough to know that the industry was not a good one to work in, and then left it.

The Minister for Mines: You never worked in it at all except at a battery.

Mr. MARSHALL: I have had a longer all-round experience of mining than has any man who ever occupied the position of Minister for Mines. That statement can be corroborated by a scrutiny of the books. Anyhow, I did not run away from the industry; I stayed there. I did not run down to the city seeking the amenities and luxuries that life there had to offer. Probably the Minister left Peak Hill for Peak Hill's good.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has gone far enough along that line of discussion.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister made the statement that I was obsessed with an opinion hostile to reservations.

Mr. Styants: That is a libel.

Mr. MARSHALL: I may be obsessed. I was always given to understand that the correct interpretation of the Labour Party's principles was that they aimed at preventing monopolies and concessions. I understood it was the principle of the party to look after the men on the lower rung, not, as the Minister has pointed out, the individual with millions of money in his possession. Evidently I have wrongly interpreted one of the principles of the Labour Movement. Apparently we should look after those who can afford to pay for looking after themselves; we should not worry about the pioneers of industry. The Minister's statement that the Act gives him power to grant reservations is, I venture to say, wrong in fact. Although past Ministers for Mines have taken to themselves the right to grant reservations under Section 297, I maintain that the section was never intended to cover prospecting and mining for gold. It is only because of lack of capital on the part of individuals that Ministers have not been challenged on the point long ago. Because the Minister has taken to himself a power he does not possess, it does not become him to tell the Chamber that he does possess it. Section 297 does not give him power to grant reservations for the purpose of prospecting and mining for gold. There is a remarkable aspect about this question. The section provides that the Minister may on the recommendation of a warden, do certain things. Who ever heard of a warden recommending a reservation? Never has a reservation been granted by any Minister on such a recommendation. Actually, the section does

not give power to a warden to recommend a reservation for the purpose of prospecting and mining for gold. If that was the intention, why is there a proviso to the section setting out that the Minister may grant occupancy? The granting of reservations has constantly been opposed, but no one has had sufficient money with which to challenge the action of Ministers. Those who have had the money have been pleased to get the concessions, and have never desired to challenge them. I ask the Minister, with all his knowledge of mining and the wonderful experience he has gained in so short a time, to tell me one mining proposition in this State that a 24-acre lease will not cover. After all the years during which mining has been carried on, there is no mine in this State that a 24-acre lease will not cover. The Minister says it is necessary to grant reservations. He advanced that argument in such a way as to throw it back on me that I am desirous of excluding individuals from legitimately developing and conducting mining operations in Western Australia.

Mr. Patrick: Companies could take up these areas in the form of leases.

Mr. MARSHALL: They could take up half-a-dozen or 50 leases, if they so desired, provided they complied with the law.

Mr. Hughes: Are not companies surrendering leases to make them part of reservations, and thus saving outgoings for rent?

The Minister for Mines: No.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not conversant with that point, and I know of no such case. The Minister advanced the argument in such a way as to cover up the real points at issue, making out that I was attempting to interfere with capital coming into this country and developing the industry. From time to time in this Chamber I have emphatically voiced my opinions in that respect. There is no limit to the area any company can hold, so long as the land is taken up in 24-acre leasehold blocks. I have repeatedly pointed out that we should not assist worthless companies by giving them reservations, when at the same time we insist upon the unfortunate prospector paying his pound per acre. That was not the intention of the Act. The Minister has put a wrong construction upon my attitude, and I hope he has done so for the last time. I am sick of these misrepresentations. I stand for the principle of companies paying the same price for their land as the prospector has to pay. That is fair and honourable. I have no desire to limit their activities or the area they hold. The Minister has yet to show me one case where a 24-acre leasehold block will not cover a single mining proposition, and yet he says it is necessary for companies to have these large areas, because capital is thus brought into the country.

The Minister for Mines: On a point of order, I ask for a withdrawal of that statement. I did not make any such remark in my speech, and "Hansard" can be produced to prove it.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will withdraw anything to pacify the Minister.

The Minister for Mines: The hon. member stated that I said something I did not say.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Murchison must withdraw the remark.

Mr. MARSHALL: If I am told what statement I have made that I should not have made, I will withdraw it.

The Minister for Mines: The hon. member stated deliberately that I said it was necessary to give big reservations to allow of capital coming into this country. I did not even have that in mind.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will withdraw the words complained of. What did the Minister's utterances imply? He said that Reedy's company had spent £2,000,000, not on reservations, but on equipping and developing its area and in wages, etc. From this outlay the company has already had a handsome dividend. What did the Minister imply throughout his speech? He said it was necessary to give these reservations, and appealed to the House not to support me. What will members be supporting if they stand behind the Minister? They will be supporting big holdings or reservations. If the Minister did not actually utter those words, the implication was there. If members support him they will obviously be supporting the granting of reservations. No other construction can be placed upon the remarks of the Minister. He did not tell us who compiled the figures he submitted to the House concerning the two companies which had spent £14,000 on their reservations. I assume the figures came from the companies themselves. There can be no doubt about that. The Minister put it for-

ward in all sincerity that the companies had spent every penny of this money. If I can show him where one of his statements was far from the actual facts, the Chamber will be able to put its own construction upon the balance of his arguments in support of the regulations. He said these reservations were thrown open a year or two ago and nobody wanted them. I took that statement down myself. I have here a minute from the Mines Department, the records of which may be accepted as correct. If the record in this instance is a true one, then the Minister's statement is far from the actual facts. I wanted to know from the Under-Secretary for Mines when these reservations were originally granted. I received from him a reply dated the 2nd September, as follows:—

As desired, I would advise you that temporary Reserve 1027H was originally comprised in temporary Reserve 654H, which was granted on 1/2/32, to Mr. Morton Webber. It comprised 1,506 acres. It was subsequently taken over by the Mararoa Goldmining Co., N.L., and was increased in area, in September, 1933, to 2,786 acres. Subsequently it was transferred to the Western Gold Mines, N.L., in 1934. The reserve was then split into two reserves, and an area comprising 1,920 acres under No. 768H was granted to the Triton Gold Mines, N.L., and 654H, containing 1,056 acres, continued in the name of the Western Goldmines, N.L., Reserve 1028H, now comprises portion of old Reserve 768H.

Both these reservations, which were comprised in one area, were granted six years and six months ago, and according to the letter I have read were never thrown open. Where are we getting?

The Minister for Mines: What has become of the rest of the area outside the 600 acres?

Mr. MARSHALL: The area has been divided into two. Under the amending Act the company had to surrender the big area.

The Minister for Mines: What happened to the surrendered area?

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister said the ground was thrown open some years ago, not recently. He said nothing about an excessive area, or the area which lapsed being thrown open or worked. The present Minister for Mines has the same idea about prospectors and prospecting as his predecessors had.

The Minister for Mines: A good idea, too.

Mr. MARSHALL: His idea is that every individual, before he discovers an indication of gold, goes to the office of the registrar and takes up the land. Nothing of the sort!

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is an idea abroad that is generally accepted by members to the effect that prospectors never prospect country without having some form of tenure. That is the reason, I believe, why the officials of the Mines Department continually advise their Minister respecting areas at one time held as reservations, but subsequently abandoned and thrown open for application, that as no prospector has applied for portions of those areas under any form of tenure, no one wants the country. Nothing could be more foreign to what actually happens. I would be safe in saying that prospectors are continually working on country that at one time was included in a reservation. They do not usually apply for a lease unless they are conversant with the area over which they are prospecting. The usual practice is to carry on until they come across indications that warrant their applying for leases. The Minister should be very careful in regarding land, once included in a reservation but subsequently thrown open for selection, as being unwanted merely because no application has been received for a lease. Prospectors come and go. No doubt in the course of time someone will discover valuable deposits on areas that were at one time included in reservations.

