

Mr B. T. Burke: Personal abuse.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister.

Mr O'CONNOR: I continue to quote what I said earlier—

Mr May: You are wrong.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member may check this.

Mr May: It was proposed to cross the river at Deep Water Point.

The statement of the member for Clontarf was not correct. In 1955 it was Mt. Henry. I wanted to have that recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr May: You have still not clarified it.

Mr O'CONNOR: How else can I clarify it?

Mr May: By going out and having a look. Obviously you have not been out there.

Mr O'CONNOR: I have been out there.

Mr May: When?

Mr O'CONNOR: In April, immediately the Main Roads Department's plan was given to me. In April of last year, when the plan was given to me by the Main Roads Department, I asked to be taken out to the area, and I went out immediately with the people from the department to have a look at it. I did not wait. I went right over the area involved. I went to Mt. Henry at that time.

Mr May: You got to Mt. Henry, did you?

Mr O'CONNOR: Yes.

Mr May: How did you get there?

Mr O'CONNOR: I went on the road—

Mr May: There is no road to Mt. Henry.

Mr O'CONNOR: We went as far as we could.

Mr May: You cannot get to Mt. Henry by road.

Mr O'CONNOR: Members opposite are very touchy on these points. As I say, when the Main Roads Department submitted the plan to me I went over the area involved with members of the department.

I do not think members who have spoken tonight have made out a case for delaying the matter. They have put up no alternative proposal and, quite frankly, statements they have made leave a great deal to be desired. I do not think it is necessary to answer them any further, except to say I believe the Main Roads Department has done a tremendous amount of work in this matter not only in trying to find the preferred way but also in trying to check up all the details various members have requested. I congratulate the officers of the department on the work they have done.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—24

Mr Blaikle	Mr Laurance
Sir David Brand	Mr McPharlin
Mr Clarke	Mr Mensaros
Sir Charles Court	Mr Naoovich
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Connor
Mr Coyne	Mr Old
Mrs Craig	Mr Ridge
Mr Crane	Mr Rushton
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Stephens
Mr Grewar	Mr Watt
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Young

(Teller)

Noes—18

Mr Barnett	Mr Harman
Mr Bertram	Mr Jamieson
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr May
Mr Carr	Mr McIver
Mr Davies	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr Moller

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr Thompson	Mr Hartrey
Mr O'Neill	Mr Bryce
Mr Shalders	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr Sodeman	Mr Bateman

Question thus passed.

Resolution transmitted to the Council and its concurrence desired therein, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Transport).

House adjourned at 12.29 a.m.
(Wednesday)

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, the 16th April, 1975

The SPEAKER (Mr Hutchinson) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (56): ON NOTICE

1. WATER SUPPLIES

Mandurah

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Is he aware of the general dissatisfaction of water being supplied through the Mandurah reticulation system?
- (2) Has the department plans for the improvement of this water; if so, what are they?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) Yes, subject to availability of finance, a scheme to bring water from the South Dandalup Dam to Mandurah will be commenced in the financial year 1975-76 and completed by about December 1977.

2.

SEWERAGE*Queens Park-East Cannington*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Further to question 15 of 8th April, 1975, what moneys have been spent on upgrading—
 - (a) treatment works;
 - (b) mains from treatment works to main pumping station at Cannington;
 - (c) effluent outfall facilities, in the last five years?
- (2) What is the length of sewer main from the Cannington main pumping station to treatment works?
- (3) Will the outfall from the Cannington area all be via Woodman Point?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) The following moneys have been expended in addition to those provided in my reply to question 15 of the 8th April, 1975:
 - (a) \$556 000.
 - (b) \$1 513 000.
 - (c) Nil.
- (2) 28 kilometres.
- (3) Yes.

3.

