

have application at a future date to some other area that perhaps has not been given consideration.

If we accept the suggestion of the member for Toodyay and the land is disposed of more or less by selection, we cannot leave the words "by public auction" in the Bill because, by those words, I think we are morally obliged to accept the highest bid, provided it reaches the reserve price. The Minister has asked us to leave the words "by public auction" in the clause, but if by doing so we find ourselves, at a future date, in the position of being unable to agree to the principles enunciated by the member for Toodyay and approved by the Minister, it does not seem to make sense to me. The department will bind itself to accepting the highest bid on the one hand and on the other will bind itself to granting the selection to the person who pays a lower sum.

I was wondering whether the Minister, when introducing the Bill, was advised that the highest possible amount could be recouped by selling the land by auction, but now feels that he has given an assurance that it will only be done by tender. If that is so, it seems to me that he should wipe out the provision for the sale of the land by auction. However, he now says that he wants to retain the words "by public auction." I would like the point clarified by the Minister.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I can see the point in the objection raised by the hon. member. As I said earlier, there will be no occasion for this land to come up for sale by public auction. However, the day could arrive when the disposal of a special settlement area would not be so easy as the one mentioned. The department could call for tenders for this land and get such a poor response that the only way it could dispose of it would be to sell it in the same way as land is sold under the conditional purchase system, or, by public auction. The hon. member now wants us to do away with the principle of selling the land by public auction. In the case under review the question of selling the land by public auction would not arise. However, I think that future Governments should have the right to sell it by public auction should they so desire.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Legislative Council

Tuesday, 24th August, 1954.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Dairying, as to artificial insemination of herds	1177
Transport, as to continuation of bus route, Maylands	1177
Resolution : North-West, as to Commonwealth financial assistance	1179
Bills : Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2r.	1178
Prices Control, 1r.	1179
Government Railways Act Amendment, 1r.	1179
Droving Act Amendment, 1r.	1179
Rents and Tenancies Emergency Provisions Act Amendment, Assembly's further message	1179
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, 2r.	1194
Jury Act Amendment, 2r., Com.	1195

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

QUESTIONS.

DAIRYING.

As to Artificial Insemination of Herds.

Hon. C. H. HENNING asked the Minister for the North-West:

When is it anticipated that a plan for artificial insemination will be sufficiently advanced to enable the Minister to supply a detailed answer to my question of the 17th August?

The MINISTER replied:

The Superintendent of Dairying is at present in the Eastern States, but it is expected that a scheme sufficient to explore the possibilities in Western Australia can be finalised shortly after his return.

TRANSPORT.

As to Continuation of Bus Route, Maylands.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON asked the Chief Secretary:

Would the Minister for Transport consider having the bus along Lisle-st. to Susan-st. and Caledonian Avenue, Maylands, continue around the block instead of reversing at the corner, to avoid more accidents at this terminus?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

The local authority has under consideration the necessary widening of road pavement to permit of looping buses.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [4.27] in moving the second reading said: This is not the first time we have had a Bill of this description in this Chamber; and I am hoping that as a result of what has occurred in the last 12 months or so, this measure will get a better reception than the one introduced last year. There are only two objects related in this Bill, which is a very simple one.

The first is to make it compulsory for the court to adjust the basic wage in accordance with the variations in the price index figures which are supplied by the Government Statistician. The second provides that, in arriving at its decision, the court shall take into consideration not only those changes in the price index figures for the previous quarter, but also the changes in any preceding quarter that have not already been allowed for by the court.

According to the price index figures of the Government Statistician the cost of living has risen by 19s. 11d. since the last variation was granted by the court. This increase has accumulated each quarter as follows:—

	s.	d.
September, 1953	4	1
December, 1953—a reduction of	1	6
March, 1954—an increase of	3	8
June, 1954—an increase of	13	8

That is a total cost of living increase of 19s. 11d. Accordingly, if this House had not been so reluctant to give the working man and woman their rights, the basic wage in the metropolitan area would now be £13 6s 5d. instead of the £12 6s. 11d. at which it has stood since July last year. In an effort to allege that basic wage increases were the prime cause of the cost of living spiral, members in opposition to the Government have often gloomily drawn the analogy of a dog pursuing its own tail. Those critics also asserted that with the removal of price and rent controls, prices would reach their proper level. As a result of the activities of these critics, price control has been removed, rent control is virtually non-existent, and the basic wage is pegged.

Maybe prices will eventually find a level. If, and when, they do, at the present cascading increase in the cost of living it would appear that all but the merest necessities of life will be out of the reach of the average working family, to whom this House refuses to grant wage increases to meet those cost of living increases for which they have been largely responsible. I wonder if members now see how fallacious was their reasoning of wage increases causing price increases.

Now we have the cost of living increase of 19s. 11d. while wages have remained stationary. Some members may state that a substantial proportion of the 13s. 8d. increase in the price index figures for the quarter ended June last was due to rent variations. They may ask how many workers pay rent. This is not a material point. Some workers do not pay rent. Some are not married. There are those with only one child, and many who are childless. What must be remembered is that the basic wage is calculated to meet the modest requirements of an average family. All wages are based on it, whether the worker has ten or no children.

Similarly, while rent is a constituent part of basic wage calculation, all workers are entitled to the wage whether or not they pay rent. If changes are required, the means of calculating the wage should be adjusted, not the wage halted. I trust that members who have proved so stubborn in the past will bring some practical thought to bear on this problem, instead of the fallacious theorising on which they have previously based their arguments.

Those are the only two points with which the Bill deals. If it is passed, it will provide that the court shall proceed as it always did until last year, and shall grant either an increase or a decrease in the basic wage, according to the rise or fall of the cost of living as disclosed by the statistician's figures. Further, it will ensure that if there have been any quarters in which such increase or decrease has not been granted, that shall be taken into consideration.

We have been told a good deal about increased wages having had a spiralling effect on the cost of living. Notwithstanding that assertion, we find that although no increase in the basic wage has been granted since last July, the cost of living has risen by 19s. 11d. Accordingly, I would tell those members who use that argument, that they must find something fresh to say as to why this measure should be defeated. And while they are attempting to do that, I want them also to give some justification for the worker being the only one who is asked to carry the burden of the increased cost of living.

Price control has been eliminated, and rent control has been practically done away with, so that these costs have been allowed to soar to the clouds—to proceed to any height—almost without hindrance. On the other hand, although there is a constituted court whose job is to investigate costs and, on the figures supplied as to the variation in the cost of living, to adjust wages, members say, "No, you cannot do that."

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: What is the argument to encourage us to change that? You say we are already doing it.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: Already doing what?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: All the things you say.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Why go on with the Bill, if that is the case?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Because we want the workers to be put in the same position as all other people.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: In your speech, you have already made up our minds for us.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Control over prices has been wiped out. But what else has been done? The wages that the workers are to get have been controlled.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The Bill has not been discussed yet.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am saying what members have done in the past.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: That is better.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I prefaced my remarks by saying I hoped members would change their minds. If the hon. member is repentant, I shall be very pleased to accept him into the fold. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. H. Hearn, debate adjourned.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1. Prices Control.
 2. Government Railways Act Amendment.
 3. Droving Act Amendment.
- Received from the Assembly.

BILL—RENTS AND TENANCIES EMERGENCY PROVISIONS. ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Further Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it no longer disagreed to amendments Nos. 14, 15 and 29 insisted upon by the Legislative Council, and did not insist upon the further amendment No. (v) to the Council's amendment No. 26.

RESOLUTION—NORTH-WEST.

As to Commonwealth Financial Assistance.

Message from the Assembly requesting concurrence in the following resolution now considered:—

That this House expresses its opinion that that portion of the State which lies north of the 26th parallel of latitude is incapable of being fully developed if wholly dependent upon such finance as is only obtainable from State resources.

It therefore requests—

(a) That the Government present a programme for the development of that portion of the State to a committee consisting of the Premier (Hon. A.R.G. Hawke, M.L.A.), the Minister for the North-West (Hon. H. C. Strickland, M.L.C.), the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Sir Ross McLarty, K.B.E., M.L.A.), the Leader of the Country Party (Hon. A. F. Watts, C.M.G., M.L.A.) and the Speaker and Member for Pilbara (Hon. A.J. Rodoreda, M.L.A.).

(b) That this committee consider the programme as presented to it by the Government and, if thought necessary, amend the programme.

(c) That the committee submit such programme personally at Canberra to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer.

(d) That a special annual grant of an amount considered necessary for such developmental work be requested for a period of 10 years in order to carry out the programme.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [4.49]: I move—

That the resolution be agreed to.

Might I at the outset explain to members, and so prevent possible interjections, that recently I was what is classed as a port-hole tourist to the North-West. Apart from that qualification, I have had the experience of travelling through a fair amount of the country in the centre of Western Australia—that is, further north than Wiluna and further east than Laver-ton. Having visited many of the important as well as the small goldmining shows and also the stations of the area, I can claim to have had some experience of what one would find away from the ports of the North-West, with the possible exception of the Kimberleys, where conditions perhaps are totally different.

It has been said in another place, and by some members here, that to have a proper conception of the North-West one would need to live there for years. I do not believe that is right. I consider that a person with a knowledge of Western Australia over a period of years, and a thorough knowledge of agriculture, would need only a little commonsense, after calling at the various ports in the North-West and going inland a little, to appreciate the position of the North-West as it is today.

I find that in the North-West—the area north of the 26th parallel—retrogression has set in over the last few years. I say this because my impressions of every port I visited were that there was a lack of improvement in port facilities, and of the usual facilities throughout the townships. There has been some improvement in

educational standards as a few buildings have been erected; and, to some extent, hospitalisation has been improved, but not to the extent that is necessary to cater for the people who live in those outback areas.

The impression I gained was that the wharves and jetties were just hanging together. In some instances, it was possible to see where repairs had been made and improvements were being carried out. But, generally speaking, I would say that the jetties in the North were in a precarious state. While the initial cost of building these structures might have been only a few thousand pounds, today the cost would be many hundreds of thousands of pounds for the same work.

It appeared to me that we had little chance of encouraging people to go to that part of Western Australia unless the State and the Commonwealth were prepared to offer better living standards and facilities for travel so that people could come south for their holidays by quicker and less costly means of transport than are now available. Those who live there should have some of the amenities, in the way of electricity and water supplies, where it is possible for them to be provided, that we in this part of the State enjoy.

After visiting some of the port towns, such as Broome, Port Hedland, and Carnarvon, and seeing the conditions under which the people live, and then going to the iron island, where we saw the people housed under ideal conditions, I felt there was a vivid contrast. If we are ever to populate the North-West to a greater extent than at present, we shall have to fall into line with what the B.H.P. has done on the iron island. There we found that every employee is well catered for, inasmuch as quarters second to none between here and there were made available, and water and electricity supplied free. The cottages on the island are of the right type for tropical and sub-tropical areas.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: And the rent is 25s. a week.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I have not finished yet. In addition to the amenities I have mentioned, there are others, such as the flushing sanitary system which has been adopted throughout the island. Then, even though the fresh water is brought from Newcastle or South Australia, it—together with a refrigerator and an electric stove—is included in the rental of 25s. to 30s. per week. That company has no difficulty in obtaining all the labour it requires. I was told by the management that it even has a waiting list; so that if someone decides to leave the island, another person will come in immediately. It is a pity that we, through the State and Commonwealth Governments, cannot make these facilities available to all the people who live in the outback areas north of the 26th parallel, because then it could be said that, as soon

as someone wanted to leave the North, someone else would step in to take his place.

Hon. G. Bennetts: It is a wealthy company, though.

Hon. A. R. JONES: That is so; but are we not a wealthy nation? We have wonderful production in this country; and if we all did our bit, there would be no wealthier nation in the world. But if we do not use properly what we have at our disposal, we cannot expect to make this nation bigger, healthier, and wealthier.

The Minister for the North-West: Do you believe that other industries should supply these amenities?

Hon. A. R. JONES: I believe they should; and not only in the North. Wherever an industry is on a good, sound footing, it should supply the best possible amenities for those engaged in it.

Hon. G. Bennetts: The companies at Norseman and Bullfinch do the same thing.

Hon. A. R. JONES: The area of that particular section of land is 530,000 square miles, which is well and truly over half the area of Western Australia. While we have not a big population in this State—about 700,000 people altogether, the population in the North—although I have not got the figures accurately—is about 10,000. On the electoral rolls for the last election there were 8,301 people enrolled; so, if we allow for those who are not on the roll and the ones who are too young to be entitled to enrolment, we could say that in round figures there would be no more than 10,000 people in the North-West.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Do you mean 10,000 white people?

Hon. A. R. JONES: I would say that figure would include some caste people and natives. That area comprises a huge tract of country; and, while none of us can possibly visualise at this stage that there will ever be really large numbers of people in the North-West, we can look forward to the time when the present population will be doubled or trebled. We do not want to aim at millions in the North; because I, for one, cannot see how it would be possible for them to be employed there economically.