Another point raised by the Minister referred to the expenditure of £14,000 on work in the reserves now in question. When discussing reserves generally—I want to make this statement by way of comparison—the late Mr. Munsie, when Minister for Mines, referred to the reservation around the Great Fingal Mine, and in refutation of what I had said that the reservation had been held for years without any work having been done, he produced figures to show that the company concerned had spent about £8,000. In the same way, the present Minister for Mines told us to-night that the company had spent £14,000 on work in the reserves under discussion. As regards the Great Fingal reservation, the figures quoted by the late Mr. Munsie were compiled by the parties most vitally concerned, but the fact remains that at least two-thirds of that amount was spent on the purchase of

a steam shovel. The money was not spent on the reservation but on the steam shovel, with the aid of which a little costeening was done across a portion of the area that was held. Notwithstanding that fact, the former Minister told Parliament that £8,000 had been spent on the reservation, just as the present Minister for Mines has said £14,000 has been spent on the reservations under discussion. On this occasion, the Minister for Mines may be right; the former Minister for Mines was entirely wrong in his statement. At a matter of fact, that steam shovel was sold to the Big Bell Company and no doubt the company was recouped its initial expenditure, so that no money whatever was spent on the reservation. I have no doubt that some work has been done on the two reservations to which I am now devoting attention. It is remarkable, however, that whenever I visit the centre, people who live there and know what is going on tell me without any hesitation that no money has been spent and no work carried out on the reservations. I do not suggest that the Minister is wrong in stating that £14,000 has been spent. I want the Minister, in view of his experience, to tell me whether it is not possible for the company to take up a lease of the area required and carry out the necessary diamond drilling and prospecting. What is there to stop the company from doing that? The Minister quoted the Premier Big Bell Goldmining Co., and said that that concern had a reservation. That is quite so, but in that instance the company did the right thing by the Government, which had treated it so generously. The company decided what ground was required, secured the necessary lease, and surrendered the remainder of the reservation. In the instance now under review, the company has held the two reservations since 1932, since when the area has not been thoroughly prospected. From time to time, the company may have done something with the area, but whatever has been done could have been carried out under the leasehold tenure provisions. If that had been done, I would have no quarrel with the company, which has been well treated. Ample time has been available to ascertain the dip of the lens, for the reservation has been held for six years. The company is now in the happy position of securing returns by way of dividends, and why should it be further considered and permitted to enjoy preference over prospectors and others who want to work in that particular area? There is no justification for the present arrangements continuing.

I do not suffer from an obsession with regard to reservations. What I object to is the cruel injustice involved. I object to the undue preference extended to those who can afford to pay, while little consideration is extended to those not in such a fortunate position. Had the reservations been dealt with in a reasonable manner, I might not be so bitterly opposed to the principle. I want it to be definitely understood by the House that I know my electorate and its requirements perfectly well. I do not remain in the city during the recess; I visit the different centres in my electorate and become acquainted with what is going on. I would not attempt to work an injustice against any company or individual, and I appeal to the House to extend equal treatment to every individual interested in this subject. It is true, as the Minister stated, that prospectors have secured reservations; but why have they secured them? Ostensibly it has been for the same reason that others have secured them, with the possible exclusion of the two reservations now under review. I would instance the reservation around the Great Fingal Mine. I will have something to say about that matter and the Minister's attitude, when the Mines Estimates are under consideration. The object in securing reservations has too often been to hawk them from country to country in an attempt to exploit the mining industry. With the advantage of a reservation, individuals are able to paint a glowing picture of the area held for development. They can attempt to entice investors to put money into the development of a concern such as, for instance, the Great Fingal Mine. There is no occasion to be surprised at the present lull in the mining industry, or at the utter collapse of the operations of legitimate investors. It is sad to contemplate that many investors have put thousands of pounds into mining operations here, without their having the ghost of a chance to secure a penny in return. The practice of granting reservations enhances the opportunities for those hawking the concessions to secure such investments. The goldmining areas are the rightful heritage of the people, and if any

advantage is to be derived from the operations of the investing public it should be by the State. As it is, Western Australia reaps very little benefit. We should not tolerate any individual or any company making such use of concessions wrongfully and illegally made available to them. I emphasise that point. They have been wrongfully and illegally made available. Such concessions have enabled certain interests to exploit the investing public and to induce them to invest in a precarious industry without any chance of securing returns from their investments. Because of that, the practice of granting reservations should immediately cease. If I were attempting to limit the scope of any individual or company from the standpoint of securing an area for prospecting purposes and to discourage the investment of capital, the Minister would have an argument against my attitude. I may repeat a statement I have made before: There is no limit to the area that a company can hold. As a matter of fact, the Wiluna company had an area extending for a mile and a half.

Mr. Patrick: The total area was 1,100 acres, was it not?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know the exact area, but I know the company held upwards of 20 leases. I do not object to that, nor do I desire to attempt to limit the area. On the other hand, I will not stand for preferential treatment. If anyone is to have the benefit of concessions, it should be the pioneers of the industry, the men who are not financial. They make all the sacrifices and I disagree with the Minister's suggestion that prospectors go around looking for companies. Members will no doubt remember the recently reported discovery at Mt. Addison, near Peak Hill. I was there some time back and I know that there were four representatives of different companies who were out to ascertain if they could exploit the prospectors and secure options. They were not out to assist the prospectors or the State; they were concerned with their own interests. I am pleased to say that the Premier Gold Mining Company has become interested and has secured an option. I wish the company well. On the other hand, we should not make it possible for individuals to exploit the industry, mislead investors, and retard the development of our mineral resources. To indicate to the House how the Minister can deliberately attempt to misrepresent what I say, I would point out that I asserted that the Wiluna company never had a reservation, and I repeat that it did not have that privilege. The Minister quoted a small reservation that had been granted to the company in 1936, years after it had commenced operating. I understand the company did secure a small reservation for the purpose of carrying out diamond drilling. The company has long since ceased to pay dividends, and, in consequence, the then Minister apparently considered it was entitled to that much consideration. If the contention of the present Minister for Mines is correct, then the more a company spends in the goldmining industry, the greater the area it should be able to secure.

The Minister for Mines: Rubbish!

Mr. MARSHALL: That is the point. If the amount of an investment governs the right to a reservation, then the greater the amount invested, the bigger should be the area.

The Minister for Mines: You have no occasion to say that so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MARSHALL: The argument advanced by the Minister is that the Reedy people have spent approximately £2,000,000. I believe they have spent three times as much. If the Triton Gold Mining Co., or whatever the name of the company may be, is entitled to those reservations because it has spent £2,000,000, then we should consider giving the Wiluna company the greater part of the State, because that company must have spent three or four times that amount. Such an argument does not hold water.

The Minister for Mines: It is your argument, not mine.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, it is the Minister's statement. The Minister made that statement in support of his contention that the company, having spent £2,000,000, was entitled to these reservations.

The Minister for Mines: It is a bona fide company, at all events.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is, and what is to prevent this bona fide company from getting the area it wants under leasehold tenure? Is there anything to prevent that?

The Minister for Mines: I would not give them a monopoly of that, either.

Mr. MARSHALL: That would be the right thing to do.

The Minister for Mines: I disagree.

Mr. MARSHALL: Some members of this Chamber really believe the gold mining industry does not contribute sufficient to our revenue in the way of taxation or royalty. I do not propose to deal with that aspect at the moment. But here is an opportunity of putting everyone on the same level and deriving some revenue. Those two reservations each contain 300 acres. If the company were paying the same rental for the land as a prospector has to pay, the State would be receiving £600 from the reservations, instead of £20. The company, as I have already pointed out, is receiving a substantial return from its investment. I know it has paid dividends at a rate as high as 22 per cent. The mine is an excellent proposition and is likely to live for a considerable number of years. Good luck to those who invested in the company! That, however, is no justification for the granting of privileges or concessions to the company. If I were Minister for Mines, I would do a great deal to stop the ramps in the industry. I would devote hours of my time to framing legislation designed to penalise severely those who exploit the mining industry.

Mr. Sleeman: You would be kept busy.

Mr. MARSHALL: Others would be kept busy, too.

Mr. Patrick: There are ramps, unfortunately.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. Reservations should not be granted in a haphazard way so that the grantees can, as it were, put them in a carpet bag and hawk them here, there and everywhere, at the same time painting a glowing picture of possible returns on investment. The investors, however, would find that although they had a fairly big area, they had very little gold. I remind the Minister that Parliament has never passed a Bill to permit of the granting of reservations of any kind. Parliament did, on the contrary, agree to a Bill for the entire abolition of reservations. In order to get some redress, I had to concede, when in conference with members of another place, certain proposals so as to get at least some control. I regret the Bill I introduced was not passed, as reservations would then have been entirely abolished and this discussion would never have taken place. I agree that there are times when we should accept part only, if we cannot get the whole.

Mr. Patrick: It is a big improvement on the old order of things.

Mr. MARSHALL: I should say so. In conclusion——

Mr. Sleeman: Again!

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. I know the hon. member does not agree with me on the subject of reservations, which seem to be so necessary to develop this particular district; but no one wants a reservation in the Kimberleys, even with gold at £8 an ounce. That is remarkable. Prospectors do not want reservations, nor did anyone else, until gold went up in price. The prospectors now desire reservations to be abolished for the same reason that the companies wish to retain them. I hope members will support the motion and that these two reservations at least will be cancelled. Not many reservations are left in my electorate and I would be pleased to see the last of them. Had no reservation at all been granted, we would not have had this wrangling to-night. I hope members will take a definite stand and abolish the reservations.