ELECTION PROMISES*Housing Finance, and Desalination of Water*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Deputy Premier:

- (1) What action has he taken to implement his election promise to propose financial help for families to extend their homes to enable aged parents to live with them?
- (2) What steps has he taken to implement his election promises to propose long-term loans at manageable interest rates to help people buy their first home?
- (3) In accordance with his election promise to investigate desalination of sea and brackish water, what progress has been achieved?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) The State Housing Commission has made some study of the practicability of "granny" flats to enable aged parents to live with families. In the main, the studies are indicating the possible need for change in building by-laws and this is being examined further.
- (2) This question was put to me yesterday by Mr Bryce, MLA, and I refer the Member to my answer to question (6) of Tuesday, 15th April, 1975.

(3)

De-salted sea or brackish water is considered when reviewing possible alternative solutions to augment water supply schemes. Except at Denham, all cases to date have indicated that conventional water supplies are more economical. Tenders will be called shortly for a desalination plan to augment the supply to Denham. The operation of this plant will provide valuable information to departmental officers who, in addition, keep themselves fully informed on the subject through the technical publications available and from information supplied by those organisations involved in the development of desalination processes.

4.

HEALTH*Cancer Patients*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

In view of the fact that it has been decided not to provide a separate building to house cancer patients at the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital or Perth Medical Centre can he advise whether the \$20 000 allocated in 1973-74 and \$25 000 in 1974-75 has been spent, and if so, how it has been spent?

Mr RIDGE replied:

\$10 788 was spent on fees. The balance of funds allocated to this project will be re-allocated to another upon which expenditure has exceeded the allocation.

5.

SHEPPERTON ROAD*Traffic Flow*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Can he supply figures for traffic flow along Shepperton Road—
 - (a) before; and
 - (b) after,
 the opening of the alterations to traffic flow at the eastern end of the Causeway when the "flyover" was brought into service?
- (2) If so, will he state, in addition to figures, the dates and places where the count was made?
- (3) If unable to supply comparative figures as requested above, what are the latest figures he can supply?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) and (2) The traffic flow summary sheets, which I table give the information on the "before" position.

- (3) Information in relation to the "after" position will be available shortly and will be forwarded to the Member.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 148).

6. ALBANY HIGHWAY Traffic Flow

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Can he supply figures for traffic flow along Albany Highway—
 - (a) before; and
 - (b) after,
 the opening of the alterations to traffic flow at the eastern end of the Causeway when the "flyover" was brought into service?
- (2) If so will he state, in addition to figures, the dates and places where the count was made?
- (3) If unable to supply comparative figures as requested above, what are the latest figures he can supply?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) (a) and (2) The traffic flow summary sheets, which I table, give the information on the "before" position.
- (3) Information in relation to the "after" position will be available shortly and will be forwarded to the Member.

The paper was tabled (see paper No. 149).

7. INDUSTRIAL AWARDS

Workers' Compensation: Calculation of Annual Leave

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

- (1) Is he aware that some Western Australian industrial awards exclude consideration being given to time spent by a worker on workers' compensation when the quantum of annual leave pay entitlement is being compiled?
- (2) Would he list such industrial awards?
- (3) Would he list those Western Australian industrial awards which do not sanction the exclusion of time spent on workers' compensation from the annual leave payment compilation process?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes. The greater majority of awards dealing with the private sector of industry contain in the annual leave clause a subclause which reads as follows—

Any time in which a worker is absent from work, except time for which he is entitled to claim

sick pay or time spent on holidays or annual leave as prescribed by this Award, shall not account for the purpose of determining his right to annual leave.

As such, any time spent on workers' compensation would not be included for the purpose of calculating annual leave entitlements.

- (2) and (3) Approximately 400 Awards and 200 industrial agreements would need to be searched by departmental officers to provide the figures involving an estimated minimum of one month's work for one officer.

8. BEECHBORO-GOSNELLS HIGHWAY

Commencement of Project

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Has finance been approved to develop the Beechboro-Gosnells closed access highway?
- (2) If so, when can it be expected work will commence?
- (3) Will this project be commenced before the proposed southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Answered by (1).
- (3) The southern extension of the Kwinana Freeway cannot be commenced until both Houses of Parliament and the Commonwealth Government have approved the scheme. Subject to these approvals work on the Kwinana Freeway southern extension is likely to commence before the Beechboro-Gosnells controlled access highway.