Whatever we do in the North—and in the whole State, too, for that matter—we have to take into account the economics involved. I do believe, however, that it would be possible to double, treble, or quadruple the population in the North in a period of ten, 15, or 20 years. I shall try to outline, as I go along, the means by which I think it would be possible to help increase the population there. No doubt the speakers who follow me, particularly those who have known the North for a number of years and have studied it closely, will give us some authentic figures which will support the motion.

When we realise the huge area involved and the scant population, it is not hard to visualise what could happen if we were implicated in a war. We were threatened during the last war; and, in fact, our northern shores, including the ports of Darwin, Broome, and Wyndham, were attacked. While no landings took place it is not hard to realise what could happen if we were engaged in another war. It is our duty to remind the Commonwealth Government—if it needs to be reminded—that the North-West portion of Western Australia is open to attack in the event of war.

I am not stupid enough to say that if we had another 25,000 or 30,000 people in the North we could defend that part of the country; but if we could increase the population in that area by another 30,000 or 40,000; and if facilities were provided, such as better roads, all-weather airports and water schemes, we would have a much better chance of defending the North than we have at the moment. If these facilities were provided, our army and air force could be moved quickly to those areas. Our navy could operate from some of the northern ports in an emergency, as it did in the last war. I have been told that Yampi Sound could accommodate all the navies of the world—at least all the navies of countries which would be our allies. If decent roads, all-weather airports, and air-strips were built in peacetime they would be available for use during times of war.

Some 20 years ago the sheep population of the North was approximately 3,000,000; but today, as far as I can gather, the number is round about 2,000,000. I have been led to believe that the severe drop in numbers—and from what I have seen I am convinced that this is so—has been brought about because of a lack of feed; and the reason for this is the increase in the number of kangaroos. They are a menace in that area and are quickly eating out all the available feed.

Because of the lack of plant growth, soil erosion is becoming a problem, and during storms and windy weather, the soil is washed or blown away because it is not held together by natural grasses. I do not know what we can do to build up our sheep population, but I suggest that experimental work be undertaken to see what can be done. If we intend to start experimental stations throughout the North, to supplement those already in existence, we must be prepared to spend hundreds of thousands of pounds. That is beyond the finances of the Government of Western Australia; and in this regard we must look to the Commonwealth Government to aid us through its research service, the C.S.I.R.O.

Wild dogs, too, have played a part in reducing our sheep population in that part of the State. They are a constant worry and a menace to the station people; and

while the State Government has done and is doing a good job in an effort to eradicate wild dogs, further research is necessary. That, too, will mean further expenditure.

One member in this House—if not more—has, in the past, suggested that we should hand over all that part of Western Australia north of the 26th parallel to the Commonwealth Government, as has been done with what was the north of South Australia, but what is now known as the Northern Territory.

Hon. H. K. Watson: With probably no better results.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I was coming to that point. That part of South Australia was handed over to the Commonwealth Government some 20 or 30 years ago. While on this trip to the North recently I, with other members, travelled through to Darwin on the boat. I had an opportunity of looking around the Northern Territory, and we travelled inland for approximately 40 or 50 miles. The Administrator, Hon. F. J. S. Wise, told us what was happening in the hinterland; and I venture to suggest that, prior to his appointment, very little was done in this connection. I believe that the Federal Government made an excellent choice when Mr. Wise was appointed as Administrator of the Northern Territory.

However, he is rapidly becoming frustrated. He wants to do a good job, but feels that the people in Canberra are complicating his work; and this is hampering him in his efforts to do something for that part of Australia. He said that although he and his officers might put in six months' work investigating a certain project, which would be recommended by the Northern Territory Parliament, some person in Canberra would write back and ask for it to be reconsidered from another angle. Yet those men, in every case, consider a project from every angle. Their efforts to do something are thwarted by somebody in Canberra who has, possibly, nothing better to do than write letters and place obstacles in their way.

If that applies in the Northern Territory, it would apply even more so to the northern part of Western Australia if that country were administered from that august place, Canberra. In Darwin we found that the authorities were doing their best to bring the town into some semblance of order. We saw photographs of Darwin when Mr. Wise first went there and it was a complete ruin. Wrecks of aeroplanes, trucks, and all types of army equipment and buildings, were to be seen everywhere. In some places the port was choked with sunken vessels, and the administrative block had been blown to pieces. Very little had been done up to that time; but the present Administrator soon made order out of chaos.

There was a reason why nothing had been done: people in the Northern Territory had no security, as they were granted

only a fortnightly tenancy. As a result, no person would spend more than was necessary to house himself and his family. The first thing the Administrator did was to grant 99-year leases to people, so that they had some security of tenure and some faith in their work in the territory. As a result, while we were in Darwin, 100 houses were in course of erection, and business firms were spending £250,000 in building concrete, brick, and stone structures. The population has grown to something like 8,800 people.

But what struck us was the fact that when boats pulled into Darwin they off-loaded their cargo, but little cargo from Darwin was reloaded on to the boats. Until the Administrator and his experts can do something about improving the trade from Darwin, that port will not be of much use to the Commonwealth, except as a jumping off point for our defence forces. At the moment, all the people in Darwin, with the exception of a few who are employed by private air-transport firms, are employed by the Commonwealth Government. Vestey's Meatworks, which was the only big building in the Territory, is dilapidated, and practically a complete ruin, because there was not sufficient industry in the Territory to keep the works going. I would hate to visualise what would happen to our North—and woe betide us—if we ever decided to hand it over to the Commonwealth authorities, for we would be even further removed from Canberra than is the Northern Territory.

We must stick to the northern part of Western Australia; and to do this, we must develop it. As a solution to increasing the population of the North, might I suggest that the provision of water is the first major essential. It is not hard to find, I am led to believe, because at times there is up to 16 or 20 inches of rain. But the important thing is to impound the water during that flood period; and departmental officers believe that the water can be dammed and harnessed. If we dam the water, that will prevent flood damage, and it can be impounded for use during the dry seasons. But to do that a considerable sum of money must be spent.

During my speech on the Address-in-reply, I mentioned briefly a scheme which was outlined by a young engineer at Derby. He has since left the Government service and is now the secretary-engineer of the Pingelly Road Board. It is a pity that the Government has lost this young man, because he was so keen on his job, and we could have retained his services if amenities had been provided to enable his wife and family to stay in that part of the State. All he wanted was reasonable educational facilities and other amenities.

This man told me that if his scheme were adopted, five times as much water as there is in the Canning Dam when full could be impounded; and his estimated cost, even on today's figures, was approximately

£300,000 or £400,000. That is not a large sum of money when we realise the huge project envisaged.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Where is it located?

Hon. A. R. JONES: On a tributary of the Fitzroy River—I believe it is the Margaret River.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: That is right.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Is it salt water?

Hon. A. R. JONES: No.

The Minister for the North-West: That is only his estimate of the cost—his guess.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It is a matter of getting a site suitable for a dam.

Hon. A. R. JONES: The Minister said it was only his estimate or guess. Of course, these men are paid to make estimates. He estimated £300,000; but I added another £100,000, to be on the safe side. Even if the cost reached £500,000, we should not quibble at that figure; because I believe that over a period of years, with the flooding which takes place when storms occur in that location, damage to an amount greater than £500,000 would be caused in that area, by way of loss of stock, and loss of man-hours, in that people cannot get around and do their jobs.

The crossings of some of those rivers cannot be used until many weeks after the floods have occurred. In Derby, it was explained to us that the Fitzroy Crossing was still impassable to heavy traffic; yet the floods occurred three or four months previously. This will give an idea of how long transport can be held up, and how many man-hours can be wasted because of the conditions which prevail there. One contractor told us that he had to keep his four drivers on the payroll, although their services could not be used at that time. He had to retain them until the roads dried up, and until his men were ready to go to work. If he had paid those drivers off, or stood them down, they would not have been available to him when required.

There are two sites on the Fitzroy River which can be dammed and a similar amount of water impounded. The costs were not mentioned. If water is to be impounded, the cost will naturally be more than a few pounds. We can estimate that it will cost £1,000,000 to impound that water. Wherever it is possible to dam up water, we should do so in order to provide a supply for the area. I believe that once water is provided, the stations in that area will be able to produce more than at present.

There would have to be a redistribution, a cutting up, or whatever one calls it, of the stations. Today a station may be 1,000,000 acres in area; and it would be a matter of dividing it into five or six smaller stations, so that each would have some land which could be irrigated. Even if such an irrigated area were only 500 acres, quite a large quantity of feed could be grown

on it. This would ensure an adequate supply against lean periods when feed was scarce.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: You agree that the holdings should be cut up?

Hon. A. R. JONES: I am certain of it. In order that something may be done for the North, these large properties must be cut up; but there is no use cutting them up until such time as it can be proved that each subdivided station can carry as much stock as the large station is carrying today, and until some assurance can be given of a supply of feed during lean periods by some method of growing and preserving fodder. Until that time is reached, it is useless to cut up the stations. Once we can bring about the things I mention, then the cutting up of the stations will be a most urgent necessity.

To give effect to my suggestion of growing and conserving fodder would entail a great amount of work, more people to carry it out, and a natural population increase. What I regard as a matter of secondary importance to water is a system of roads throughout that area to facilitate transport; and wherever possible, all-weather roads should be built. Other members may know more about this matter than I do. I know it would be very difficult to build all-weather crossings on some rivers, but provided storm water is impounded at the upper reaches, to have all-weather roads would be within bounds; and if roads were built to standard, to meet as nearly as possible the requirements of all-weather conditions, the man-hours that are wasted at present through transport not being able to get through, could be saved. I believe that air strips should be weather-proof. The need for this was clearly demonstrated while we were in the North. In one place aeroplanes could not land because of the condition of the strip.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Was that Roebourne?

Hon. A. R. JONES: That was one place. The strip was ordinary earth, and not suitable for landing after 40 or 50 points of rain had fallen. It is necessary to make every one of those air ports or air strips of an all-weather type. This is necessary to enable sick people to be flown out to receive attention, if they cannot be treated at those centres. It would also allow people from the outback stations to be landed in those centres for treatment.

It is not difficult to realise, when the matter is viewed from the angle I have outlined, that it is beyond the capacity of the State to provide the necessary finance and facilities to develop the North if it is desired to populate that territory to any extent. The State cannot provide all the requirements—water, roads, air strips, hospitals, education facilities, and houses. It is beyond the State to finance some housing schemes so that people up there can

be properly housed and become more contented. Houses have to be built so that insect pests cannot enter them. This was illustrated when I was in Broome.

I have not spent such a trying hour, as when I sat on a verandah of a house in that town. From the time I entered to the time I left, I did not stop slapping myself: the mosquitoes were so plentiful that they resembled a swarm of bees; and they had plenty of sting in them. It is little wonder that people do not like living in those areas. Houses must be so constructed that insects can be kept out. The State Government should, from the funds made available by the Commonwealth, finance the building of decent and comfortable houses on a private ownership basis.

Quite apart from the industries of sheep raising, wool growing and cattle and beef production carried on at present, other forms of agriculture are possible. Experimental stations have been established; I was fortunate to see two. The one at Ord River impressed me very much. I saw sugar cane growing in abundance and of good quality and size. We were told by the experts that the experimental crops were the equal of the best Queensland crops, and that there was a very bright future for the sugar industry or the growing of sugar cane.

It is unfortunate that the world production of sugar cane does not make it worth while to foster that industry in the North-West at the present time. As with any other industry which is overproducing, there is not much point in fostering the sugar-cane industry in this State. The fact is that, provided water from the Ord River is available for irrigation, sugar cane can be grown there in competition with other countries of the world. But it is not much good competing with Queensland, because already sugar cane is grown in abundance in that State.

Other experiments have been conducted in peanut and rice growing. Pineapples are being successfully grown under irrigation. In that particular area, there are about 40,000 acres of good flat land which can be irrigated for these and other purposes and so one more form of production can be carried out in Western Australia.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: There are many more areas like that in the North-West.

Hon. A. R. JONES: No doubt; but that was one which I saw. I gauged the possibilities of that area. Making a quick mathematical calculation, I would say it could accommodate 1,000 small farms of 40 to 50 acres each. With the warm tropical sun, with sufficient water, and with good rich country, who is to say what will or will not grow in that area, until it has been tried? Until we can establish more experimental stations we shall not know. I have mentioned only one area; it has been said that there are several such, with at least equal, if not greater, capacity.

Experiments are being conducted in the Northern Territory. Former officers in the Western Australian Agricultural Department, possibly known by the Administrator, Mr. Wise, have been engaged to carry out this work. We found one officer, Mr. Bennetts, carrying out experiments just out of Darwin in the growing of pineapples, peanuts, and various types of grasses and fodders. He is a very keen and energetic officer. What we saw was very encouraging. The pineapples grown there are equal to any of those grown elsewhere. If pineapples can be grown in Darwin, which is not very far from the Kimberleys, then it is logical to assume that they can be grown in the Kimberleys.