Question put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	.. .. ..	22
Noes	.. .. ..	14
Majority for	..	8

Ayes	
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Sampson
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Seward
Mr. Fox	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Hill	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Watts
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Welsh
Mr. North	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Raphael	Mr. Withers
Mr. Rodoreda	Mr. Doney
	(Teller.)

Noes	
Mr. Coverley	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Doust	Mr. Styants
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Troy
Mr. Millington	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Needham	Mr. Wise
Mr. Panton	Mr. Nulsen
	(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

BILL—FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Discharge of Order.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [7.56]: I move—

That the order be discharged from the Notice Paper.

Question put and passed.

BILL—MARKETING OF ONIONS.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 7th September.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [7.57]: I support the second reading of the Bill. I commend the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) for bringing it forward. It is certainly a step in the right direction. The one regret I have is that the Bill was not brought forward by the Government, because difficulty is likely to arise when a private member brings forward a Bill of this kind. I hope, nevertheless, that the Bill will become law, and so give the onion growers of the State statutory power to fix reasonable prices for their produce and secure a measure of control of the industry. All over the world movements are taking place in favour of grower-control. Already we have a dried fruit measure, the Whole Milk Act and the sandalwood measure. Those enactments have established a principle that is well justified and that I hope will now be established for the marketing of onions. We have many districts where onions can be grown, although I realise that at Spearwood, from whence comes this special request, onion growing is a very large industry and one that can fairly receive the support of this House. In addition, in other States control is becoming increasingly the rule. The export of apples and pears which, of course, includes the Eastern States is likely to be put under similar control. That is a big move forward. I noticed in the Press recently that steps were being taken by the New Zealand Parliament to create a measure of control in the local marketing of fruit and vegetables.

The member for South Fremantle has put up a very good case for the Bill. His argument is sound and the Bill is planned on lines similar to legislation that has been introduced in other States. Whether a private member's Bill can do what is necessary remains to be seen. Only time can tell; that is, should the Bill be passed. It is said of marketing laws that they are full of pitfalls. Evidently the draftsman has seen the possibility of legal conflict ahead, particularly in regard to paragraph (d) of Clause 14, for at the end of the Bill there is a special clause which provides that the Act can be construed subject to the Federal Constitution and laws. The measure provides the possibilities for which the growers have been striving for a long time. It provides that a prescribed majority shall control and that a vote of three-fifths of the growers shall be necessary before the suggested board is created. Assuming the board is set up, it will be subject to stringent restrictions upon its activities. Nevertheless provision is made whereby a simple majority of growers at a poll may bring about a dissolution. The Bill provides for three elective members, all of whom shall be growers, and two nominated members, one of whom shall possess mercantile and commercial experience. This means that there will be one representative of the public. The hon. member who introduced the Bill does, I consider, know his onions, and the commodity is one that is specially suitable for controlled legislation.

Mr. Hegney: He is as familiar with his onions as you are with your bees.

Mr. SAMPSON: Exactly. It will be agreed that onions are not as necessary a commodity in the same sense, as, for instance, milk, butter and flour, I could have added sugar, but that is a commodity that can be done without because of the elements contained in honey. There are no substitutes for milk, butter and flour and if the prices of those commodities were oppressive, either through the action of boards or the operation of private enterprise, consumers might raise a roar and do something to embarrass the Government in respect of the legislation. However, those who purchase onions should pay a reasonable price; they should have to pay the same as they are obliged to pay for everything else, other than is so often the case where primary products are concerned. The work of the onion growers should be sufficient to provide a living for those engaged in the industry. While I say that onions are a desirable commodity on which to base legislation, I do not suggest that any household could get along very well without onions. Onions are not essential, although a very desirable adjunct to the culinary art.

Mr. Sleeman: They are all right when a bit of steak goes with them.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is so. If prices were too high, importations would be encouraged and, under the Constitution the commodity could not be kept out. The steamer freight on onions from Adelaide is 33s., from Melbourne 38s., and from Sydney 42s. Therefore the local price of onions

could never be higher than that of the Eastern States, plus the shipping costs from East to West. At first sight, mill offal would seem to invalidate this argument. Actually it does not, for the local prices of bran and pollard were dropped £1 a ton immediately importing supplies from the East was contemplated. There are, of course, certain substitutes for onions—leeks and shallots; but I do not think we need seriously consider those. Members of Parliament sometimes have the unpleasant task of eating the leek, but I hope that will not be the lot of the member for South Fremantle in respect to this Bill. The movement for control is not a mere flash in the pan; it has been urged and desired for many years past and it is gratifying to note that the market gardeners of Osborne Park, Wanneroo, Pickering Brook, Harvey and other places are joining together as a market gardeners' association, with the object of bringing about some control; in other words having some say in the return they receive for their labour. In this new organisation that is being set up—and no doubt many of its members will be concerned in the passage of the Bill—there are various nationalities represented. They may be said to be as varied as is the map of Europe. Rules have been prepared by a well-known solicitor and arrangements have been made for the legal incorporation of the organisation. At Spearwood there is a splendidly organised, independent and virile organisation, which has been in existence for many years. The people there are combining with the Market Gardeners' Association of Western Australia. In fact, they are a very important part of it. If the Bill goes through and operates satisfactorily, no doubt it will be of great assistance to the organisation. The trouble is, as seems to be general in connection with primary producers, that vegetable growers do not receive a fair price for their product. The consumers are getting cheap vegetables at the expense of the growers. However, the Bill before us is restricted to onions. There does not seem any necessity to tell any stories of hard luck which are continually arising, nor even stories about "red ink" as the Americans say when the returns show a deficit. The time undoubtedly has come when the protection that is being sought should be given to the growers of onions and I commend the member for South Fremantle for introducing the Bill. I express the hope that success will follow his efforts. I shall certainly support the Bill and I repeat that it is a pity the Government did not introduce it. I should like to hear that old stalwart on marketing control, the Minister for Lands, giving his blessing to the Bill. In my youthful idealism I was thrilled to think and to realise that a Minister of the Crown was so concerned as far back as fifteen years ago about the needs of the unfortunate producers. It is not too late for the Minister for Lands to express his sentiments to-night.

Mr. Cross: He is not listening to you.

Mr. SAMPSON: Perhaps not, but the Minister has the faculty of being able to carry on a conversation and at the same time listen to what is going on. That only comes through long practice, a practice that enables the Minister to perform two duties at the one time. I know that control of marketing is supported by every member who is progressive in thought, and who has real regard for those that are concerned in earning a living from the soil. Further, it postulates something in the way of democracy, because whether a man grows onions, or runs a fleet of buses, or controls any other industrial organisation, he has the same problems to face. In this instance we say that the problems of the onion growers should receive every consideration. I trust the Bill will have a successful passage and that it will solve the difficulties of those concerned, people who I am sure if they do obtain this measure will act fairly with the public and receive treatment they have never before had.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [8.13]: I support the second reading of the Bill and I am sure it will have the wholehearted support of members of the Country Party benches. It is the thin end of the wedge in marketing legislation and I consider it is appropriate that the commencement should be made with onions, because it is said that an onion a day keeps the doctor away, though others might say that an onion a day keeps everybody away. The application of marketing to onions is, in my opinion, appropriate because onion growing is a small industry that is established in the metropolitan area. It will prove an excellent starting point and will enable us to see how efficiently the legislation

applied to the marketing of this commodity can be carried out. Another fact that appeals to me is that one clause of the Bill gives the board power to fix prices. I remember that when a deputation of the Spearwood onion-growers waited upon the Minister for Agriculture, the Minister told them that he approved of their arguments in favour of the establishment of a marketing board, but that he objected to the fixing of prices for growers. The leader of the deputation informed the Minister that the fixing of prices was the basic objective of the deputation, and that in view of the Minister's statement, the deputation fell short of obtaining complete success. The clause of the Bill to which I have referred, however, gives power to the proposed board to fix prices and to finance its operations. In short, it is a complete marketing Act, such as those on the Country Party Benches advocate. I hope our Nationalist friends have their collective ear to the ground in this regard. It is very fine that a Labour member—and one who is essentially a representative of the consumers—should be seized with the necessity for justice being meted out to a section of the electors of his constituency that consists of primary producers.

Mr. Sleeman: All he wants is a fair deal for everybody.

Mr. BOYLE: All we want is a fair deal for everybody, but I and other members on this side of the House have occasionally to listen to a criticism, or as one member put it, a beating of drums concerning our desire to penalise the consumers. We do not advocate penalising the consumers, but we do want a fair deal for the producers. That there is an increasing tendency towards the regimentation of primary producers must be patent to all men and particularly those in public life. That is a natural corollary to the regimentation of industrial life, and I cannot for the life of me see what valid objection can be raised to the attempt by the primary producers to imitate the successful tactics of other sections of industry. The Bill, moved by a Labour member is an admission that it is only right and just that such a regimentation should be proceeded with. Another fact that appeals to me is this: That this regimentation must be of an Australian-wide character. The Minister for Lands has just returned from the Eastern States from a conference at which he pledged the Government of Western Australia to the fixing of a home consumption price for wheat in Australia.