9. POLICE STATIONS

Gosnells and Cannington: Staff Increase

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Police:

In view of the increased population in the Gosnells-Cannington area together with the fact as reported in his reply to me on Wednesday, 9th April, question 39 there had been 145 homes broken into, 25 arrests and 104 reports of vandalism in the past six months in the Gosnells area—

- (a) will he increase the staff at both the Gosnells and Cannington police stations;
- (b) if not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (a) and (b) No, but I will refer the matter to the Commissioner of Police, who has the responsibility of deploying his force to best advantage.

in the area, including North Kalgoorlie.

- (3) Yes.

10. TRAFFIC

Crosswalk Attendants: Public Holidays Payment

Mr BATEMAN, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is it a fact crosswalk attendants in the past were paid for all public holidays?
- (2) If so, why was this entitlement taken away from them?
- (3) Will he reconsider reinstating this entitlement?
- (4) If not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No, the rate of pay of crosswalk attendants contains a loading for public holidays, and is reviewed each year.
- (2) There was no entitlement.
- (3) and (4) Answered by (2).

11. NORTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL

Substandard Classroom

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Does the Minister confirm that letters bearing date 12th April, 1975 from the president of the North Kalgoorlie School Parents and Citizens' Association have been received by the Minister for Education and also by the Education Department superintendent of building?
- (2) Will the Minister accept the invitation tendered in the letter addressed to him to visit the North Kalgoorlie School?
- (3) In the light of the statement in paragraph 3 of the said letter addressed to the superintendent of building, does he still adhere to his statement in *The West Australian* newspaper of 15th April, 1975 that "neither a condemned pavilion nor a storeroom is being used as a classroom"?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) No. The Minister has visited Kalgoorlie twice and is conversant with the condition of schools

12. NORTH KALGOORLIE SCHOOL

Overcrowding and Sanitation

Mr T. D. EVANS, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Does he confirm that the Acting Commissioner of Public Health is in receipt of a letter dated 12th April, 1975 from the president of the North Kalgoorlie School Parents and Citizens' Association complaining about overcrowding, sanitary and health problems at the said school?
- (2) Will he advise whether the invitation tendered in the said letter, for a visit to the school for an inspection of its facilities by the officer referred to in (1) above or by an officer appointed by him will be accepted?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No. A phone complaint only has been received.
- (2) The Acting Commissioner of Public Health has already arranged for an inspection of all schools in the Kalgoorlie district as part of a current programme.

13. AUSTRALIAN WINE LICENSE

Restrictions

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister representing the Minister for Justice:

- (1) Is the Minister aware that the holder of an Australian Wine License is unable to make applications under provisions (2), (3), (5), (10), (11) of section 4 of the Liquor Act?
- (2) Does the Minister concede that this restriction limits the ability of such a license holder to make a living?
- (3) Will the Minister consider this situation when considering amendments to the Liquor Act?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Yes.
It is presumed that the reference is meant to be section 24, and not section 4 of the Liquor Act.
- (2) This restriction would limit trading by holders of Australian wine licenses in comparison with the holders of other liquor licenses.
- (3) Yes.

14. ROAD TRAFFIC AUTHORITY

*Shire Traffic Inspectors:
Conditions of Employment*

Mr OLD, to the Minister for Traffic:
Referring to question 87 on
Thursday, 10th April—

- (1) Has a decision yet been made regarding conditions of employment of local government traffic inspectors?
- (2) If not, in view of the disquiet expressed by many local government authorities and traffic inspectors, on what date will a decision be made?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Submissions from the Municipal Officers Association on behalf of local government employees affected by the changeover were received only on 15th April and are now being examined. It is not possible to give a firm date when a decision will be reached, but the urgency to do so is recognised.