Not very far from Darwin, there is an area known as the coastal plain, consisting of 2,000,000 acres, which follows the coastline running from Darwin northwards and extending inland for 50 or 60 miles. It is quite accessible. We were told by the experts carrying out experiments on rice growing on 70 acres of land, that last year the yields were very profitable. Nothing was done during the years when South Australia had that country, and when the Federal authorities took it over. As far back as 1883 the Chinese asked for a concession of 250,000 acres for rice growing. This request was refused. We are discovering today that what they thought possible 70 years ago is, in fact, possible.

From what we saw, with the right type of rice that area will become a rich rice-growing area. The same argument can be applied to the north of Western Australia, although I am not aware that there is any area similar to the one in the Northern Territory suitable for rice growing. But with the impounding of water, and after further experiments have been carried out, rice growing may prove to be a vast industry in our North.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: That was the Humpty-doo area.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Yes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: There are many places like that in our North.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I am pleased to hear that. The Humpty-doo area impressed me very much. At least 2,000,000 acres were automatically flooded during the wet season and the water from six inches to 18 inches deep was retained. It gradually dried out to allow for the harvesting of the rice in the dry season. In other parts of the world, it is necessary to plant in the wet season; and because of the more favourable conditions here, I believe the possibilities are very great; and if the requisite finance were made available to provide irrigation facilities, I believe there would be people prepared to settle in the North.

If some form of tax reduction were granted, we would be in a better position than we are at the present time to populate

the northern parts of the continent. I would not favour the granting of total exemption from taxation, except for the moderate wage-earner, because there would be a tendency for people to go there and make money, and then come south and spend it, or live in the city and reap the profits from stations or businesses. Whatever assistance were granted should be conditionally upon the recipient developing an area and reinvesting the money in his holding or business. All the things I have mentioned will assist to populate the North to a greater extent; but before we can achieve those things, we must have help from the Federal Government.

In the Eastern States a great many big schemes have been undertaken with the help of the Commonwealth. The Snowy River scheme is going to assist not only the Commonwealth, but also Victoria and New South Wales, and perhaps finally South Australia. Good luck to those States if they can get the Commonwealth to assist in financing such a project; but it is not too much to ask the Commonwealth for money to assist the development of our northern areas. In Tasmania, the Commonwealth has provided something like £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 to assist the aluminium industry. Such an industry would be most valuable from a defence point of view if we had to defend this country again. In Queensland, the Commonwealth is assisting the coalmining industry; in fact, all States except Western Australia have received a hand-out from the Commonwealth.

We must not lose sight of what happened during World War II when the Commonwealth aided many types of industry that were helpful to the war effort, such as the munitions industry in South Australia. In Tasmania, New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria, huge industries were established and financed by the Commonwealth, but Western Australia did not participate; nothing along the same lines was done here. Yet during that war Western Australia played its part; in fact, more men were enlisted in the services in proportion to population than in any other State.

The Minister for the North-West: We had our territory invaded, too.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Yes. The people of Western Australia pay taxation to the Commonwealth, and I would be prepared to say that they pay more taxation per head of the population than do the people in any other State. This being so, why cannot we share in the good things being handed out by the Commonwealth?

HON. C. W. D. BARKER (North) [5.37]: I support the motion. Ever since I have occupied a seat in this House, I have stressed the need for developing the North; and it is with much pleasure that I find this motion placed before us without any party ties whatever, and in a

manner that permits of its being discussed on non-party lines with all parties co-operating.

At the outset I should like to stress that there must be no thought of handing over the North-West above the 26th parallel to the Commonwealth. If that territory were handed over, it would be so far away from Canberra, whence it would be administered, that it would become merely the tail end; and my experience is that the tail end always comes last. When we are on the verge of having oil fields coming into production, and of the possible discovery of uranium and other important minerals—I would not be surprised if that happened in the near future—it would be foolish to think of handing that territory over to the Commonwealth.

As Mr. Jones mentioned, the North-West covers a very large area—I have stressed this many times in the House. It comprises 530,000 square miles, and it carries a very sparse population—only 8,000 or 9,000. To say that the North could carry only 30,000 or 40,000 people is not booming it very much, because it represents one-half of the area of Western Australia and one-sixth of the area of the Commonwealth. I would say that, given development, we could carry a much larger population than that. True, it would take many years to attain that goal, but I believe it could be done.

The Commonwealth Government is the only authority that could carry out the big development needed in the North-West. If the State attempted it, to provide the requisite money would prove to be too big a drag on our finances. Therefore I consider that the Commonwealth should come to our aid, just as it has assisted other States, and help us to develop this territory.

There are several reasons why the Commonwealth should assist in its development. One reason is defence, and the Commonwealth should do that for its own benefit. In many ways the Commonwealth would gain if the North were developed, and such development would be in the interests of Australia as a whole. If we laid a concrete plan before the Federal Government, I believe it could hardly refuse our request; and if anything comes of the passing of the motion, I hope that the money will be spent wisely on reproductive works and that the North will go ahead.

There is plenty of room for development in the North. As has been stressed in this House several times, one of the great needs is roads. We also require jetties, more shipping facilities, more goods sheds, more efficient gear for handling cargo, better hospitals, better educational facilities, more and better aerodromes, bridges, dams, and other things. But what would those facilities be provided for? Would they be provided to cater for 30,000 or 40,000

people? Many people picture the North-West and the Kimberleys as merely desert. I repeat my belief that, with development, the North could carry a much larger population than that.

The Kimberley area offers scope for intense development, more than does any other part of the North-West. As to the part of the North between Wallal and the Ninety-Mile Beach, I am afraid that it will never carry much more population than it does today; but it has great mineral possibilities.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Do you include the Kimberleys in this motion?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I would be indeed surprised if the Kimberleys were not included because that is the part where intensive development could be undertaken.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Did we not have a North-West Development Committee?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: That has nothing to do with this motion. If the Commonwealth made financial assistance available, I think the money should be spent through a responsible Government body. So I think some idea of what can be done in the North should be given clearly to the Commonwealth Government. It is no use our just saying, "We would like your assistance to develop the North", unless we also put forward a concrete proposition showing that the money to be spent would give a worthwhile return. As I said on the Address-in-reply, I feel that the Commonwealth should help in a project such as this mainly for reasons of defence.

I agree with the Commonwealth Government's policy, part of which is that our defence should not begin on our own shores. I believe we should co-operate with our allies, and send our troops wherever it is necessary for them to go in the defence of Australia, and from the experience of the past, I think that is sound. During the last war we sent our troops overseas and fought the enemy step by step, until we met him as close to our own shores as New Guinea; and that could easily happen again. For that reason our shores should be fortified, and I feel convinced that one of our best forms of defence is to develop and populate our country.

Never before in our history has Australia had such clear warnings as she is receiving today that she should look to her defence. Events in South-East Asia should make it apparent to anyone that this is indeed an urgent matter. A race whose political ideologies are different from ours is gradually gaining a foothold closer and closer to our shores; and if we do not look to our defence in the near future, we may well be very sorry.

In 1926 there was an Asian conference, something like that mooted to be held in the near future; and, if I remember rightly, it took place at Colombo, one of the main resolutions passed being "Asia for the Asiatics." If we examine what has happened in Asia since then, we find that that policy has been rigidly adhered to, and that the influence of Europeans and the white races generally has declined in Asia, more recently with the help of a foreign power with whose ideas we do not agree, and whose methods of Government we have no desire to see here.

Because of the present world situation, I think the Commonwealth Government should have no hesitation in helping us to develop the North, if only—I repeat—from the defence angle, because that part of our country is wide open to any invader. In spite of modern methods of warfare, the quick transportation of troops, the use of mobile units, and so on, it is still necessary that our North-West should be populated and developed as a defence barrier. To do that would require an immense amount of money, but I think the return from such a policy would also be considerable. If this motion does not embody the Kimberleys, I think that before the debate is ended the wording should be altered to include that portion of the North.

Hon. L. Craig: The motion says "north of the 26th parallel."

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: In my opinion, that includes the Kimberleys. No matter what development takes place in the West Kimberleys, I feel convinced that the production of beef cattle will always be the main industry there, as they provide a source of income that can be relied upon for many years to come. The production of cattle in the Kimberleys could, by the right methods, be increased beyond all measure.

A pastoralist with a 1,000,000-acre property owns none of it at all. All he does is to lease the right for his cattle to eat the grass growing on that land, and his lease has perhaps another 30 years to run. We cannot expect pastoralists to pour large sums of money into the country for development when they hold the land merely on lease. Most of them have done some measure of improvement and the tendency today is for them to do more than has been the case in the past.

But, as I said, if we developed that country properly, it would produce vastly greater numbers of cattle than it does today. I believe—I think the pastoralists would realise the truth of what I am saying—that if that country were split up into smaller holdings, and a different kind of tenure were given to the holders of land, they could develop it more efficiently and carry more cattle on it than

they do today. I was pleased to hear Mr. Jones say he agreed with me on that point.

I, in turn, agree that if we were to cut those large stations up, we would have to do a great deal of work in the conservation of water and the provision of the other necessary facilities in that area. If the large holdings were cut up, and each property were provided with so much land for irrigation purposes, it would be possible to produce, in that part of the State, fat and finished cattle. Anyone who has seen the cattle in the North-West going to the meat works, and has compared them with the beef produced in the southern areas, must agree that they are nothing but forward stores. The average weight this year of cattle going to the Wyndham Meat Works was, I think, 560 lb.

The Minister for the North-West: It was 514 lb.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Any man with an idea of how to grow beef cattle—particularly my friends of the Country Party and Mr. Craig—will agree that a beast weighing 514 lb. is a poor type of bullock. Even at a weight of 600 lb., it is still just a bullock.

Hon. C. H. Henning: They are called steers today, not bullocks.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: When we produce beasts weighing 800, 900 or 1,000 lb., we are really growing cattle.

The Minister for the North-West: They produce themselves.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I have never seen what I would call a finished bullock in the Kimberleys; but with irrigation to provide the fodder, cattle could be grown there of a standard equal to those anywhere else.

The Minister for the North-West: I think 1,200 lb. is a good weight.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Beasts from the Ord River station have been killed at 1,600 lb. They were ordinary cattle that came from Ivanhoe station but were fed on controlled pastures at the experimental station. One was killed at 1,600 lb. weight and some at 1,200 lb. and 900 lb., out of a herd of 20 or 25 cattle. If that can be done at the Ord River station, it can be done elsewhere in the North. In the North-East Kimberleys there are 20,000,000 acres of country that is today being explored and surveyed. I am informed by the authorities that, with the available conservation of water, that country could carry a further 70,000 cattle, using present-day methods.

If we improved our methods of running cattle in the Kimberleys, I am sure we could double or even treble the number of cattle produced there. That, in turn, would result in a larger population of that part of the State. I would point out that there are certain stretches of country in

the North—adjacent to rivers, the damming of which would be easy—that would enable the carrying on of several other forms of agriculture. Here I refer to the growing of rice and sugar and the production of vegetable oils. I emphasise the production of vegetable oils, as I believe there is a good world market for them and feel they could be produced in the North on an economic basis. Ground nuts and several other crops can be produced in the North-West, as has been proved at the experimental station.

Sugar crops grown in the North today are equal to anything produced elsewhere in the Commonwealth. Of course irrigation would be necessary; and I do not know how the growing of sugar in this State would compare, from an economic point of view, with the Queensland sugar plantations; but I am told it would be an economic proposition, and that our country would produce a bigger crop than is secured in Queensland.

There are also several tropical fruits that could be grown; and cereals such as hybrid corn and sorghum, which could be used for the feeding of stock. The waste from the sugar mills could also be used for that purpose, and would be a real help to the beef industry. If this motion is agreed to, and help is given by the Commonwealth Government in the way suggested, great things can be expected of the Kimberleys.

I am informed that 40 acres of rice planted near the Fitzroy River will this year yield 50 tons. It is of different varieties which come to maturity at different times, but the batches already harvested indicate the result I have mentioned. There are available millions of acres of land similar to that in the Fitzroy Valley where the rice is being grown. The distance from Fitzroy Crossing to the coast is approximately 200 miles, and for that distance this land stretches on each side of the river, varying in width from 10 to 30 miles, all the way to the coast.

Of course, a great deal of water would be required to put all that country into production; but the possibilities of damming the rivers there are such that I feel we should have no hesitation in commencing that work. Mr. Dumas once said that the Ord River dam site, if used, would be equal to five rivers like the Nile, on which there is one of the largest dams in the world. On the Margaret River, as Mr. Jones said, there is a dam site which has been termed an engineer's dream.

There is quite a narrow place where a dam could be thrown across, and the country has a good bottom and is solid throughout. The water storage area behind the dam site is something that would have to be seen to be believed. A little further up there is another good site. On the Barker River there is also an excellent site for a dam and in front of it there is

a huge black-soil plain. Therefore, it can be seen that the possibilities of the Kimberleys are tremendous.

This area, of course, may also hold a great future if oil is discovered. A large tract of that country has not even been tapped, and nobody knows what it may hold. If it could only be developed and populated, I believe that the State and the Commonwealth as a whole would greatly benefit. I have always said that the development of the North-West is not a State problem but a national problem.