The Minister for Lands: Not on this principle.

Mr. Sampson: But you did speak in favour of a similar principle.

Mr. BOYLE: The Minister says, "Not on this principle," but it was a principle that can stand side by side with this one.

The Minister for Lands: No.

Mr. BOYLE: Yes. Without digressing too far from the subject of onions, I point out that the Minister has agreed to the fixing of a price for flour, and to the appointment of a board to control prices. He has agreed that the wheatgrowers should receive a fixed price of 4s. 8d. a bushel at the siding for their wheat. Where is the difference between this Bill and what the Minister and the representatives of the other States of Australia have agreed to?

The Minister for Lands: I will tell you later on.

Mr. BOYLE: The Minister will have to argue away from the facts to explain any difference. I hope the Bill will be the forerunner of many others of the same type. The final clause states it must be in conformity with the Constitution Act of Australia. That means that it is on all fours with the Bill that the Deputy-Premier is shortly to introduce in this House.

The Minister for Lands: I will speak on that subject later on.

Mr. BOYLE: I am making an ordinary commonsense deduction from the facts placed before us. The circumstances are that the representatives of all the Governments in Australia have agreed to do certain things, and the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) has introduced a Bill to apply the same principles to the onion industry, particularly in Fremantle, or the districts close to Fremantle. Consequently I find myself in complete agreement with the member for South Fremantle.

The Minister for Mines: There is something wrong with it then.

Mr. BOYLE: I find myself in complete agreement also with the Minister for Lands.

The Minister for Lands: No, you do not.

Mr. BOYLE: Absolutely; though, I admit, for the first time in my life. I have no difficulty in reconciling my point of view

with the viewpoint of the member for South Fremantle. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Sleeman) says it is an act of justice. It may be a belated act of justice, but justice is just as sweet no matter how long it is delayed, and in this instance, justice will be done to the growers. In the same way, the Bill to be introduced by the Minister for Lands will constitute one step towards securing justice for the wheatgrowers. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [8.21]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [8.22]: I intend to support the second reading, because the Bill will give to the producers on whose behalf the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) has introduced the measure, an opportunity of obtaining at least a fair return for their labour. Some years ago the Collier Government introduced a Bill known as the Primary Products Marketing Bill. Had that been passed, its provisions would have enabled the onion-growers or any other growers to take a poll with a view to the organised marketing of their products. The Bill passed the Assembly, but was defeated in another place. I understand that the Opposition came from members representing apple-growers and others in the Nelson electorate, and those members had sufficient influence to bring about the defeat of the measure, which I believe was rejected by one vote. I want to make it clear that a Labour Government initiated that Bill, which was to provide for the marketing of primary products, and that, had the measure become law, producers such as the onion-growers, would have been able to organise the marketing of their products.

During the recess I had an opportunity of visiting the Eastern States. The Minister for Agriculture knows that in the State from which he came a good deal of marketing takes place. The Minister for Agriculture in that State, who has just been on a visit to Western Australia, discussed the matter of marketing with me, though I was not long with him. I also discussed the matter with an officer of his department in whose company I spent a day. He told me that for most of the primary industries in Queensland, marketing boards had been established, and that those boards had been very successful. He asked me whether many primary producing constituencies in Western Australia were represented by Labour men. I told him that unfortunately not many were represented by Labour men, but that the representatives were mostly Country Party members. He then told me that as a result of the Queensland legislation the Labour Party had a lien on certain country seats and obtained support from primary producers in the country because of the existence of marketing boards and the opportunities provided for organised marketing under the Queensland laws. I was commissioned by the member for South Fremantle to make inquiries in Victoria regarding the marketing of onions. Accordingly, I interviewed Mr. Ryan, an officer of the Victorian Department of Agriculture, with whom I discussed the matter. Onion-growers in that State have been functioning under an Act for three years, and while, at the beginning, the system was not quite successful, it gave the growers an opportunity to carry on. The Commonwealth Bank financed them and has continued to do so. Under the Victorian marketing Act, it is competent—and a similar provision is made in the Bill now before us—for 60 per cent. of the growers to take a poll and for the majority to decide to form themselves into a marketing board. If it is good enough for Victoria to organise along those lines and to ensure that the producers in this industry obtain a fair return for their product, I see no reason why similar legislation should not apply here, and in view of the fact that a Labour Government on a previous occasion sponsored a primary products marketing Bill, the present Government should support the Bill under discussion. We will await with interest the remarks of the Minister for Agriculture on this matter.

Another Bill before the House at present is one for the establishment of a bureau of industry and economic research. The aim is to initiate secondary industries in this State. The onion industry is one in which primary producers are engaged, and it is in the doldrums in various periods of the year because of a surfeit of production. We are all aware that from time to time growers of vegetables and other commodities supplied to the consuming public do not receive a reasonable

return for their labour. We hear of growers taking to the market cauliflowers and other produce necessary to the well-being of the community, and many of them receiving nothing at all for their labour. I do not read into the Bill, as the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) does, a proposal for fixed prices. The measure does propose to organise the industry, and regulate the market, thus ensuring reasonable returns to growers in periods of glut. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) made an observation to the effect that consumers get cheap commodities at the expense of growers. That is not a fact. The truth is that the consumer has to pay high prices to-day even though there may be a glut in the market to-morrow. It is the distributors, and those engaged in the marketing system, who exploit both consumer and producer. The price is kept high to the consumer, though the producer receives little for his labour. Therefore the statement of the member for Swan is not in accordance with fact. He has an altogether wrong conception of that phase. In my opinion the growers are entitled to a reasonable return for their labour. It has been suggested to me that others engaged in production are also entitled to a reasonable return for the services they render to the community. As a Labour member, and a Labour man all my life, I have agitated for the right of labour to receive a fair return. If that is good enough for those engaged in secondary industries, it is good enough for those in other avocations.

I listened attentively to the speech of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) in moving the second reading. I am unable to discover in the measure anything that will prove detrimental to the interests of the consumer. It may be suggested that to give the power proposed will mean the raising of prices to the consumer, but I do not think anything of the kind will take place. If the measure is enacted, it can be tried out; and if it proves successful, and if there are other industries in the doldrums with the worker not getting a fair return, we can apply similar legislation to them. I am glad to support the second reading. Amendments may be required in the Committee stage. Various clauses may not be agreed to in toto. Nevertheless the proposal which the member for South Fremantle has incorporated in the measure is sound and logical. Therefore I support the second reading.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, debate adjourned.

BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 7th September.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [8.34]: I intend to support the second reading, but whilst not agreeing with the measure in its entirety, I consider that the principle of enabling women to sit on juries is sound and right.

Mr. Marshall: You are only playing to the gallery!