15. HEALTH

*Arteriosclerosis: Report on
Treatment*

Mr DAVIES, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) As in his letter of 11th December, 1973 the vascular surgeon who visited Kassell, Germany, to investigate the Dr Moeller treatment for arteriosclerosis said, "A report covering the present and recommended future management of arteriosclerosis in Western Australia is being prepared.", can he advise if the report has been completed?
- (2) If so, will it be made available to the Government, State Health Council, THAC or similar body?
- (3) If the report has been received can he table a copy?
- (4) If not to hand, can he advise progress being made?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) and (3) Answered by (1).
- (4) The report has been prepared in draft form but requires the inclusion of certain technical details which are currently awaited before it can be completed.

16. BUILDING INDUSTRY

Apprentices-Tradesmen Ratio

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Is he aware that as at 30th June, 1974 the ratio of apprentices to building tradesmen employed by the Government was 1 to 3.57 while at the same date in the private sector of the building industry the ratio was 1 to 9.23?
- (2) Does he consider this ratio of apprentices in the private sector of building industry satisfactory?
- (3) If not, what is the Government doing so as to avoid a future shortage of building tradesmen as envisaged in the C. H. Smith report?
- (4) Did the answer to question 89 given on the 27th March, 1975 include State Housing Commission activities?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) While not being aware of the specific ratios quoted, it is known that there is a marked imbalance of apprenticeship employment in the Government versus private sectors of the building industry.
- (2) If the future needs of the building industry are to be met, it does appear to be necessary for the private sector to increase the number of apprentices-to-tradesmen employed.
- (3) The Government has adopted the recommendations contained in the Howard Smith, Q.C., report following his inquiry into the building industry regarding firms employing apprentices being granted a degree of preference for Government contracts. A meeting with representatives of industry, and others who may be affected, has been held and details of a plan to implement the Government's decision are now being finalised.
- (4) Yes.

17. WATER SUPPLIES

Port Hedland Shipping

Mr JAMIESON, to the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) Why is water supplied to shipping interests at Port Hedland at a cheaper rate compared with that applying to industry and domestic consumers?
- (2) Will the Government give early consideration to increasing this price?
- (3) What was the number of kilolitres supplied to shipping at Port Hedland during each of the last five years?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

- (1) Water is not supplied to shipping interests at Port Hedland at a cheaper rate than supply to industry and domestic consumers. Water is supplied by the Public Works Department to the Port Hedland Port Authority at 15.4c per kilolitre and is sold by that authority to shipping interests at 16c per kilolitre.

Industrial consumers are each charged 11c per kilolitre for the first 909 kilolitres each year and domestic consumers are each charged 7c per kilolitre for the first 683 kilolitres each year.

The average quantity of water supplied to shipping interests at Port Hedland by the port authority is approximately 90 kilolitres for each call by the vessel.

- (2) No.

- (3) 1970—1 822 kilolitres
1971—21 721 kilolitres
1972—24 230 kilolitres
1973—44 192 kilolitres
1974—55 972 kilolitres

18. PUBLIC SERVICE ROYAL COMMISSION

Submissions

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) In view of the growth of the number of schemes administered jointly by State and Australian Government public servants, and because of the degree of overlap of functions performed by some State and Australian Governments, has the State Government sought the opinion of the Public Service Board or of any other Government authority, in order to make a submission to the Royal Commission on the Australian Public Service?
- (2) If not, will the Premier take steps to do so?
- (3) Will the Premier allow the State Public Service to make individual submissions which will not be vetted by Ministers?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) The number of schemes with which State and Commonwealth public servants are currently involved are of concern to the Government, particularly in view of the excessive, and in some cases, unnecessary demands on the time of State public servants.

Recently the Government sought, from the Public Service Board the views of a number of State permanent heads regarding all

aspects of this matter, including the overlapping, duplication and degree of detail required by the Commonwealth.

- (2) and (3) When the board's report has been fully considered the Government will determine an appropriate course of action.

In any case it is considered both desirable and necessary that sub-missions made to the Commonwealth or one of its commissions or committees should be subject to State ministerial control, as it is the State Government services and systems that are involved.

19.