From Wallal Downs to Onslow, the country is different altogether. It is rough and auriferous. It is capable of growing certain types of grasses, and sheep do quite well on it. Nevertheless, I am of opinion that a large number of sheep could not be carried on that country. The work that is being done at the experimental station at Port Hedland is proving to be of great benefit. They are making experiments with spinifex and other types of grasses. I am sure the carrying capacity of the country can be increased, but I do not think that the population will be increased purely as a result of agricultural pursuits. Its future lies mainly in mining; and, of course, there is always the prospect that oil may be discovered.

If oil is found in any part of the North, the basins in that region are so extensive that the whole of the North-West could be regarded as a potential oil field. In that district there are many minerals which could be exploited; and if companies with large capital could be encouraged to prospect and develop the mineral fields, this would prove to be of great advantage to the State.

The quantity of tin that will be produced in this district in the future will be much greater than that which has been mined in the past, and there is no doubt that the possibilities in that direction are tremendous. So far, the only tin mining that has been done has been in the dredging of creeks and bulldozing the material out, so that it may be carried to a plant where adequate water supplies are available. On an average, this area has produced about 5 lb. of tin per cubic yard, and in some places it has produced up to 80 lb. per cubic yard; but they are, of course, exceptions.

That vast area from Marble Bar to Bamboo Springs, and across to Hillside and Tamboora, has many creeks which are capable of producing tin. No geological report on this country has ever been issued, and no one has ever tried to discover the source of the tin. Up to date, the mineral has always been obtained from creek beds. As time goes on, the source of this alluvial tin will be found, and I am sure that anything could result if such efforts are successful. I am certain it will be a very important tin-producing centre before very long.

Tantalite, columbite and other rare metals that exist in the North are also being much sought after today. They are very valuable and will continue to be so because such metals are not available in large quantities in other parts of the world. At Port Hedland, towards Ragged Hills, there are extensive rich lead deposits which have a lead content of 60 and 70 per cent., ranging down to 30 and 40 per cent., and even lower. However, the majority of the lead produced is of high quality, and there is an abundance of it.

Then we have manganese. If we take for granted the statement by the Minister for Mines, we hold the largest manganese deposits, not only in Australia, but in the world. I believe that, as development comes to the North and the mineral wealth is investigated by improved methods of geological survey and modern prospecting, larger deposits of manganese than those known today will be found. This will be of great importance to the State and the Commonwealth, because manganese supplies are short, not only in Australia, but also throughout the world. America is prepared to expend much capital to mine the manganese in our State and to export it to its own shores. So, as time goes on and if no metal is found to act as a substitute for it, manganese will become very valuable indeed.

There is also gold in the Pilbara district. However, very little work has been done, and the surface only has been scratched. A lot more could be done. At Wittenoom Gorge there is a company producing asbestos, and it has been predicted that it will be able to supply asbestos for the next hundred years. But there is still a large tract of country that could be taken up to mine asbestos. Huge deposits of copper and of white asbestos exist around Roebourne. Neither of these has been developed. Although, as I have said, that country could carry more population by following agricultural pursuits, I think that mining offers greater possibilities.

We then come to that stretch of country ranging from Onslow to Carnarvon. This is good pastoral land, and is a different proposition again. Unfortunately, it is in a belt where a good rainfall is not assured; nevertheless, pastoralists there have made a great deal of money and have built up excellent stations. The majority of them are fenced, and have been improved in many ways. They are well watered, and are being used to the best advantage under present conditions. If taxation were not as heavy as it is today, and more encouragement were given to people in the North to increase production, I am sure they could do so.

Mention has been made in this House of the kangaroo menace; but the only ones to blame are the pastoralists. If they took decisive action, they could eradicate this pest. When I took over Hamersley station in the nineteen-thirties, there

were literally thousands of kangaroos on the property. I found that, by fencing off the troughs and poisoning them in the summer, I could destroy the kangaroos wholesale, and was successful in killing in the vicinity of 15,000.

If a similar campaign were conducted in the North by every pastoralist, the kangaroo would soon cease to be a menace. It has been suggested that the problem should be tackled by giving more encouragement to kangaroo-shooters, but I am sure this would not overcome it. From experience, I found that kangaroo-shooters generally shot boomers only and the rest bred more rapidly than before. The best method is to poison them wholesale.

Experiments have been conducted by the C.S.I.R.O. on the eradication of wallabies and rabbits by ploughing up the warrens and placing poison in rabbit holes. This was found to be very effective. Now, the coastal wallabies are practically non-existent. If station-owners tackled this problem in a wholehearted manner by co-operating with each other to use poisoning methods, they could effect wholesale destruction and wipe out the kangaroo pest. If the number of sheep have been reduced through the incidence of kangaroos, the blame lies with the pastoralist himself.

The menace of dogs and foxes has also been referred to. That is an entirely different problem, and the Agriculture Protection Board is playing a big part in their destruction. A study of the habits of dingoes has shown that they migrate from other parts. By following their pads at breeding time, pastoralists could go a long way towards eradicating this pest. The fox is a great problem in the North, as it is in the south, but its eradication could be tackled scientifically also. Therefore, these pests should present no problem as far as the carrying capacity of the Kimberleys and the Gascoyne is concerned.

Better methods must be employed to increase the carrying capacity and to improve the breeding. We should produce sheep in the North that will give more wool, and investigation should be made into the growing of improved fodders. No one can be assured of a good rainfall in that country. The North has just passed through some very lean years. A few years ago, there were practically seven years of drought in the Gascoyne and adjacent districts, and during that period station-owners suffered great losses. They had to stand by and watch their many years' work go to ruin; and, in fact, the country today still carries the scars of that drought, because the land takes a long time to rehabilitate itself. To a great extent, this has been the cause of the reduction in the number of sheep compared to what it was a few years ago. I believe that with more intensive development; with the subdivision of land; and with improved methods of production, a

much greater number of sheep could be carried in the North-West and Gascoyne districts.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Before tea I was trying to describe some of the possibilities of production in the North. I think this is very necessary if we are to put up a case to the Commonwealth Government. Before we ask for moneys for development, we must prove that from that development we will be able to recoup money spent and increase the population of the North. I was speaking of the Carnarvon district and of the sheep properties there; and I hope I left an impression in the minds of members that the people who own these stations have, to the best of their ability, tried to develop that country and put it to the best use, though they have been faced with many difficulties not the least of which has been drought.

I believe that throughout the State—and indeed throughout Australia—the tendency is that, where there is large earning, only so much should be produced, because if the producers entered a certain income group they would be penalised to a large extent; they have no initiative to go on with their production. I think that applies to primary industry generally; and if something were done along those lines to help primary producers to increase their output, and they were given some initiative to do so, I feel sure they would produce more goods, particularly if they knew that they would get some relief from taxation if they entered a certain income group. The tendency, however, is for them to say, "We have earned enough; if we earn any more it will be for Arty Fadden."

There is a measure of tropical agriculture in Carnarvon—there is the banana plantation there—and if something were done to make the water supply position secure, that industry could go ahead and would, of course, eventually carry more people.

I would now like to refer to a little town which everyone seems to forget. Its name is Shark Bay, and it has quite a good fishing industry. Shark Bay has been described in this House many times as being neglected from the point of view of medical supplies, education, and almost everything else. It really needs some attention. The people produce quite a lot from the sea; and I would say that, right along the coast of Australia, there is opportunity for expansion in the fishing industry. The possibilities are tremendous.

The pearling industry could be expanded and could carry a lot more people. The whaling industry is now at its peak; but I do think the Commonwealth whaling station could be put to some use during the off-season. Perhaps it could be used as a processing or canning factory for tuna or shrimps. In that district, there is an abundant supply of all types of sea fish,

and I do not know why we should stand by and watch people from other countries reaping this wealth right under our noses. There is a great opportunity and a big harvest—such as has never been reaped—for any enterprising person who would care to undertake it. I have no doubt that if these people were given the necessary facilities and encouragement there would be a big expansion in that industry.

That more or less covers the possibilities of the increase in production. If that took place, we could expect an increase in the beef and cattle industry and the pastoral industry generally; they could carry at least 25,000 people. I do not see why the fishing industry, which would include whaling, pearling, and so on, could not carry as many as 10,000 people.

I would now refer to mining which, if it were given close attention and were opened up and developed, could carry another 20,000 people. There is no reason why it should not, particularly if something were done about the asbestos production at Wittenoom Gorge, and the Tariff Board permitted the company there to produce its products at a payable price. Mining could quite easily carry 10,000 more people; and that is without including the possibilities that might arise from the production of oil.

There is a great future in the North-West; and if oil were found in sufficient quantity, it could place a large number of people in that industry, particularly if the companies concerned put in a cracker or a treatment plant in the area. That would mean a big settlement in the North; and if we had a refinery, the oil industry could carry as many as 40,000 people or more. I am basing those figures on the oil refinery being built at Kwinana, and the numbers it will directly or indirectly employ. If a cracker or a treatment plant were put in, instead of the oil being carted away, as I think it will be, we could have a number of people employed in that industry.

It is no exaggeration to say that the North-West could carry 30,000 or 40,000 people. When we consider the area of the country concerned, we find it is half that of Western Australia, and one-sixth of the Commonwealth; and it would have to be a very poor country indeed if it could not carry a larger population than 30,000 or 40,000 people.

There are, of course, several methods of approaching the Commonwealth Government: we could ask for a grant in hard cash each year to help in the development of the North.

Hon. A. R. Jones: Could not we leave that to the committee?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: We could; but I do not think it is a bad idea to give the committee and the public some pointers to work on. The committee will, of course, deal with this; but as a private member

of Parliament, and a very humble one. I put forward these pointers. I do not suggest that the people selected for the committee are not competent. I am sure they are. I do not think I could have selected a better committee myself, unless perhaps it were one which included another Country Party member in the person of Sir Charles Latham. His wide experience and sympathy with the North would be a great help; and if he had been included, I would have been very pleased indeed. He has shown his ability in the past, and I am sure he would have been an acquisition on such a committee.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: If you want any support in the future, you have it!

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I am sure we need not only go to the Commonwealth Government and ask for a grant in hard cash. There are other ways to approach the Commonwealth for assistance in the development of the North. When we consider the urgent need for the defence of the North-West of Australia, I am sure it will be agreed that £10,000,000 a year out of the £200,000,000 that is being set aside for defence purposes would be money well spent. There are other ways in which the Commonwealth Government could assist, and I will deal with these later.

The Commonwealth Government has, time and time again, refused the North-West concessions in taxation. It would have cost that Government nothing in hard cash; it would have merely meant that it would not have got about £1,000,000 from taxation. That being so, I do not know what chance we have in asking for millions of pounds each year in hard cash. But I hope the Commonwealth will take notice of this committee and that it will be successful. Let us consider how this money will be spent, if we get it.

In the first place, more shipping should be provided. The shipping on the coast at the moment is worked almost to capacity; there are passengers and crews offering for which we cannot cater. At the moment one ship is being built, and this will be ready in 18 months' time. Another two ships are urgently needed; and if money is allocated by the Commonwealth Government for development, I think shipping should be one of the first requirements of the North to receive consideration. Another two ships should be provided. Apart from that, we must consider additions to harbours.

I think I have said before that the jetties in the North are falling to pieces. They have been neglected for years, and at the present time the facilities are not large enough. The goods sheds should hold both inward and outward cargo. It is becoming more difficult to work the cargo as the days go by, and the handling facilities are insufficient and antiquated. Some of the cranes that have been there recently are far too small; and something

should be done about it, even though they may serve the purpose. We have railway wagons up there dated as far back as 1894; they came from the New Zealand railways. They are tiny antiquated wagons, and we have not half enough of them. So shipping and harbour facilities should receive first priority.

Then, of course, there is the matter of roads. Transport is essential to the development of any place. I admit that the roads in the North are better than they have been in the past, but a lot still needs to be done, particularly in the provision of all-weather roads, and in sealing them and making them fit for carriage of goods during the whole year. In the Kimberleys and throughout the North, there are often four or five months of the year when it is impossible to get near the roads on account of the river; and when access is gained, they are so ripped and torn about that the expense of the upkeep of vehicles travelling over them is terrific. All that cost would be reduced if the roads were put in better condition.

In order to open up new country, additional roads have to be made, and that will cost a lot of money. This will be specially necessary in the new stretch of country in which exploration and surveys are now being carried out. There are no roads in existence, and it is difficult to get to some of the country being traversed.

There is also the question of communications. I think I have said before that it is impossible to hold a conversation with Perth from anywhere beyond Carnarvon. That is the Commonwealth Government's responsibility, and I think something should be done about it. If anyone wants to ring Perth today, he can do so only from Carnarvon. Sometimes it is difficult to telephone from one town to another, except at certain times. The position between Broome and Derby has been improved recently; but I think more attention should be given to that matter, particularly from the point of view of wireless telephone communication. That is the modern way of tackling this problem of long distances.