Mr. SLEEMAN: I remember that in 1924 the interjector and I were responsible for having a Bill of this nature recommitted on three different occasions in order to put up a fight for the presence of women on juries. A provision similar to that contained in this Bill was enacted then. Personally I do not think women should be put on the jury list. Neither should women be subjected to the indignity of applying to have their names placed on that list. That provision was struck out of the earlier Bill, subject to women having the right to decline, in writing, to sit on juries. I do not think women should be compelled to write asking to be placed on the jury list if they desire to serve as jurors. Persistence in that proposal means that not many women would apply. Possibly women prominent in public life and taking a keen interest in the affairs of the country might make application; but the average woman would not do so, if the matter was left to her. Therefore I hope that in Committee the Bill will be amended as was the Bill of 1924, and that the women of this country will have the right to sit on juries, together with the right to decline to sit. In 1924 the property qualification for women jurors was eliminated in Committee. Thus was recognised the right of women to sit on juries. The percentage of women qualified subject to a property qualification would not be large. I think the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) will agree that there are in Western Australia hundreds of women who have the necessary ability to serve on juries but who would not be able to satisfy the property qualification. With these adjustments made in Committee, the Bill will become a good measure.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [8.36]: It is not often that I rush in where angels fear to tread, but I should like to give my opinion about a measure of this character. I have no doubt that some hon. members regard such legislation as an indication of progress. They have an idea that this is doing something for the people, or for one section of the community—something that is desired, something that creates an uplift for society: and that sort of impression is apt to get abroad without a clear understanding of the subject. The Bill proposes that any woman who desires to serve on a jury shall be entitled to serve if she makes application. But, really, who wants to serve on a jury—either man or woman? What benefit will it confer upon the other sex to let them sit on juries? What uplift does it give them? It may give them certain responsibilities. It may give them certain experiences, if they desire to have those experiences. But it will not do anything to advance society in general. What is happening in the world to-day when women, the sex whom we all respect, feel it essential that they shall enter into all avenues of life, merely to assert their rights? I am prepared to vote for the passing of the Bill and for giving women all the rights they want, if they think that will make for happiness; but in my opinion this sort of legislation does not advance society at all. I hope I speak with all respect for the opinions of the hon. member who introduced the Bill, but my feeling is that the entrance of women into all the avenues of life, jostling with men, struggling with men to assert themselves, will be to their great disadvantage. It has been to women's distinct disadvantage so far. In my opinion, it is largely responsible for the unhappy state of society to-day. I hope I do not speak merely as an old-fashioned person. I have a very great respect for women. I think all men have.. I know it is a tradition and an innate principle of men to be chivalrous. The great majority of men are naturally chivalrous. Their whole aim is to protect women, shelter women, and husband women. So far as I see it, the desire of some women—not all women—to compete with men in every avenue of life on the pretence that they are taking their proper place in the world leads them into avenues of life which in my opinion, have not been to their advantage. The member for Subiaco sometimes quotes Holy Writ. I am not good at quotation myself, but I refer her to that passage of Holy Writ which refers to the valiant woman. Did that woman want to sit on juries? Did she want to compete with men, to jostle in the market-place with men, to take her place with men in worldly preoccupations? No. She was an entirely different person. She was a woman who supported her husband and her family by her sympathy and help in the home. She had an empire to herself. I do not intend to oppose the Bill, though I think women have lost greatly by going out into the world and seeking opportunities which they would be happier without. I have heard travellers say that in Germany the women are great supporters of Hitler, and that the reason is not far to seek: that Hitler sent them back to the homes and gave them husbands and children.

Mr. Fox: That need not stop them from sitting on juries.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: My experience is that the home is the place where women are happy. What more beautiful thing is there in life than to see a woman in her home surrounded with a family, sheltering that family, succouring that family, and teaching that family, and setting it an example? The mother in the home—a home with children, where she gives her husband and her children moral support and sympathy—can she serve a higher purpose? Much of the unhappiness in the world to-day is due to the fact that that great principle has been lost sight of. I do not greatly object if some women want to serve on juries, but I sometimes think some of their activities are foolish. I am a married man myself, and my wife will probably take me to task to-morrow for what I am saying now. Some ladies in public life used to tell me confidentially that they could be of great help to public men.

Mr. Fox: What a chance you missed!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Wisely I knew in my heart that such a woman could be of no help at all. What public man wants a woman at the other end of the table in the morning at breakfast time to discuss with him the newspaper report of last night's Parliamentary proceedings? Women have played a great part in the world because they have opportunities that men cannot have. Yet women are throwing

all that away and for what? To sit on juries and for similar activities. I may be chastised for what I am saying but I must take that risk. There never was a time in history that I know of—and I have read a fair amount of history—when there were so many active bodies composed exclusively of women bent on saving the world. Before women obtained the vote they made great sacrifices to get it. They said if they got the vote there would be a new world. Well, they have the vote, but it has made no material difference. In my opinion women possess about the same amount of original sin as do men. We were told that if women got the vote we would have purer politics, better politics. I have been in Parliament a long time and politics are no better as a result of representation by women. The vote to women has made no difference whatever. Again, men may say hard things on a public platform or in this House and allowances are made accordingly, but one becomes disillusioned when one finds women during elections canvassing house after house and saying just as harsh things. So I say women have made no difference in politics.

I have always been puzzled by the talk of sex antagonism which is said to exist. Probably some members know more about it than I do. I confess that I know nothing about it although I am a married man. I do not know of the existence of sex antagonism; in fact, I believe the contrary to be the case. Why, if there were sex antagonism, there would be no marriages. My experience has been that the vast majority of men have a great respect for women, and show great chivalry to women, and no matter what women do, I hope that spirit will continue. Reverting to the organisations that women formed in order to save the world, I hope they are playing a useful part. The other day, however, I was impressed by a remark made to the Acting Minister for Education. A women's organisation requested that more money should be provided by the Government for domestic science teaching in schools. One lady was reported to have made the astounding statement that her daughter had learnt to cook half a potato and one sausage roll, but found it impossible to cook for a family. Surely that would not be correct! It seemed incredible to me that a woman should go to the Government and ask for the expenditure of money on educating children in a direction that should be the responsibility of the parents. What was the woman doing if she taught her children no more than that, and what service would she be able to give society?

Mr. Patrick: I imagine that she would give her husband a fairly rough time.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: What service could that woman give society, in face of an admission that her daughter possessed such limited qualifications?

Mr. Fox: Too much tinned food perhaps.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Therefore I am sceptical about the usefulness of such activities. Perhaps I am very old-fashioned, but I feel that all this disputation by women for a place in worldly affairs will cause them to lose tenfold more than they will gain. What woman wants to serve on a jury? Most men would shirk the duty if they could.

Mr. Marshall: They deliberately attempt to avoid it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The member for Subiaco evidently thinks she is making a tremendous advance by advocating the right of women to sit on juries when nobody else wants to do so. A new world, we are told! I have the solid conviction that women to-day, by these new activities, are the losers, not the gainers. It may be that some women feel they are fitted for tasks that men have to undertake, but certain it is that the majority of women do not want such activities. So I do not think they want legislation of this type.

I do not propose to vote against the hon. member's Bill. She regards it as important and I regard it as utterly unimportant. I should like to point out to her that if thousands of women in this community were consulted, even those in business, they would not agree with her. I know dozens of women filling positions formerly occupied by men. During their earlier years of business life, those women were happy and interested in their work, but as the years passed they became disappointed because they had not undertaken the natural obligations of life. I meet with them and talk with them; in fact, I have spoken to girls holding good Government positions, and they are disappointed at not having married. I cannot believe that legislation of this kind will do any good, but if there are some women who wish to sit

on juries, I have no objection to their doing so. At the same time I hope there are not too many. I sincerely hope my wife will have no desire to serve on a jury. I should not like to get up one morning and find my wife in a hurry and be told, "You cannot have eggs and bacon for breakfast today because I am going to sit on a jury."

Mr. Sleeman: You would have to get your own breakfast that morning.

Mr. Marshall: And hers, too, before she left.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do not think that will be my experience. I assure the hon. member that although this legislation may appeal to her, it does not appeal to me. In my opinion there is no such thing as sex antagonism, and never was. Women have no need to sit on juries in order to secure fairness for their own sex or for the opposite sex. Men, we know, do not want to sit on juries. The jury system is popular because juries often do not convict when they should. Men serve because they cannot avoid service. The presence of women on juries will not make any difference. I should like to see woman given opportunities in the home. I should like to see her with a husband, a home and children. That is the ideal. It is probably an old-fashioned idea but I cannot help that.

Mr. Sleeman: Bring down a Bill to that end.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: To have women happily married and with children would be the best thing that could happen to Western Australia. All legislation of this kind, and all the movements to enable women to take a more active part in the affairs of the country will not bring happiness to women. What this country needs is happy homes and happy children well brought up. Nothing is needed so badly as good homes and good children, for with them we could build a nation. If such an uplift is intended, I will support any measure to bring it about in the way I have mentioned. I respect the hon. member's opinions and have probably made what she regards as an old-fashioned speech.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Not at all.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I stand for the old idea that a mother, in her children, has the greatest scope in the world, and this young nation has suffered, and will continue to suffer, if women will expend their energies and activities on things that are of very little moment. This proposal for women to serve on juries does not matter in the least; it is of no importance. If the hon. member will lead a crusade to give women decent homes, and make them happy in their homes, and set a good social standard and sound ideals of morality, I will be with her.

Mr. Marshall: Now you certainly will hear from Mrs. Troy in the morning.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have alluded to the women who never sat on a jury and never stood for Parliament as the mainstay of the nation. Whether my remarks are regarded as old-fashioned does not matter. I am firmly convinced that the thrusting of women into the world has done them no good. Not nearly such high respect is entertained for women now as was the case in my younger days. I remember that when I went out into the world as a youth I regarded woman as being on quite a different plane. There was a recognised convention in those times, even though woman, on acquaintance, might not have proved as ideal as I first thought. But there has been a drift, and it has proved a distinct disadvantage. I should like to see a return of those old days when there was not the familiarity that now exists, and when reverence and respect were entertained for women. If those times could return, I am sure we would all be the happier, and that it would be better for the nation and for women particularly. I will offer no opposition to that which the hon. member desires in this piece of legislation, but I can assure her that society will not be beneficially affected, neither will women be advantaged.

The Minister for Works: With those reservations, you support the Bill.