NARROWS BRIDGE

Traffic Capacity

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to my question 37 of Tuesday, 8th April, 1975 which related to total traffic flow and not to the distribution between peak and off peak periods. Would the Minister advise whether present trends predict that daily Narrows Bridge traffic will exceed the theoretical capacity in 1985?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

If the present distribution between peak hour and 24-hour traffic flows continues then the forecasted demand could exceed the theoretical capacity. However, this distribution between peak hour and 24-hour traffic will not remain static with the growth of the region and theoretical capacity will not be reached by 1985.

20.

NARROWS BRIDGE

Traffic Capacity

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

In connection with my question 36 of Tuesday, 8th April, 1975 and to the replies to parts (2) and (3) of question 8 of 27th March, 1975, if the assumption was not made that the flows in both directions are equal, why does lane reversal at peak periods not increase the total capacity?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Peak period traffic flow will not be equal in both directions, but the total daily flows should be similar. Reversible lane operation has an effect on the peak period movement only and should not significantly affect daily flow.

21. **NARROWS BRIDGE***Traffic Capacity*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

Referring to my question 40 of Tuesday, 8th April, 1975, why is it that grades and truck volume should affect the capacity of tunnels but not of bridges?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The answer to question 40 does not state this.

22. **KWINANA FREEWAY EXTENSION***British Motorway Standards*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to my question 39 on Tuesday, 8th April, 1975—Why should British motorway standards not apply to the Kwinana Freeway?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

The capacity figures used are based on Australian experience.

23. **NARROWS BRIDGE***Traffic Capacity*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

(1) Referring to question 16 parts (1) and (2) on Thursday, 27th March, 1975, to question 8 part (2) on Thursday, 27th March, 1975, to table 1.2 and lines 7 to 9 of sections 1.1.1 in the Main Roads Department document proposed southern extension dated May 1974, does the Minister accept that the predicted traffic flow for 1989 is 38 600 vehicles per day greater than the theoretical capacity of the Narrows Bridge in its present form?

(2) Referring to question 8 parts (1) and (2) on Thursday, 27th March, 1975, why is the daily theoretical capacity estimated to be a factor of ten times the theoretical hourly capacity when the corresponding factors for urban motorways in Britain range from four to eight?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) The figure of 158 600 vehicles per day is a forecast of travel demand and not traffic flow. This demand exceeds the theoretical capacity of the bridge by 38 600.

(2) The ratio of peak hour to daily traffic flow is a factor which will vary from road to road depending upon the function of that

road. It is not a figure that can be universally applied automatically without regard to local conditions. I assume the Member has based his question on the British technical memorandum H 6/74 which gives the ratios to be used in Britain in the absence of extensive network assignments or models. The Main Roads Department has information available based on network assignments and models which was carried out for the Perth Regional Transport Study 1970. This information is more reliable for use in the Perth scene.

24. **KWINANA FREEWAY EXTENSION***Traffic Flow*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

Referring to the reply to question 37 on Tuesday, 8th April, 1975, does this imply that total daily flow will be more than ten times the peak hourly flow in 1985?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Yes, because with the continued growth of the metropolitan region it is forecast that the main growth in traffic will occur outside the peak hours.

25. **NARROWS BRIDGE***Traffic Capacity*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

Referring to question 36 on Tuesday, 8th April, 1975 will he please detail answers to parts (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) and state the premise on which the answers have been made?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(a) The morning peak hour showed a ratio of approximately 2.8 to 1 and the evening peak hour on the same day a ratio of approximately 1.8 to 1.

(b) Not necessarily.

(c) Answered by (b).

(d) The figure quoted in reply to question 8 of 27th March is based on actual operating conditions on the Narrows Bridge.

(e) As present trends are unlikely to continue I will not predict a date. I refer to my answers to today's questions 19 to 24.