Further, there is the conservation of water. Dams should be built and clay lenses should be established at Carnarvon. A dam needs to be built at Rocky Pool. That is another direction in which money could be spent wisely and could be repaid from increased production.

The establishment of a deep-water port is necessary. This is very important to the North. Everyone will agree that such a project will cost a lot of money. What is the use of having a good business but no shop window or front door? Goods are produced in the North and they have to be transhipped to Perth, with the exception of a few bales of wool which are taken to Singapore and transhipped to

London. According to the surveyors, there are several places at which a deep-water port could be established in the North.

One site which has been mentioned is Black Rocks, north of Derby and I understand that the provision of such a port would cost in the vicinity of £3,000,000 to £5,000,000. If money is made available by the Commonwealth Government, this matter of a deep-water port should be looked into, and roads should be provided that would all converge on it. To that port vessels could come from England and pick up cargoes, particularly meat, for shipment to England direct.

In Australia there is a tendency for people to flock to the capital cities. In this State practically three-quarters of the population live in Perth. If we had a deep-water port in the North, there would spring up in its neighbourhood a capital city; and we would find that instead of people leaving that area each year and coming to Perth, they would spend their holidays in their own capital. That would lead to the development of the North. Everywhere that a capital city is established, industries—and particularly primary industries—seem to radiate from it. If we had a deep-water port, and all roads and railways converged on it—as they would have to do—there would be a decent-sized city, and we would have a chance of keeping people in the North.

In order to retain people in that part of the State, we must improve our medical facilities. The hospitals are reasonably good, but a lot remains to be done. Officers of the Medical Department have just visited that area and freely admit much needs to be done in the establishment of medical facilities. The flying doctor service should be given greater help. That is a fine acquisition, and its encouragement would be an inducement to people to remain in the North and others to go and work there.

Many other improvements are needed in that part of the State, particularly in the direction of housing. More has been done in the last few years by this Government than had ever been done before in the supply of State homes. There are quite a number in the North-West, and many are to be built this year. As time goes on there will be an even more urgent need for it. Developments are outgrowing facilities, and there will be a necessity for a greater housing programme.

What Mr. Jones said, is true: that in the towns of the North generally, conditions are below standard as far as housing is concerned, with the exception of the homes at Yampi Sound, and those that have been built recently by the Housing Commission. That is not to say that people have not built good homes for themselves. Lots of people have erected quite decent buildings; but the conditions as regards homes for

workers need considerable improvement before they will be anywhere near standard.

The B.H.P. Co. at Cockatoo Island has set a good example and shown what can be done in the matter of housing in the North. Whenever a man leaves the island there is another waiting to take his job, because the conditions there are so good. That is a credit to the company, and I wish others would follow the lead it has given and do something similar in that respect.

Money must be spent wisely; and I think it would be necessary to have a committee, or perhaps an administrator, responsible to the Minister for every penny spent. The North-West being so far from Perth, I do not think that the different departments derive the best benefit from money expended in that area. I would go so far as to say that I would like to see much of the money spent, particularly on main roads, allocated to contractors and the work done by them, unless the Government sees fit to establish a department of the North-West right on the spot so that a closer watch could be kept over all the work done there, and the best results achieved from every penny spent.

Those are things that could be done by the Commonwealth Government without its having to lay out hard cash. Assistance could be given to the mining industry along the lines of the 13-point mining plan covering the base metal industry, which I set before the House last year. Such a project could be established by the Commonwealth, not only in the North-West, but throughout the State. Time and time again a proposal has been put before the Commonwealth for relief to be afforded by way of taxation concessions for people in the North. The previous speaker said he did not agree with complete freedom from taxation. He said that the people working and the companies operating there would stay only long enough to get money and then clear out. That is not so. The scheme proposed was that there should be complete freedom from taxation; but a proviso was added that all moneys saved through such concession must be reinvested in the different properties.

There are lots of ways like that in which the Commonwealth could help without handing over hard cash. But in view of the urgent need to defend our shores, it is not too much to ask it to grant us at least £10,000,000 a year from the defence estimates towards the development of the North. The money would be well spent. Ever since I have been here, I have stressed the urgent need for this; and I will keep on doing so until something is done, because I think the need is pressing. The best method of defence is to populate and develop the country, and put it into full production. Then let us trade freely with the people alongside whom we must live.

I am very grateful to those who brought down this resolution. I think it was well for it to have been submitted as it was so that we could discuss it freely without any party ties or bias. This is a problem beyond party politics, and I feel sure everyone will give the resolution support. The proposed committee is as good a one as we could get; and I hope some notice will be taken of it when its case is put to the Commonwealth Government.

However, as I said before, the Commonwealth Government has time and time again refused a concession by way of taxation, which would have cost in the vicinity of £500,000 to £750,000 at the start, and perhaps £1,000,000 or £1,500,000 at the end of 20 years. So what chance have we when we go to that Government and say we want millions of pounds in hard cash? The Commonwealth has spent huge sums of money in other States. It has assisted the Snowy River project and the aluminium project, amongst others; and it is up to Western Australia to see that it receives its share of financial support.

It is all very well for the Federal Government to say that the development of the North-West is the State Government's responsibility. Certainly it is our responsibility; but the Commonwealth Government must remember what we contribute towards the wealth of Australia and give us our just share, the same as it gives to the other States. I cannot see why that should not be done; but I am afraid that we will be buffeting our heads against a stone wall. However, I hope that I will get a pleasant surprise.

Hon. G. Bennetts: The Commonwealth was not prepared to help the Kwinana project.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: No. And nobody can deny that is a national asset.

The PRESIDENT: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are talking of the country north of the 26th parallel and not of Kwinana.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I am trying to connect my remarks. I think a reference to Kwinana is relevant to the subject of the resolution. I am trying to point out that when this proposition is submitted to the Commonwealth Government, it can say, as was done in connection with the Kwinana project, "That is your responsibility." The Commonwealth will receive a lot of money from the production of oil and the increased production of beef and other commodities in the North, and I do not see any reason why it should not listen to our proposals, which would contribute greatly to the defence and safety of Australia. I hope the Government will pay heed to what is said by the proposed committee, which I think is a good one. I support the measure.

HON. C. H. HENNING (South-West) [8.0]: The two previous speakers have covered most of the detail required in regard to this motion, but I wish to say a few words in support of it. I think it is one of the clearest motions I have ever read. Anyone can understand it. It deals, in the first place, with that portion of the State which lies north of the 26th parallel of latitude. Just to say that, does not imply very much; but when we consider that an area of over 500,000 square miles—more than half the area of the State—is involved, we realise it is a tremendous problem.

According to some statistics which I read, which were brought up to 1952, there are about 400 holdings in that part of the State; and they cover an area of approximately 200,000 square miles, which means that some 300,000 square miles or more of country has not been touched, although we heard over the air only last night that a survey team was up there and was extremely well equipped; and that, probably, as a result of their work, further land will be utilised for grazing purposes, at least.

Dealing with the statistical register, it was interesting to note that of the 850,000 beef cattle in the State, more than 500,000 came from the area north of the 26th parallel—in other words from that part of the State lying north of a line running roughly from Denham, Shark Bay, just below Peak Hill, and right across to the South Australian border.

Also, in the same part of the State, there are 2,250,000 sheep—I would not be surprised if the cattle and sheep numbers have dropped somewhat since 1952—out of a total State sheep population of 12,000,000. In other words the number represents approximately one-sixth of our sheep. The wool clip was almost 19,000,000 lb., or just under one-sixth of our total wool clip. That is a most important feature of the State's economy, and what we can make it into, no one knows. If we could get some special grant, not only would these products be increased, but many others which we know can be mined or produced in the North-West would go forward and would aid the general prosperity of the State.

I notice, too, that on these 400 holdings there were roughly 750 whites employed. I refer to the whites because if it were not for the natives, many of the stations there would not be operating. These figures account for 750 out of a population of approximately 8,500. If we have a look at the progress figures of Western Australia from 1829 to the present day, we find that in 1901 the population of the North-West was 5,500 out of a population for the State of 193,000.

In 1952—51 years later—the State population had increased to 600,000; but that of the North-West, generally, had

increased to only 8,200. Were it not for the new industries such as whaling, asbestos mining, goldmining and other mining, and the banana industry, what would the population of the North be today? It has taken 50 years to find out what we can get from the North. The information has come very slowly.

The main object of the motion is to accelerate production and use the whole of this vast area, and not to have a population increase of from 5,000 to 8,000 in 50 years, but to push it up as much as we can—possibly even to the figure mentioned by Mr. Barker—namely in the vicinity of 40,000. If we are unable to do that, I maintain that it will not be many years before the North will be populated—not by Australians, but by other people. It is just as important for us to do everything we can to develop and populate the North as it is to develop any other part of Australia. This is a vital area and will continue to be so in our defence programme for many years to come.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: Very wise words indeed!

Hon. C. H. HENNING: Wherever we have development, we must have water. Much of the area under discussion has a rainfall of well over 30 in., but some of it goes down to 8½ or 8¼ in. This, however, does not mean that there are not many items that can be grown or found in the lower rainfall areas. We are doing nothing to utilise the rainfall in the higher rainfall area—although, certainly, at Ord River experiments are being carried out. Unless we give effect to the experiments there, we will get nowhere. Water for stock is most important.

A couple of years ago I said I had visited a cattle station in Queensland that was roughly in the same latitude as is the Kimberley area. That station carried 66,000 head of cattle on approximately 184,000 acres. Mr. Barker told us about the bullocks coming into Wyndham, and he mentioned that their average weight was 514 lb.

The Minister for the North-West: That is for this season.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: As far as I am concerned, these bullocks are half the trouble of the North-West. In last Wednesday's market, choice, quality, light-weight steers were bought at up to 220s. to 225s. per 100 lb., while bullocks brought only 140s. per 100 lb. I maintain that the trouble with the meat in the North-West is that it is not young enough; it does not develop quickly enough. A 600 lb. bullock is only the same value as a 400 lb. steer. Last year Mr. Barker asked a question concerning the Government's subsidising of beef bulls the same as it was subsidising bulls in the dairying industry. Whether they are subsidised or not, I maintain that the quality of the beef that comes

from the North could be vastly improved if the right type of bull that matured quickly were used. But the cattle will never survive there for any length of time unless they have only short distances to go for water.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The Government sent some bulls to Wyndham once.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: I would not like to try to describe the bulls I have seen there. The cattle on the Queensland station I referred to did not have more than two miles to walk to water; and that is where the quality comes from.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: You have to do away with the million-acre properties; you will agree with that.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: The motion goes on to say that the portion of the State in question is incapable of being fully developed if wholly dependent upon such finance as is only obtainable from State resources. That, I believe, is perfectly obvious. The development of that area is a tremendous job for a sparsely populated State such as ours. The difficulties of development, even so far as roads are concerned, are huge. Even in most of the closer settled areas we have not got suitable roads. In this country, where the metal or the foundation for the road is in most cases completely lacking, any State Government on its own, particularly the Western Australian Government, could not possibly deal with the problem.

I think the committee that is suggested could not be bettered. In the first place, I am a believer in small committees; but in addition to this committee being a small one, I agree with the quality of its personnel. The committee is to consist of the Premier, the Leader of the other two parliamentary parties, the Minister for the North-West—he is not a Minister in name only, but a man who for many years has known the North-West intimately—and the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. If through the positions that these five men hold they are not able to influence the Prime Minister or the Federal Treasurer, then I do not think anybody will.

I hope the members of this committee, after the motion is carried, will put a case which will mean that they will get blood out of a stone; because I assume that every Federal Treasurer is more or less like a stone. The committee has to consider the programme presented to it by the Government. I assume that will be drawn up by Government experts and that the North-West Development Committee will have something to say in the matter. I believe it is far better to do that than that the committee should formulate its own programme. There is the matter of policy; and the committee can deal with the policy and, if necessary, amend it.

The Minister for the North-West: Who are the members of the North-West Development Committee? Do you know?

Hon. C. H. HENNING: No; but I do know of one or two of them. They were buzzing around quite a lot a few years ago. The final portion of the motion is that the committee shall personally submit the programme to the Prime Minister. That is another extremely good point.

Then the motion suggests that there shall be a ten-year scheme, and it asks for a special grant. It may sound as though we are asking for a tremendous lot; but spread over ten years, what we seek could mean the development of that portion of the State. The scheme itself is not so important as the fact that it will, if successful, attract people to the North. If certain amenities—such as transport, water, etc.—are provided in the North, I am sure that people will go there. Mr. Jones mentioned the amenities provided by the B.H.P. for the employees of that company. As a result of those amenities, the B.H.P. has a waiting list.

I am certain that, if this request is successful, the development which will take place as a result will attract a large population to the North; because there is in this vast area the potential for great wealth, which will be of advantage to the people concerned, and to the State as a whole. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

On motion by Hon. L. A. Logan, debate adjourned.

BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 18th August.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [8.15]: Since I have been in this House I have spoken on a similar Bill to this on a number of occasions. This measure is not vastly different from one which was before the Chamber last year, in that it proposes to extend the jurisdiction of the State Insurance Office to enable it to undertake all normal types of insurance business, with the exception of life assurance.