HON. N. KEENAN (Nedlands) [9.1]: I also support the Bill. I understand that the Minister, having given many and potent reasons why he should oppose it, will also support the measure. With a good many of the statements made by the Minister, I am sufficiently old to find myself in full accord. The world is changing. It is no use our trying to resurrect the ages that have passed, I am afraid, forever. Women have undoubtedly lost, in the opinion of some of us, a lot of what I may describe as the special privileges they enjoyed in other days. At their own distinct wish they have cast on one side those privileges, and asked to be

allowed to come down from the pedestal on which they stood, and to take part in the life of the community in a very large measure on equal terms with men. They have done something more than that.

Mr. Raphael: They have worn the trousers instead of us.

Hon. N. KEENAN: In the days the Minister and I recall, women occupied a position of very great weakness. They were almost afraid to travel alone in a train, and, if they were young persons, a journey by train would be looked upon with considerable trepidation by their relations. In many ways women remained grown up children, depending entirely on the protection of the male for doing even the most simple things in life. They have thrown all that away. Nowadays, of their own will, they have stepped down from the pedestal we placed them on in those earlier days, and have asked for the right to take part in life on the same level and subject to the same conditions to a large extent as those that affect men. I think it is correct to say that the Bill amounts to nothing at all, but it is incorrect to say that men look on the duty of serving on juries as something they would very much wish to avoid. Suppose to-morrow we proposed to take away that right from men, to abolish the jury system altogether. What a howl there would be!

Mr. Patrick: If we gave them the right to refuse to serve it would be difficult to get a jury together.

Hon. N. KEENAN: Yes, because we are convinced that the most satisfactory form of trial in criminal cases and many civil cases is to be found in the jury system. It is true that a number of people, no matter how much they may value some privilege which also involves a duty, will endeavour to shirk that duty. The same position arises with regard to women. It is no new thing to have women on juries. They have been on juries in the United Kingdom for many years, and have proved most satisfactory. I have never yet seen in any law journal any comment of a deprecatory character on the fact that women have sat on criminal and civil juries in the Home country.

Mr. Marshall: Have you heard that said about men sitting on juries without women?

Hon. N. KEENAN: I have heard nothing detrimental to the system, except that occasionally verdicts are pronounced by juries, whether mixed or comprising men alone, that it would be difficult to reconcile with the evidence given.

Mr. Marshall: Do you know anything detrimental to juries consisting only of men?

Hon. N. KEENAN: No, but, as I said, there are cases where juries have returned verdicts it is difficult to reconcile with the evidence. That applies equally to juries consisting only of men, and to mixed juries. The idea is not new. I find it was adopted in Queensland in 1923. The Act was exactly on similar lines to the Bill before us. It was brought in by Mr. Theodore, when Premier of a Labour Government. The proposal was that if a woman wished to serve on a jury she was to notify the authority named in the Act—it is immaterial what particular authority is set up—and having notified that authority, she was then liable to serve on a jury. If she did not answer when called on a panel, she was liable to a fine just as men are. That gets over a lot of the difficulty of women who cannot conveniently serve on a jury, those who have large families to look after, or are in a poor state of health, or are expecting another member of the family. If there is any blame attachable to their being on a jury list, the blame must be placed upon their shoulders. They can remove themselves from the list if they find that being on it interferes with their domestic work. I can see no objection to the Bill. It is not a jump in the dark. It is merely applying to Western Australia what has been found to work satisfactorily in other States and in the Homeland, as well as in America and France. I do not suggest there is any possible comparison between our jury system and the carrying out of the duties that are discharged by juries in France. In that country a jury frequently allows itself to be carried away by emotion, and sentiment rules far more highly than evidence. Whatever may be the drawbacks of our jury system, they will not be increased by the inclusion of women on juries. Whatever virtues may lie in the jury system will not be affected by the passage of this measure. I hope the Bill will be supported by the House in the form in which it is submitted by the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver.)

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [9.10]: The Minister for Lands, of course, is in disagree-

ment with the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver). That is the difference between stagnation and progress. She ought to be flattered. He talks about relegating women to their homes, and the beautiful empire they serve when surrounded by children. Many women in bygone days were surrounded in their homes by children. They were not empresses ruling over an empire, but slaves working early and late, struggling to meet the needs of a large family. Reference was made to the member for Subiaco leading a crusade for larger families. I do not think there is much sincerity in that suggestion. Whilst members in this House talk about the need for bigger families, there are mothers of seven or eight children living within a stone's throw of the Chamber. The Minister for Lands and his colleagues are prepared to do nothing more for them than give them 49s. a week to live on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is getting away from the question.

Mr. HUGHES: I am dealing with the illustrations afforded by the Minister for Lands.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the Minister, otherwise I would have stopped him. I hope the hon. member will not proceed further on those lines.

Mr. HUGHES: I am unfortunate to be on the side of your good ear, Mr. Speaker. The idea of relegating women to their homes belongs to an age that is past. Women are taking their proper place in the world. We are giving them the same facilities for education and access to the University that we are giving to men. We are providing them with the means for intellectual development that for so long were denied to them. We are compelling them to take their place in the community whether they like it or not. We have practically pushed them out of their homes into public life, by forcing them to put their names on the roll and to vote. They are compelled to take their places as citizens. Half of the community is made up of women. I am glad to see them becoming self-reliant. It is a good thing that our daughters can stand on their own feet instead of being dependent on some man, who may turn out to be a waster and who may leave them high and dry. I am glad they are developing their intellect and taking their place in the community, so that if misfortune comes upon them they can fend for themselves. The more opportunities we give them to do that, the better for the nation. The fact that they should want to take their place on juries is not so much that they wish to serve in that capacity, but it represents a further step forward in the equalisation of male and female. The world is no worse off for the different steps that have been taken to give females the same rights as males. Have we had any worse government because women have been given a vote or have been allowed to sit in Parliament? Has the world deteriorated because they have been allowed to attend the Universities and study for various professions? Into the avenues in which they have entered they have brought a different outlook, and this must improve the general situation. The Minister for Lands talked about women's experience in their home and in the rearing of families. These very characteristics would stand to them as members of juries, far more so than they would in the case of men sitting on juries. Women who have reared families and have had the experience of bringing up their own children are rich in a knowledge of human nature. They have a sympathetic understanding of the shortcomings and failure of their fellow human beings. They have seen them for a generation in their own household and have had to deal with them. What better qualification could be brought to bear upon a jury, when some unfortunate individual has transgressed the law, is standing his trial, and is not sufficiently influential to induce Parliament to bring down a Bill to absolve him? He has to take the consequences of his shortcomings. That is the time when human understanding and sympathy are needed. The fact that a woman has reared a large family, or indeed any family, and that she has an opportunity to serve, will improve the jury system. One great defect of that system is that it is so restricted. All sorts of people are exempted from service on the jury, and therefore juries are drawn from a limited section of the community. The suggestion that jurymen are reluctant to convict is not correct. In the majority of instances jurymen do convict. If a record were perused of the criminal cases tried by juries, it would be found that in a great majority, convictions had been registered. On the other hand, some jurymen are too ready to convict. Some are willing to convict the moment the accused person is charged. On the other hand, there are some individuals who will not agree to a convic-