The State Insurance Office has had a most interesting history. It came into being many years ago in order to meet a serious state of affairs which arose in connection with the insurance of miners. For some years it carried on its activities in spite of the fact that Parliament refused to approve of its existence. However, as the years passed by, the office proved its worth; and eventually, in 1938, a Bill was passed ratifying its existence. Since then the office has functioned in a way that has won it wide approval and respect. It has given good service to all sections of the public who have done business with it, and

it has made a financial success of its activities. This has been done despite the fact that its jurisdiction has been confined to the less profitable lines of insurance.

It seems to me that there can be no valid objection to the proposals in this Bill. The Government has given consideration to certain views expressed by members in this House when a similar measure was before the Chamber last year. It is to be hoped, therefore, that this gesture will meet with the approval of certain members who opposed the measure last year. The State Insurance Office is well conducted, and is a credit to the management and staff; and it is one State concern which people would find it difficult to criticise with any justification. It seems only right and proper, therefore, that it should be able to carry out the ordinary types of insurance and function in the normal way.

Members who have spoken in opposition to the Bill have used the argument that if we pass the measure it will mean only an enlargement of a State enterprise. My answer is that, in principle, we have accepted the State Insurance Office; and from humble beginnings, and in spite of considerable opposition, it has made good. It has rendered a service, particularly to the mining industry, and it deserves commendation. I fail to see why we should hesitate to let it conduct its business in a normal way.

Over the years I have had a fair amount of experience with the State Insurance Office; and the way its affairs have been conducted are, I repeat, a credit to the management and staff. Insurance is a most important aspect of our public life. The advent of the State Insurance Office in the past had no dire effect on other companies; and if we agree to expand its jurisdiction in a perfectly normal sphere, I fail to see that any dire results will accrue to anyone.

The State is expanding. There will be ample business for all concerned; and this office has proved that it is able to conduct its business on a fair standard. It has given good service to the State in general; and having accepted it in principle, even though some members did it with some reluctance in the past, we have to accept the fact that it is an established institution which has won its place in the affairs of our State; and I think that now we ought to do the right thing and let it conduct insurance in the normal way.

As I said earlier, the Government has taken into consideration the views of some members who opposed the extension of the office's jurisdiction to life assurance; and I hope that those members will now be able to support the Bill, and that it will receive the approval of this House.

On motion by Hon. A. F. Griffith, debate adjourned.

BILL—JURY ACT AMENDMENT.*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 18th August.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West—in reply) [8.25]: I waited for a few moments because I understood Mr. Simpson wanted to say a few words. I do not wish to close the debate if anyone wants to speak; but as Mr. Simpson is not here just at the moment, I am afraid I shall have to reply. However, I do not intend to speak at length.

I was not surprised to find that, generally speaking, most of the previous speakers did not oppose the right of women to sit on juries. It can be safely said, I think, that no logical objection can be submitted to women being called as jurors. It might be that sentimental reasons for their non-inclusion can be raised; but, in arriving at a judgment, the House should discount these.

An objection was made that the Bill did not require women jurors to have the small property qualification required of men. I do not think this a valid objection. Many married women of the type to make good jurors would never have the opportunity to obtain property qualifications. I consider that the principal qualification for a juror is intelligence, rather than property. Intelligent women should have the same right to serve on a jury as their male counterparts. Mrs. Hutchison ably presented the viewpoint of the weaker sex. I do not know that I am correct in calling them the weaker sex.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They will be stronger if this passes.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: That is really a misnomer; they are the stronger sex, because they order us about so much.

Hon. F. R. H. Lavery: They get away with it, too.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: Mrs. Hutchison scored a point when she said it was a matter of principle that women, who were the mothers of men, wished to share in the obligations of society. The hon. member pointed out that in England and New South Wales, for instance, no difficulty had arisen because of women serving on juries. Mr. Griffith is one who does not doubt women's right to act as jurors. However, he did not think women would desire to undertake the obligation. This, I think, should be left to the women themselves to decide.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you really believe that it should be left to the women themselves to decide?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: Then why force them to sit on juries?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: We are not forcing them. If the hon. member read the Bill, he would find that we are giving them the opportunity to serve on juries if they so desire.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: But you are making it compulsory first of all.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: In other words, you are making them liable to serve on juries.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: If they want to. They have only to explain that they do not want to serve, and they will not be forced. Mr. Craig's speech was, as usual, sound and well reasoned. Unlike some other speakers, he accepted the principle of women's right to be on juries, and he also stated he would support the second reading. Mr. Henning's opinions, too, were much the same as Mr. Craig's.

He said that women, when receiving notice of inclusion in the jury list, ought to be advised that they were at liberty to withdraw. I have ascertained that there would be no difficulty in including such information with the advice of inclusion on the jury list. Sir Charles Latham definitely objected on sentimental grounds to women being jurors; but this type of objection, as I have said before, is not a valid one.

One of Mr. Baxter's objections to the Bill is that, although a male juror must have a property qualification, the only qualification for a woman is that she must be on the electoral roll. This situation applies in other places. For instance, in New Zealand, women have the right to sit on a jury without having any property qualification. Queensland requires that a woman shall be a householder, the interpretation of which is a person whose husband is a householder or occupier of a dwelling-house.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: What are the requirements for male jurors in New Zealand?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: Certain property qualifications. The term includes the daughters residing with such householder; also, a person or persons who has or have occupied residential quarters, a flat or a room continuously for a period of not less than six months immediately prior to any compilation of the jury list and is enrolled on the electoral roll. There is no property qualification for such enrolment.

In New South Wales a woman is required to be enrolled as an elector pursuant to Part III of the Parliamentary Electorates and Election Act, 1912-1946. There is no property qualification for such enrolment. I feel sure that Mr. Baxter will agree with me that the essential thing to have in a juror is intelligence.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That is so.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: We do agree on something! The property qualification for a man under Section 5 of the Jury Act is real estate to the value of £50 free of all encumbrances, or clear personal estate of the value of £150 or upwards.

This, in my view, does not ensure intelligence on a juror's part. Women, by their nature, are not in a position very often to acquire real estate or personal property because they are mostly engaged with more important things in life; it appears to me that they should not be expected to have the same property qualifications as men.

With those few remarks I have answered the main objections raised during the debate. I thank members for the reception they have given the Bill. I have no doubt as to its fate. No worth-while opposition to the Bill has yet been put up, including that by Sir Charles Latham.

Hon. L. A. Logan: That is only your opinion.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: At no time would I care to express the opinion of the hon. member, because it varies so much. Naturally, I can only express my own opinion.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: The comments of Sir Charles Latham might have influenced you to change your mind.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The longer Sir Charles spoke, the fewer supporters would he have. The Bill has had a good reception, and one or two amendments have been suggested. In the usual reasonable manner in dealing with amendments, they will be given due consideration. It is possible that one or two will be accepted to improve the Bill. I have no doubt that those who have suggested the amendments will give their reasons. I feel confident that the Bill will pass the second reading and emerge from this Chamber very little altered.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	8

Majority for 12

Ayes.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. C. H. Henning
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. J. G. Hislop
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. R. F. Hutchison
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. W. F. Willsee
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. R. J. Boylen

(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. Sir Chas. Latham	Hon. J. McI. Thomson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. Murray	Hon. H. L. Roche

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Section 5A added:

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: As will be seen from the notice paper, I have three amendments standing in my name on this clause. I hope members will give these their favourable consideration. The reason some members voted for the second reading was that they were aware of the intention to move these amendments. I move an amendment—

That after the word "character" in line 20, page 2, the words "and is not under the age of thirty years" be inserted.

I have sought the opinion of many men and women, and they all agreed that it could be very distasteful for a woman of 21 to be called upon to serve on a jury in a particularly unsavoury case. They agreed also that when a woman reaches 30 years, she has arrived at the age of discretion, when she is fully alive to the facts of life. At that age she would be better qualified to accept the responsibility which sitting on a jury entails. It is true the Bill provides that a woman can notify her unwillingness to serve. But generally speaking, people tend to forget about their obligation to perform these duties; and before they realise what has happened women might find themselves called upon to serve on a jury.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would ask for your ruling, on this amendment, Mr. Chairman. I think the words appear in the wrong place. Reading the clause with the amendment, there seems to be a conflict. If the amendment is agreed to, then the word "twenty-one" in line 18 must also be altered.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: This is entirely my fault. Members are aware of my intention, so I ask leave to withdraw the amendment—

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: I move an amendment—

That in line 18, page 2, the word "twenty-one" be struck out with a view to inserting another word in lieu.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: During the week-end, I canvassed for the opinion of women living on both sides of one street. I spoke to the women of every household, and only one expressed a desire to serve on juries; and that was only provisional, because she reserved the right to refuse to sit on criminal cases. The result of that canvass shows that this legislation is not supported by the womenfolk of this State.

While I am opposed to this Bill, I am agreeable to having it toned down as much as possible seeing that it has passed the second reading. So I must support the lifting of the age for service from 21 to 30 years. It is remarkable how quickly members change their minds. I have before me the division list on a similar Bill during last year. There are nine ayes and 13

noes. Those who opposed the measure included Mr. Bennetts, Mr. Boylen, Mr. Hall, Mr. Heenan and Mr. Strickland—all Labour members.

The Minister for the North-West: Read the rest of the names.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: This Bill is almost identical with that of last year.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine his remarks to the amendment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Yes. This is the vital clause, and I wished to show how some members have changed their minds. I feel that I am doing justice to the women by opposing the age of 21; and my action, I believe, will be endorsed by the women generally—but, of course, not by those who wait for admission to the court house when a sordid case is to be heard.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: What about the men who do that?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am aware that men do it, but I do not want the women to be classed with men. I commend the amendment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope that the amendment will not be accepted. The mover gave no reasons to justify our increasing the age. I should like to know whether the hon. member, in making his canvass, inquired of men whether they liked to serve.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: No.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: How many men would want to serve if they had an opportunity to refuse? Perhaps only one lone one.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Then it might be necessary to repeal the Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Anyhow, the hon. member would have got the same result had he canvassed the men. While the jury system operates, it is necessary for people to serve, whether they be men or women. If anybody stopped 100 men in the street and asked the question of them, he would be lucky to get one who said he liked to serve.

The hon. member spoke about some who had changed their views since last year. There are differences between the two Bills. In any event those members have since seen the light, and I compliment them on having the courage to change their minds. Rather than condemn them—

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: I am not condemning them; I am only sorry for them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If a man of 21 is eligible to serve, why not a woman? The average woman of 21 is much more sensible than a man of the same age. If an alteration is desired, let it be made later on and applied to both.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: Have you any teen-age daughters?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, they are past that stage.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: I thought so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Members are overlooking the fact that a woman who does not desire to serve will not be compelled to do so.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: But they will not know that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Many women will serve because they will realise it is their duty to do so.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: They will do so if they know it is the law of the country.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If Parliament provides that they shall serve, they will be prepared to accept the responsibility. If not, they will only need to write in asking to have their names removed from the list.

Hon. H. K. Watson: Why should there be any distinction between male and female?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We have to face up to facts, and the facts are that at times women could not serve.

Hon. H. K. Watson: That is covered by a later clause in the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is also covered here. It would be impossible to provide for women the conditions that are applicable to men.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: We shall not achieve anything by offering second reading speeches on the main principle of the Bill, to which we have agreed.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: You have only adopted the principle. We can discuss the amendment.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I agree with the Chief Secretary that Mr. Simpson did not give solid reasons for the amendment, and members are entitled to have them.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: I think I gave two or three very good ones.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I hope the amendment will not be accepted. I have had some experience of juries and believe whole-heartedly in the system. It has some shortcomings, but few of our institutions are perfect. The great merit of the jury system is that it permits of an accused person being tried by a cross-section of the community, people in various walks of life, of different religions, different stages of education and different intelligence. The system requires men from 21 to 60 years of age to serve and it has worked satisfactorily. Has anyone heard complaints about men of 21 sitting on juries?

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They must have a property qualification, which is being omitted in the case of women.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: The property qualification is a very mild one.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Property of a value of £50 or £150 in cash.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Property to the value of £50 would not be much, and not many young men would be excluded on that account. Over all the years there has been no objection that men of 21 were too young to serve. If there is merit in Mr. Simpson's proposal, we should amend the Act to provide that men should be excluded until they reach the age of 30. But why do so? Surely Dr. Hislop would not say a man of 22 should not be permitted to qualify as a doctor! Men of that age have been admitted as solicitors. We had a doctor in Kalgoolie, one of the best, who qualified at the age of 20.

Hon. J. G. Hislop: Only after special training.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: A man of 21 may be elected to another place to help frame the laws of the country.

Hon. N. E. Baxter: That applies to odd ones, but we are dealing with the majority.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Where have the complaints come from? As there have been no complaints against men serving on juries in the past, at that age, the only logical ground for supporting the amendment is to allege that women are less mature, intelligent or stable than men of similar age. I could understand the intention if it were to alter the age for both sexes to 30 years, but the differentiation is not logical or sensible.

Hon. H. K. Watson: The whole clause differentiates.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: We are dealing with one point at a time. The great merit of the jury system is that it provides a cross-section of the community as regards age, type and point of view. People from 21 to 30 years of age have pretty high standards.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: And intelligence quotients.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: At 21 years of age they can qualify in the professions, serve in theatres of war and in the legislative halls of the States and Commonwealth, so I do not think anyone can substantiate the argument that they are not qualified to serve on juries. In many instances it might be preferable to have the point of view of the young people who have not become soured with age and have not acquired the prejudices that some older people have.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Is that a qualification for judgment?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Some people, as they grow older, develop prejudices and a narrow point of view and adopt standards of morals and character to which they did not adhere in their younger days. How old was Christopher Columbus when he

set out to discover America? I do not know, but perhaps some member can tell me. I venture to say he was a young man. If we are to have women on juries, let us have among them a sprinkling of young ones.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: In objecting to women of 21 years of age serving on juries the mover of the amendment said he would not like them to serve on cases such as some he has known. Many women of 21 years of age have a number of children and know the facts of life. During the war, girls served on the A.A. guns in London, on active service and stood up to the blitz as well as the men did. In all the services in which they were eligible to serve, their record was equally as good as that of men. Would any member here be game to tell a crowd of young women that they were not mentally the equal of men of the same age? I would not be.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Who raised the question of intelligence?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: Virtually that is what is being done. I repeat that in London during the war the women stood up to everything sometimes better than the men. They could take it—

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Are you referring to the sordid side of life?

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: No, but the greatest test of humanity is found in war, and the women came through with flying colours.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: The time has arrived when this fundamental prejudice against women should be discarded. I maintain that women are at least equally as fit as men for jury service, and no valid reason has so far been given why they should not serve in that way. As the mother of a large family, I maintain that there is no reason why women should not sit on juries.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Mr. Heenan put up the best possible case why the Bill should not be accepted.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: And the best inconsistencies.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: He said that the basis of the jury system was that it provided men who were a cross-section of the community. If we give women the right to refuse jury service, we will not have on juries a cross-section of the women of the community.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: How do you know they will write in and ask to be excused?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: In Queensland, where they are eligible for jury service, there has been one lady on a jury in five years. That shows that they will write in. If women are to have the same rights and conditions as men, why the provisions of

Clause 10? I believe this Chamber has accepted the principle that women should sit on juries, but their terms should be the same as those of the men.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: A man can get out of jury service if he is sick.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: The Bill provides women with other excuses. By the time the women write in expressing their objection to sitting on a jury that cross-section, to which Mr. Heenan has referred, would be lost. I oppose the amendment. If women want equality let us give it to them, but let us have equality all the way.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: We should be realistic on this question. It is not a matter of whether women have the same intelligence as men or not. We must realise that the vast majority of the women of this country between 21 and 30 years of age, are rearing young families. If we permitted this group of women to apply for exemption from sitting on a jury, a large staff of clerks would be needed at the Supreme Court to keep the jury list up to date, because each year a fresh crop of names of women who became eligible to sit on a jury would have to be added. It would be a never-ending task, because practically all of them would be seeking exemption. For that reason alone I think the amendment should be carried. We have enough civil servants now, without creating another body of them whose salaries would have to be paid from the public purse merely to obtain a reasonable number of women to sit on juries. This is a logical commonsense amendment and members should support it.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Chief Secretary stated that he was surprised that many members had changed their minds about the Bill. In my opinion it is only a fool who does not change his mind; and the Chief Secretary changes his mind when it suits him. I thought that remark would bring the Chief Secretary back to his seat.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to keep to the amendment.

The Chief Secretary: I said they were to be commended for changing their minds.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is all right. A few moments ago the Chief Secretary said he thought that only a few women desired to serve on a jury; and yet, when introducing the Bill, he said that great pressure had been placed on the Government to submit this proposal to Parliament. I voted for the second reading of the Bill because I knew of the amendments that appeared on the notice paper. If the amendment is defeated, there will be two sections of the public eligible to serve on a jury. One section will comprise men between the ages of 21 and 60 years with a property qualification. The other will comprise approximately

159,000 women, unless they all write in to the Crown Law Department expressing the desire not to serve. What Mr. Diver has said is perfectly true. There will need to be a small army of clerks to deal with the notifications from women who do not desire to serve.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: That is only supposition.

Hon. L. C. DIVER: It is so obvious.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: By limiting the ages of women eligible to serve on juries from 30 to 60 years we would achieve two objectives. We would limit the number of women who would be available to serve on a jury; and, more important still, we would enable a young woman, between 21 and 30 years of age to stay in her home and rear her children. Would the Chief Secretary be enlightened if I told him that the Women's Parliament has expressed an opinion on this matter?

The Chief Secretary: I do not know what its opinion is.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Would it have any influence on the Chief Secretary if I told him that I am reliably informed that the Women's Parliament is of the opinion that women between 30 and 60 years of age would be quite willing to serve?

The Chief Secretary: No, it would not.

Hon. R. J. BOYLEN: We are not dealing with the Women's Parliament. We are dealing with this Parliament.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Mr. Boylen, during a discussion on a previous Bill of a similar nature, expressed his objection to it, but since then he has said a considerable amount of pressure has been brought to bear on the Government to introduce this measure.

The Chief Secretary: Yes, to introduce this Bill.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is quite all right. Is it considered that, because of the pressure that women have exercised on the Chief Secretary the Government believes that the Bill is worthy of consideration? All this talk about the equality of the sexes is a lot of piffle. No one doubts that a woman of 21 has the same intelligence as a man of the same age, but I think that many women of 30 years of age have married young and have had their families early in their married life.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: How will you know that they are 30 years of age?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: How would the hon. member know that they were 21?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Their names would be placed on the roll.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: How would a girl five, six or 10 years of age know that 15 or 16 years hence her name would be placed on the jury list?

The Chief Secretary: How would she know that she has to be 18 before she is able to get a driver's licence?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Because, as one member has said, it is an everyday occurrence.

The Chief Secretary: So is this. It is a matter of usage.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I think it will be a long time before people will become accustomed to this usage.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Why do people forget to renew their driver's licences?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: That is a good point, too. I know that every man is deemed to know the law; but during Mr. Heenan's legal experience, how many thousands of men has he encountered that did not know the law?

Hon. H. K. Watson: I hope every member has renewed his orchard registration.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes; they have to be reminded of that, and of hundreds of other things as well. The Committee would be wise if it agreed to this amendment.

Hon. Sir FRANK GIBSON: I support the amendment. I voted for the second reading of the Bill because I was aware of the amendments that are on the notice paper. Personally, I do not think that women should serve on juries at all, but realising that a number of women's organisations are seeking this right. I voted for the Bill at the second reading. The reason I am in favour of an age limitation is that, although I may be old-fashioned, I have always been brought up to believe that a woman should be revered; that she was entirely apart from the ordinary activities of human life.

I do not doubt that a woman of 21 has as much intelligence as a man of the same age. She could weigh the evidence placed before her equally as well as a man. However, I want to protect young women from the sordid things that characterise the proceedings of a criminal court, and for that reason I do not approve of their sitting on juries that are listed for hearing criminal cases. I hope the Committee will agree to the amendment.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I support the amendment because it is very sound. The Chief Secretary tonight used the argument concerning the property qualification of a man. I would point out, however, that that provision was placed in the Act away back in 1898.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: We are not dealing with the property qualifications, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: I would point out to the hon. member that it has a direct bearing on the question. In 1898, very few

men of 21 years of age possessed property valued at £50 and, as a result, the number eligible to serve on a jury was extremely limited. As Mr. Diver has said, a woman of 21 years is still anxious to have a good time in life and would not be particularly concerned about public matters. Furthermore, she is on the verge of embarking on marriage. Up to 30 years of age a woman is generally busy rearing her children. For that reason she would have no desire to serve on a jury or even to express her objection to serving in writing.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: How do you know?

Hon. N. E. BAXTER: Men and women do not differ very greatly in such matters. I would ask the hon. member: How many men wish to serve on a jury? Very few. And the same applies to women. When women reach 30 years of age, there is a percentage that take an interest in public affairs and a small percentage of that number would wish to act on juries. If they did, we would be willing to give them the right to do so, from the age of 30 years onward. I support the amendment, which brings the qualifications of a woman closer to those required of a man.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: There seems to be a consensus of opinion that women would be needed to serve on juries and that they would never be able to do so between 21 and 30 years of age. I have yet to find the man who wants to serve on a jury, and yet men are called. The majority of women are asking for this privilege.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They are not.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I have had telephone calls constantly, and all the women's organisations are asking for it.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: How many do they represent?

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Many thousands.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: The Country Women's Association has not suggested it.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Sir Charles Latham's speech was nothing but camouflage; it was his good old-fashioned style. Women are asking for a civic right on principle, and it is time they got it. If they are unable to serve, women can write in and say so. I know the insincerity of this constant reference to reverence. If women are sick, or are unable to serve—

Hon. N. E. Baxter: I think the hon. member should relate her remarks to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I feel she is doing so.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I oppose the amendment and hope that it will not be carried.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I would not have risen again but for the remarks made by Mrs. Hutchison. On two or three occasions I have taken exception to her

statements, and now she says I have been camouflaging. If there is one person who does not camouflage, it is Charles Latham. I have always been prepared to stand by what I say. I tried to ascertain from the residents in houses in a street whether the women would be prepared to serve on juries. Only one was prepared to do so, and she stipulated conditions. Mrs. Hutchison, therefore, has no knowledge whether women want to have their names on the jury list or not.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I have.

Hon. L. C. Diver: She wants to be a dictator.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: The question of tolerance has been mentioned. There is far more tolerance among old people than among those who are young. I have a family, and I know that to be true. Older people can see reason because of the experience they have gained, whereas younger people are inclined to lead a more hectic life. Mr. Heenan talks about my inconsistency. The greatest inconsistency is shown by those members to whom I have referred who spoke on a similar measure last year. At that time Mr. Heenan put up a very good case for his point of view; tonight he has put up another very good case from a different point of view. That is the result of his legal training, and I would not be influenced too much by the opinion of a lawyer. At least Mr. Barker is consistent. He did not make such a wonderful speech this time, however, as he did on the previous occasion.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: He has had more experience.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I respect women; and as I have said, I would hate to see my mother or my sister or any fine woman whom I know sitting among men who may have diseased and filthy minds, and listening to some of the sordid and degrading evidence which must be adduced before a jury.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: There are ample safeguards.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I have seen judges shudder at some of the things said. I would say that Mrs. Hutchison has never been in a criminal court. If she had, I feel sure she would have walked out on hearing some of the filthy evidence that has been adduced.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: I would have attended if it were my duty.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: It is not duty; it is interference. I feel sure that the wives of members opposite would have too much respect for themselves to wish to sit on juries. People have to be 30 years of age before they can enter this House as members. That is provided in the Constitution. Why is it provided?

The Chief Secretary: I do not know. Tell us.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Now we are going to force young girls of 21 to serve on a jury. I would not mind supporting a provision whereby, if they wanted to serve, they could make application to do so.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Another camouflage!

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Does the hon. member understand the meaning of the word? After hearing her maiden speech, I thought she was an intelligent woman. There is no camouflage about what I have said.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Yes, there is.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: We have provided that a man should be tried by his peers, and that a man in the House of Lords is entitled to be tried by the lords of the realm. As I instanced the other night, we had a cold-blooded murder in Government House ballroom.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to connect his remarks with the amendment.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Why should we compel women to have their names placed on a jury list? How are we to know when women have become 30 years of age?

Hon. E. M. Heenan: They would not tell you!

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: If they would not, then they would not wish to be on the list. If women want to listen to some of the sordid evidence adduced in court, they will lose the respect of their men-folk.

Hon. R. F. Hutchison: Why should you not respect a woman if she is doing a civic duty?

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: I am not going to allow the hon. member to lead me astray.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to resume his seat. I would like to tell members that I consider myself fairly tolerant in permitting interjections, but Standing Orders do not allow so much interruption. Up to a point, it is all right; but there have been too many interjections recently, and if they continue I will have to enforce Standing Orders to ensure that members do what is expected of them. I would like to give this warning, because there have been too many interruptions and we are getting nowhere. The hon. member may continue.

Hon. Sir CHARLES LATHAM: Members know exactly where I stand. I am prepared to consider allowing women to serve on juries at the age of 30, but I intend to

oppose the clause providing for women of 21 to be on the jury list, because they will not know they can be excused. When the statute was first put into operation they might have that knowledge; but in a year or two they would forget all about it; and we might find ourselves with a jury of two or three women of 21 years of age, and the rest consisting of aged men. I know some of these men; they would be very pleased if they had a woman alongside of them to whom to point out the more sordid side of things. Of course, there are plenty of gentlemen who sit on juries as well. Were I not excused from serving on a jury, I would feel justified in asking to be excluded if I had to sit alongside women who had a fine upbringing, and who had taught us to respect their kind.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I support the amendment. I regret that into this place has been introduced the idea that women of this State consider that no longer are they revered by menfolk. If that is the attitude that is being brought to this Chamber, then, rather than our new member being a person who can convey to us the opinions of women, as far as I am concerned I shall have to consider very carefully the views that are put forward. I frankly believe that the vast majority of women still consider that men have a sense of reverence for them.