tion if they can possibly evade the responsibility, but such instances are rare. The general body of jurymen are willing to weigh the evidence and arrive at a decision. I do not think they show any more capacity for so doing than they would if they happened to be mothers. Women are quite capable of arriving at logical deductions as are men; so why should we exclude them from serving on juries? Why should we endeavour to burlesque the efforts of the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver)? Why should we hark back to the good old days when women were regarded as chattels, as they are in some backward countries today? The speech delivered by the Minister for Lands indicated that he has never read history, the whole trend of which has been towards the gradual emancipation of women. The Minister referred back 2,000 years, and mentioned Holy Writ. The Founder of Holy Writ made a special feature of the uplift of women, and He established women's rights. Ever since then there has been a continuous march forward to provide women with opportunities. Why should woman not enjoy opportunities in the world and the right to expand her intellect? Why should she not be allowed her place in the sun equally with men? Anyone having children of both sexes recognises the justice of that claim. Why should a parent say, "My daughter shall not have a place in the sun but my boy shall"? Why should not the daughter's talents be developed? The first steps in the emancipation of women originated with men of broad vision. It did not emanate from men who looked back to the old days when females were chattels. They had a better understanding, and had a more progressive and more humane outlook. The member for Subiaco merely wishes to carry that march of progress one step foward. It is a pity she is not able to go still further and secure the removal of all sex disqualifications, and to secure the granting of equal rights of citizenship irrespective of sex. In the French Revolution the proud boast was that the citizen and citizenesses enjoyed similar standing. So it has been with every revolutionary movement that has been designed to sweep away the old order and establish the new. In every instance one fundamental has been the granting to women of their place in the sun. I hope the Bill will become law. The member for Subiaco deserves well of the community, not only of the women but of the males, because she is willing to further the march of progress. Even if women were permitted to interfere in Government and even if they secured absolute control in Western Australia, we have this safeguard that they could not do worse than men have done. In those circumstances, we have nothing to lose. We have not governed the country so well that we should desire to keep women off the Treasury Bench. Are we to tell women that we want babies and require them badly, and at the same time inform them that if they produce the children we will do nothing towards feeding and clothing the little ones? If we cannot bring about a better outlook through the advent of women on juries or in politics, then we certainly cannot do worse than we are doing at present. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, as I supported a similar measure in 1924. In that year the Bill was passed in this House, but unfortunately did not become law. Possibly the passage of 14 years has broadened the minds of some people, and that may lead to the hope that in 1938 we shall be more successful than we were in 1924.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [9.24]: I support the second reading of the Bill but I remind the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) that the present Bill is nothing like the Bill we passed in 1924, not by a long way. The Bill that was introduced was not the Bill that went to another place where it was ultimately defeated. There are objectionable features in the present measure to which I desire to refer. I subscribe to the contention that women have a right to serve on juries, and I can see no objection to that at all. The Minister for Lands raised no objection. He subscribed to an idea that is ancient and therefore out-of-date. I do not desire to revert to the old days, but I do not wish in this year of grace to subscribe holus-bolus to a piece of legislation that says that a person who has £50 represented in real estate or £150 in hard cash may be singled out for special treatment or allowed to think he or she is more intelligent than the person who happens to live in more humble and straitened circumstances. That is a most objectionable feature. The hon. member must know that a female is not more intellectual because she

happens to possess a little wealth, than her sister who possesses none.

Mr. Raphael: That is the old-fashioned idea of the Bill.

Mr. MARSHALL: I respect the person who has wealth in human ideals. That is the natural qualification that should entitle a person to sit on the jury. If the member for Subiaco's Bill is passed, it will debar many of both sexes from serving on juries. It will certainly debar many of her own sex, and the Act provides restrictions on males because they are not supposed to be good enough or intellectual enough for that duty as they do not possess some wealth. If the member for East Perth is desirous of forwarding the march of progress, he will take up the stand that he adopted in 1924.

Mr. Hughes: Yes, we endeavoured to amend the Bill then.

Mr. MARSHALL: We did not try to do so; we did amend it after having it recommitted on three different occasions. The member for East Perth was somewhat inaccurate in saying the present Bill is similar to the earlier measure, because it is not similar. I do not know what the attitude of the member for Subiaco may be, but I believe very few women will ever indicate any desire whatever to sit on a jury. Very few males have any desire to do so. I do not know that the passing of the Bill will make any great difference. Nevertheless, I subscribe to the principle that is involved.

Mr. Sleeman: Will women write in and ask to be permitted to sit on juries?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not agree with that aspect. Very few women will desire to sit on juries. I am positive that the Crown Law Department or magistrates will not have to work overtime answering written applications from women for the right to sit on juries. There may be a few who will be anxious to avail themselves of the privilege, and their desire will be gratified if the Bill becomes law. If we are to be consistent, however, and do all things calculated to forward the march of progress, then we will place females in the same position as males, and require them to sit on juries when called upon to do so. There would, of course, be some few reservations that females are entitled to enjoy, but those considerations will be very few. Apart from those features, they should be obliged to sit when required. In speaking in support of her Bill, the member for Subiaco advanced an argument to which I cannot subscribe. She suggested that an Irishman could see no wrong in another Irishman.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Very little.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the hon. member had witnessed some of the combats I saw on the goldfields in the early days, she would quickly change her mind. If there was one thing that an Irishman enjoyed, it was a fight with one of his countrymen.

Mr. Sleeman: Were you in them?

Mr. MARSHALL: It would be a general brawl before the hon. member could get into it; if it is a private brawl, the Irishmen are generally there. It is unfortunate that it should be so, but it is a characteristic of some people. It is equally unfortunate that some people who sit on juries display bias at times. I subscribe to the Bill because I believe it is woman's right that she should be allowed to perform equally with males the duties involved. The hon. member should go further and seek to secure the equality of the sexes. That would receive my support. We know there are limitations to that principle, although we need not discuss them now. I cannot agree to the Bill being passed in its present form, because I take exception to two principles involved. I do not believe property should play any part in the qualifications that a woman or a man should possess to have the right to sit on juries. That duty should be made obligatory upon women subject to exemption in respect of the considerations I have already indicated. I support the second reading, but will do what I can in Committee to mould the Bill more in accord with my own ideas.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco—in reply) [9.30]: I have very little to reply to. As a matter of fact, my reply has already been made by various hon. members. I am not referring to what the Minister for Lands said. I love his old-fashioned sentiments. I, too, feel that the greatest honour a woman can have is to be a happy wife and the mother of children, and to live in a decent and comfortable home. The reason many women are not as happy as they should be in homes is because homes are not comfortable; and, as the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) remarked, it is difficult to-day to find the wherewithal to clothe and feed children. That is perhaps

what has brought woman out. The economic position has forced her out; it is not because she fails to appreciate being a wife and a mother. The Minister for Lands has great justification for what he said. I do not agree with his remark that a political man does not want a political wife sitting at the table with him, because I find that nearly all male politicians are dependent upon their wives. I am at a great disadvantage in that I am a woman and have not a woman to do my political work for me. I have to do both the man's and the woman's jobs.

Mr. Sleeman: You should get a husband.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: While the Minister was speaking, I was reminded of a story. It is rather against women, but you, Mr. Speaker, know I am broadminded. A man married a woman—I want to put it nicely—who tried to make herself look as beautiful as possible. After marriage, she no longer used powder and lipstick at the table. The husband had said he objected to paint and lipstick, in fact, to everything that she did. After they were married for some time, however, he told her to do it again. He was so alive to the beautifying effects of powder and lipstick that he was glad when she used them again. I am sure that if the Minister for Lands did not have some woman to help him in his political career, he would be glad to find one. I do not wish to speak to any of the remarks made on the Bill, except to those made by the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall). He has somewhat misunderstood the Bill. The Bill gives exactly the same privileges to women as to men, with the exception that a woman must make application if she wishes to be placed on the jury list. When one considers the disabilities under which so many women work, that is a reasonable request. With regard to the qualifications required of a male juror, if it is desired to alter these, another amendment to the Act will be required, and the member for Murchison could easily bring it forward. I feel that, in its present form, the Bill will pass another place. I therefore ask members to be kind enough to pass the Bill as it stands. I am sure that the march of progress which we have spoken about will have a better chance in another place if the Bill remains unaltered. I wish to mention one other matter. The Minister for Lands referred to a noted man, Hitler, who sent the women of his nation back to the kitchen. Australian women and Australian men have no wish to emulate Hitler. Australian women feel no pride in the fact that Hitler told the women of Germany to go back to the kitchen. Nevertheless, he provided the kitchen. He also provided milk and food and clothes for children.

Mr. Cross: Hitler is a bachelor.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: We do not want Hitlers in Australia, and I am rather sorry the Minister for Lands mentioned him. I feel sure that members present will support the Bill, which I leave to their just consideration.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Sampson in the Chair; Mrs. Cardell-Oliver in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of Section 5 of the principal Act:

Mr. MARSHALL: My chief objection to the Bill is this clause. I have no desire to jeopardise the passage of the Bill, but I strongly opposed a similar clause in another Bill some years ago. Wealthy people should not be given precedence over others. I move—

That the following words be struck out:—"who has the property qualification required of a male juror under the preceding subsection and who notifies in writing addressed to the Resident or Police Magistrate of the district in which she resides that she desires to serve as a juror,"

Mr. RAPHAEL: The amendment goes too far. It would be sufficient if only these words were cut out, "who has the property qualification required of a male juror under the preceding subsection." If we cut out all the words suggested in the amendment, it will be taken as the will of Parliament that every woman should be called upon to serve on a jury.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I trust the Committee will not alter the amendment. It would be an indignity to ask a woman the reason for not wanting to serve on a jury, and some people may argue that if the property qualification were cut out for women jurors, that would have the effect of placing women ahead of men. Whilst we are on the job, I trust we will do that job well.