There were times in the past when every man was brought up with that idea, and I hope those times have not gone altogether. I think every member here was taught to walk on the outside of the footpath to protect women from danger, and to assist them down steps—without any of the sniggering such as is going on behind me! It does not help to influence my views on this matter that when I speak of men having some reverence for women, I am sniggered at. That only makes me feel that the mind behind me is not normal. And the sniggering goes on, Mr. Chairman!

I think the position is very serious and is one that must disturb every member in this place. We have been taught to reverence our womenfolk; and I for one would not like to see my daughter or my wife sitting on a jury. I think there are very few who would like to see their wives and daughters doing so. I voted for the second reading of this Bill because I felt there were some women who considered it was their duty to serve on juries at certain times; but I do not think that is the view of women generally. I see a number of women in my occupation, and I have not found one who has wanted to sit on a jury.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: You cannot find men, either.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Nor can I find one who agrees that women under 30 should do so. Despite what has been said, I still

intend to try to prevent women between 21 and 30 from sitting on juries, no matter how I may be regarded.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: I do not want to prolong this debate, but I am still opposed to the amendment. However, I would not like the Committee to think that I have no reverence for women or that I believe the day of chivalry has gone. When we give women civic rights, I think they should have equal rights with men when they ask for them.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: They are not asking for them.

Hon. C. W. D. BARKER: When they ask for civic rights, they should take full responsibility with men and should be able to stand up to anything that is coming to them. I respect my wife and my mother and my sisters, and all women; and I do not think that, because I say women of 21 should have equal treatment with men in a case like this, I am in any way degraded below other members.

Hon. L. CRAIG: The question is entirely one of age. The Committee has accepted the principle that women should be allowed to sit on juries. Now we are discussing what the age should be. It is a pity that Mrs. Hutchison should have introduced such bitterness into this place as I have not before seen.

Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: Mr. Chairman, I object to that statement. I did not introduce any bitterness.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It is a matter of opinion. I think I have a right to say that bitterness has been introduced. A spirit of bitterness has been brought into this place that I have not seen here before. Even if members disagree with others, they must all believe that the views held are sincerely held and are not "camouflage"—I think that is the word which has been commonly used. It is a pity that a spirit of that sort has been introduced into this place. I hope it will not continue. Although we differ in our views, we each give credit to others for believing in what they say; and in that way we get on very much better. I hope even new members will follow that custom.

Dealing with the question of age, when the duties of juries were established in earlier years, educational standards were not as high as they are today, and some restrictions were placed on people holding such office. The idea was to eliminate the inefficient or the not-so-well educated. That applied also to membership of the Legislative Council. So property qualifications—which were suitable in those days—and the qualification of age, were established. At that time, people with property as a rule were folk of judgment and resource, and perhaps had more capacity for summing up evidence. So it has been with age.

I think that people of more mature age are, through experience, better fitted to sum up and give a decision on evidence submitted. People of 30, whether male or female, are better equipped for that task than are people of 21, because the latter are immature, whatever their sex. I do not necessarily agree with the application of the property qualification in connection with juries today. It was good enough years ago, but I do not think it is necessarily so today.

However, I do think that an age qualification is necessary. Because it was considered that men of 30 had some judgment, that was the age fixed for them to be eligible for sitting in this House of review; and I think that, where no other qualification is needed, women should be of a mature age in order to sit on juries and give a considered judgment on the evidence submitted to them. Consequently, I support the amendment.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: This is an interesting debate, and it has been a pleasure to listen to the various points of view submitted. I do not disguise the fact that the Bill provides for a fairly radical step, as things go in Western Australia, though the principle has been tried in the Eastern States and other parts of the world. I hope the amendment will be defeated. I am not going to recapitulate what I have already said, but I would point out a difficulty that could arise. In this State, when a person reaches the age of 21, a statutory obligation is imposed on that person to be enrolled for the Legislative Assembly. The age qualification is 21 for both men and women.

If the age in this instance is to be from 30 years onwards, that will create a lot of difficulties. Women will have to remember when they become 30 that their names must be put on the jury list. I take it that their application would have to be accompanied by a birth certificate. That would lead to a real practical difficulty. As Mr. Diver pointed out, there undoubtedly will be a lot of clerical work involved. Many women will forget to write requesting their names to be taken off the list. However, that will gradually work itself out.

I want to make myself very clear. I agree with Sir Charles Latham and other speakers that many women have no desire to serve on juries. I think it is true that a lot of men have no desire to do so, either. However, we are dealing with a matter of principle. I have made some hurried calculations, and I would be very surprised if 20 women served on juries in one year in Western Australia.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: There has been only one in New South Wales in seven years.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If there were only one in Western Australia, on a very small figure of 10,000, the chance is one in 10,000.

But if 20 women served on juries in Western Australia, a record would be created, compared with the other States. Basing that on my calculation of 10,000 women—there would be a lot more than that—the chance of women going on juries is only one in 5,000.

I also agree that there are sordid cases with which none of us would like our womenfolk to be associated, but they are amply protected. If they have no desire to be involved in jury service they can apply for exemption, and I think the majority would do that. Secondly, if a woman was on a jury list and was likely to have to act on an unpleasant case, she could immediately ask to be excused.

The Chief Secretary: My amendment goes even further; right up to the time she is sworn in.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes. As regards Sir Charles Latham's other argument, I must respect the experience and knowledge of old age. There are great merits in old age, but at the same time there are great merits in youth. The young men and women between the ages of 21 and 30 have a point of view that the world would be the poorer without. The chances of any woman serving on a jury in Western Australia are remote. How many members, before coming into Parliament, served on a jury?

If, with some reluctance, we have accepted the principle that the time has arrived when women should be privileged and obliged to make themselves available for jury service, we should admit the principle that the same age limits should apply. I see some merit in Mr. Simpson's next amendment because, to be consistent, similar conditions should apply to women as to men. To alter the age from 21 to 30 would mean a departure from a fundamental system which is in the present Jury Act. This would create more practical difficulties than it would avoid.

Hon. C. H. HENNING: I said on the second reading that I thought 21 was too young. I have heard tonight that men and women of 21 years of age have roughly the same intelligence as one another, but I maintain that a man of 21 knows far more of worldly things than a young woman of the same age.

The Chief Secretary: You are kidding yourself!

Hon. C. H. HENNING: We all know the story about the bees and the flowers. That starts off at 14 or 15; but how many members would like to see their daughters at 21 years of age, hearing all the evidence in an incest, sodomy or other such case.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Would you like your son to hear it?

Hon. C. H. HENNING: Would members like their daughters to hear it?

Hon. E. M. Heenan: Would they not ask to be excused?

Hon. C. H. HENNING: The Chief Secretary said that in New South Wales women had to apply if they wished to serve on a jury. Here we have to notify the electoral authorities in order to get on the Assembly roll. Mr. Heenan mentioned the difficulty of finding out when women were 30.

A person's age is given when the application form for enrolment is lodged, and these forms could be kept in year groups so that it would be known when women had reached 30 years of age, and the whole matter could then be attended to. I have heard nothing to make me think that a woman of 21 should serve on juries, generally. It is not a fair and reasonable thing for any woman to have to serve on a jury until she has reached a more mature age. I support the amendment.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: The Leader of the House says I have made out no case at all. I made a number of points, and I still think they are good. I made the points that those who voted for the Bill did so because of the amendments on the notice paper; that many young girls on attaining 21 years of age would not know that they were under this obligation; that as inexperienced girls they would not be emotionally or temperamentally fitted to do the job; and that women of 30 were more mature in their emotional reactions and so would be better fitted.

It was said by Mr. Heenan that this is not a party Bill. I can only subscribe to the view that the members of his party are very loyal to their leader. I hope the same attitude will be adopted by the members of my party. The insinuation that the amendment is a reflection on the intelligence of these young women is quite beside the point. I would be the first to acknowledge that women are quite as intelligent as men, taking the sexes age for age, but I say that they have not the same emotional maturity. Men have certain qualities and women have others.

There are certain things that women can do well that men would not even begin to attempt, let alone try to excel at. Mr. Heenan's claim that very few women would be willing to serve is more or less discounted by the statement that pressure has been brought to bear by many women's organisations for women to be enrolled as jurors. If this is so, there should be little or no anxiety in regard to the number of women available for the duty.

Another point I made was that I had spoken to many people who were not keen to serve but felt that the age of 30 for women was probably a fair assessment if they were called upon to accept this responsibility. There are many women who probably would not like to assume this duty but, who would, as loyal members of the community, accept it if the law said it

was their obligation. I do not think there will be a shortage of women to assume jury duty when the time arrives.

Hon. E. M. DAVIES: I supported the Bill which came before us last session, and I have supported the second reading of the one now before the Committee. I have debated the question in my own mind since the Bill has been before us, and I am conscientiously of the opinion that I must support the amendment. I want to indicate that, by no stretch of the imagination, can I be said to be supporting the amendment for the reasons that have been given by Mr. Simpson or Sir Charles Latham.

I think that, as far as the sexes are concerned, the female is just as intelligent and able to analyse questions of debate as is the male. Further, I agree with the statements that have been made this evening that it would not be in the interests of persons of 21 years of age to hear some of the sordid evidence that might be placed before them if they were members of a jury.

Between 21 years and 30 years is the marriageable age, and I believe that the majority of young women between those ages are looking after their homes and caring for their young children. The female is at a disadvantage as compared with the male because a married woman is compelled to look after her home and family; whereas the husband is able to put on his hat, light his pipe and walk out, sit on a jury or do whatever he likes.

I think I will be doing women between the ages of 21 and 30 a service if I support the amendment and they will not be called up for jury service until they reach the age of 30 years, if the amendment is agreed to. I know some members will say that these women can make an application for exemption, but I do not want them to have to go to that trouble. I support the amendment but not for the same reasons given by other members, because I do not think their reasons are valid. I consider that these young women who are looking after their homes and children should be given consideration, and as a result I support the amendment.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move—

That the Committee do now divide.
Motion put.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to remind members that they are not voting on the amendment, but are voting on a closure of the debate. It is necessary to have at least 10 members voting in the affirmative.

Division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	21
Noes	6
Majority for					15

Ayes.

Hon. O. W. D. Barker	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham
Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. J. McI. Thomson
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. C. H. Henning	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. A. F. Griffith
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. R. J. Boylen
	(Teller.)

Motion thus passed.

Amendment (to strike out word) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	14
Noes	13
Majority for	1

Ayes.

Hon. N. E. Baxter	Hon. Sir Chas. Latham
Hon. L. Craig	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. Sir Frank Gibson	Hon. J. McI. Thomson
Hon. C. H. Henning	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. A. F. Griffith
	(Teller.)

Noes.

Hon. O. W. D. Barker	Hon. F. R. H. Lavery
Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. L. A. Logan
Hon. R. J. Boylen	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. E. M. Heenan
Hon. A. R. Jones	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Hon. C. H. SIMPSON: To put the matter in order, I move an amendment—

That the word "thirty" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out.

Amendment (to insert word) put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 24th August, 1954.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Optometry, as to invention of new type lens	1205
Railways, as to liability for fires caused by locomotives	1206
Tram and trolley-bus cables, as to removal of danger points	1206
Water supplies, as to utilisation of streams	1206
Steel prices, as to reported increases by B.H.P.	1206
Petrol, as to legislation regarding service stations	1206
Pig Iron, as to agreement between B.H.P. and State Government	1207
Midland Junction abattoir, as to effect of strike on stock sale	1207
Bills : Droying Act Amendment, 3r.	1207
Lotteries (Control), 2r.	1207
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 2r.	1209
War Service Land Settlement Scheme, 2r.	1210
Shipping and Pilotage Ordinance Amendment, 2r.	1214
Criminal Code Amendment, Com., report	1214
Police Act Amendment (No. 2), Com.	1215
Bush Fires, 2r.	1221
Land Act Amendment, Com.	1227

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

QUESTIONS.

OPTOMETRY.

As to Invention of New Type Lens.

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Health:

(1) As recent reports in the Sydney Press disclose that one Joseph Lederer, of the New South Wales University of Technology has invented a new type of lens enabling near-blind persons to read small print, has his department any information on the subject?

(2) If not, will he take steps to obtain such information as soon as possible, in view of the great possibility of assistance being given to many afflicted people?

(3) As the same Press reports indicate that Mr. Lederer has spent much time lecturing on, and demonstrating his invention to optometrists in Queensland, and proposes to act similarly in Victoria, Tasmania and New Zealand, will he take steps—

(a) to ensure that Mr. Lederer visits Western Australia also; and

(b) to enlist the co-operation of Western Australian optometrists?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Answered by No. (1).