Hon. N. KEENAN: There are two objections taken to the Bill by the member for

Murchison, and those two objections are embodied in the amendment to strike out the words quoted by him. With regard to the qualification, it would be an anomaly to have women standing on an entirely different basis from that embodied in the present Act. This is an amending Bill, and if it passes it will be an amending Act, and the principal Act will remain. The principal Act has been before this House on many occasions and recently on two occasions when Labour Governments were in power. Perhaps it was not then thought necessary to alter the position. As the member for Subiaco has pointed out, it is not her desire that the Bill should be loaded from too many aspects on which there might be a divergence of opinion. The member for Murchison asks for the right for a woman to serve, and then being charged with the duty she must serve, or be liable to a penalty if she does not serve. The member for Fremantle desires that a woman should be on a jury and that she should also have the right to leave herself off. During a debate in the Queensland Parliament in 1923, when Mr. Theodore brought down a similar measure, that very point was discussed, and it was held that it would be far more convenient to give the woman the right to claim, and when she claimed make her liable under a penalty, to serve.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It would be an indignity on the woman to say to her, "If you want to serve on a jury, you must write and ask." All should be treated in the same way. I believe in what the Minister for Justice has said, that if it is left to the woman to write in to ask for permission to sit on a jury not many will do so, because a lot of them will look upon it as an indignity: but if it is adopted as a right, we will have quite a large number of women eligible to sit on juries.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The member for Subiaco has posed as a champion of women's rights and is demanding a certain degree of equality in connection with the right of women to serve on juries. Why should she impose upon them the necessity for making an application to serve on juries? Why not extend to them the right and the denial of that right if they desire it? That would be a reasonable proposition to put forward by any champion of women's rights. It is making an invidious distinction to say that women should have to make application, that in order to secure that right, they must apply. A male juror's qualification to-day is that he must be possessed of £50 worth of freehold or £150 of personal estate before he is entitled to serve on a jury. That excludes hundreds of male jurors from the obligation to serve, and the opportunity to serve if they desire to do so. There is a much stronger case for the excuse of qualification in respect of women serving on juries than there is in the case of men: it is stronger because, generally speaking, property is held by the male member of the family. In nearly every case the house in which the wamily lives is in the name of the husband.

Member: No, it is not.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: A much greater percentage of women in Western Australia have no property of any description in their name.

Mr. WATTS: This invidious distinction to which the Minister has referred has operated in Queensland for the last 15 years, during eight of which a Government of the same political complexion as that to which the Minister belongs has been in office. I would willingly agree to the property qualification being excluded from the Bill but I can see no point in enrolling every woman as a juror and then asking them to write to the court requesting that their names be removed from the roll, if they did not wish to serve. As the Minister suggested by interjection such a provision would merely mean the amassing of work for the officer concerned in the matter. It is admitted that a large section of women will not desire to serve as jurors and if their names are included in the list they will make application for their removal. As a commencement of this march of progress about which we have heard so much we should allow those that really want to sit on juries to enrol. Having thus found out how many desire the privilege we should then have some idea whether the march of progress is as great as has been indicated. I hope the member for Murchison will be prepared to move his amendment in two sections. I hope that he will first deal with the proposal to strike out the words referring to property qualifications and then bring the other part of the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. McDONALD: The suggestion of the member for Katanning is a good one. It

does not matter one iota to say that the member for Subiaco is posing as the champion of the rights of women. There is no more point in saying that than in saying that the Theodore Government of Queensland, which introduced a similar Bill in that State in 1923 posed as the champion of the rights of women in Queensland. It is not a matter of being a champion, but of dispensing equal justice as between men and women. It is a question of doing something that is a natural consequence of the Bill passed in this House in 1921 to remove the disqualification of women from holding public office. Let us suppose that, say, a fourth of the total number of women in the State that will be eligible under the Bill to serve on juries, desired and were able to do so. It seems far more sensible that they should write in and express that desire than that the other three-fourths should be put to the bother of writing in to say that they do not wish to be enrolled. These latter women would also run the risk—through failing to write in and through being unable as a result of commitments or obligations to attend the court to serve on the jury—of being rendered liable to a penalty. A certain number of people is summoned to serve on a jury panel and it is a serious matter if jurors do not attend.

The Minister for Justice: Privileges cannot be obtained without responsibilities.

Mr. McDONALD: To prevent such women from falling into what we might term legal traps, it is better to leave the Bill as it is rather than to adopt the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It seems that the member for West Perth is in favour of granting privileges without the recipients being required to undertake responsibilities. If a woman does not supply the information that she does not wish to serve on a jury, her name will be amongst those from whom a jury panel will be comprised. She will be notified of the fact that she is a member of that jury panel and as she has been given the privilege of serving on a jury and has failed to notify that she is not desirous of so doing, she must accept the attendant responsibility of the privilege extended to her. Male jurors often find that they have commitments and that to serve on a jury is very inconvenient.

Mr. Patrick: They are not given the right of refusal such as is suggested for women.

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: No, of course not. It is the soft-heartedness of the male that gives women the right to refuse. Although male jurors find that to meet their responsibilities on a jury panel seriously inconveniences them, they have to face those responsibilities just the same and I see no reason why, if this privilege is extended to women, they should not face the attendant responsibility as well.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I have a certain sympathy with the Minister's ideas, but I want to tell him that there will never be complete equality between the sexes, because men cannot have babies.

The Minister for Justice: But they can be sick in hospital.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The difficulty remains that we want this country populated and if the Minister says women must have equal responsibilities with men, then I say that Nature must be persuaded to make men have children as well as women.

Mr. Raphael: Why not introduce a Bill to that effect?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The Minister made an illogical statement; I do not think he meant what he said. He is probably trying to laugh at me or, as the saying is, "to pull my leg." There is a difference between asking women to apply for inclusion on a jury and compelling enrolment. In England a woman is regarded as eligible if she has a property qualification, and if she desires exemption she must ask for it. The result is that many women ask for exemption and have to write for it. It is often necessary for them to go to a doctor to obtain a certificate so as to secure the required exemption. It is all very difficult. Australia is sparsely populated and country women live at great distances from the city. It would be almost impossible for some of them to know they were on the jury list, if the amendment were passed, and when they received their notification to say they had to serve on a panel, those poor women would not know what to do. They could not pay any fine because as members on my right have often told us, people in the country have not much money. They have not even sufficient to pay for a stamp to send a letter asking for exemption. I appeal to members opposite not to spoil the Bill, which has been well thought out. If the member for Murchison persists in his amendment regarding the property qualification, and succeeds in securing it, the result

will be that the Bill will be thrown out in another place. I am sure that he desires to make some improvement. Let us get this measure through and I will support him if he later moves the amendment to the Act that he desires.

Mr. MARSHALL: It is most remarkable to observe the perpetual somersaulting indulged in by members immediately one seeks to assist them to give effect to the desires they have expressed for a considerable time. The hon. member says she wants equality. The Bill by means of which she desires to effect that equality, is based upon the ideas of 1898. The member for Subiaco is quite willing to take the modern girl back to that period. As soon as ever an attempt is made to achieve equality of sexes, objections are raised. The member for Subiaco says that if my amendment is carried, every woman will be obliged to serve on juries. The hon. member says that is not practicable, because women become mothers. I think it is practicable. Does the woman who writes asking to be exempt from jury service know whether she will become a mother or not? If we are to give women the equality that we hear so much about, why not put them on the same plane as men? The hon. member said women would not know they were obliged to serve on juries. Because of the over-legislation in Australia, many men as well as women do not know of various legal obligations until the law takes hold of them. However, so that other members may move amendments they have in mind, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. SLEEMAN: To test the feeling of the Committee, I move an amendment—

That in the proposed subsection the following words be struck out:—"who has the property qualification required of a male juror under the preceding subsection."

The amendment deals only with the property qualification. I hope it will be carried. I do not believe in a property qualification in any case, and especially not as regards women, on whom it bears more hardly than on the average man. Very few wives of workers in Western Australia have banking accounts. Every woman should be granted the privilege of sitting as a juror.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.23 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 15th September, 1938.

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY, PARKESTON-KALGOORLIE.

Commonwealth's Offer to Construct.

Hon. J. CORNELL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, To obviate retrucking of stock and minimise risk of infection, and also to prevent additional cost, has the Commonwealth Commissioner of Railways offered to construct a 4ft. 8½in. gauge railway from Parkeston to a point close to the Government Abattoirs, Kalgoorlie? 2, If so, has this sensible offer been accepted? 3, If not, why not?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, No. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell, leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to Hon. C. B. Williams (South) on the ground of ill-health.

RESOLUTION—YAMPI SOUND IRON ORE DEPOSITS.

Commonwealth Embargo.

Debate resumed from the previous day on motion by the Chief Secretary to concur in the Assembly's resolution as follows:—

That this Parliament of Western Australia emphatically protests against the embargo placed by the Commonwealth Government on the export of iron ore from Australia, in view of its disastrous effects upon the development of the State. We consider that the information available does not warrant such drastic action, and we urge the Commonwealth Government to remove the embargo.