26. **NARROWS BRIDGE***British Motorway Standards*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Referring to the reply to question 38 parts (1) and (2) on Tuesday, 8th April, 1975, why does the reduction of 400 vehicles per hour to urban motorway sections with less than 3 km between interchanges which is standard in Britain not apply to the Narrows Bridge capacity?
- (2) Why do British motorway capacity figures not apply to the situation referred to in question 39 on Tuesday, 8th April, 1975?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) and (2) The capacity figures quoted for the Narrows Bridge are based on actual operating conditions on this bridge, not the theoretical design figures for British motorways.

27. **KWINANA FREEWAY EXTENSION***Mr W. M. Rahmann: Conclusions*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Transport:

- (1) Did W. M. Rahmann a highway planning engineer from the Brisbane Main Roads Department present a paper at the 45th ANZAAS Conference held in Perth in August 1973 on the place of freeway development in cities?
- (2) Is W. M. Rahmann a current holder of a Churchill Fellowship?
- (3) Were the conclusions reached by W. M. Rahmann raised at the MRPA hearings of objections?
- (4) If so, in what respects are the conclusions of W. M. Rahmann considered to be invalid?
- (5) Why have the conclusions of W. M. Rahmann not been considered in planning the southern extension to the Kwinana Freeway?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) to (3) Yes.
- (4) The views were considered by MRPA in reaching their conclusions.
- (5) Senior Main Roads Department officers are aware of Mr Rahmann's paper and indeed attended the ANZAAS Conference in Perth in 1973. In reaching a conclusion the views expressed by one expert must be considered in relation to other experts who may hold differing views.

28. **ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES***Bunbury: Load Growth*

Mr MAY, to the Minister for Electricity:

As perusal of the State Electricity Commission annual report for 1972 reveals that the load growth in Bunbury is increasing by approximately 15% per annum and that the 1971-72 summer peak load was 47 MVA—

- (a) has there been any increase in the 2 x 37 MVA transformers operating at that time;
- (b) if "No" will he indicate if the growth rate safety margin has been exceeded having regard for the existing generation system at Bunbury;
- (c) (i) if one of the supply transformers broke down would this occasion widespread power rationing in the south-west area?

- (ii) if so, what action is being taken by the Government to rectify this very unsatisfactory situation?

Mr MENSAROS replied:

- (a) No.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) (i) No, but some restrictions would be necessary and the supply system would operate under emergency conditions prone to more interruptions than normal.
- (ii) Work is proceeding to relieve the situation and will be completed in the 1975-1976 financial year provided sufficient funds are available.

29. **GERMAN SHEPHERD DOGS***Restrictions on Breeding*

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Has any approach been made to have the restrictions on the breeding of German shepherd dogs in Western Australia lifted or modified?
- (2) If so, by whom or what organisations have such approaches been made, and what are the details of requests received by the Government?
- (3) Does the Government propose to modify or lift existing regulations which currently apply to the breeding of German shepherd dogs in this State, and if so, what are the details of such proposals?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The German Shepherd Dog Association of W.A. has proposed amendments to the Act on the basis of—
 Controlled breeding within a specified radius of Perth and in other districts where the approval of the shire is given.
 Higher license fees for unsterilised Alsations.
- (3) The matter is still being examined by the Agriculture Protection Board and full consideration will be able to be given to this issue when the board's report is received.

30. MILK

Production and Transportation Costs

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

What is the estimated cost of—

- (a) production; and
 - (b) transportation,
- of milk per gallon in each of the following dairying areas—Serpentine, Waroona, Brunswick, Albany, Walpole, Northcliffe, Margaret River?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

No reliable estimate of the cost of production of milk is available at present but a survey of the cost and income structure of the market milk industry has been completed by the Rural Economics and Marketing Branch of the department.

When the report on the survey has been finalised, costs of production and transportation will be able to be determined for—

- Metropolitan area (north of Pinjarra).
- Pinjarra to Bunbury.
- Margaret River-Busselton.
- Albany-Denmark.

Similarly, a survey of the dairy industry carried out by the Australian Bureau of Agricultural Economics in 1974, when available, could provide information regarding costs of milk production in manufacturing milk regions.

31. DAIRYING

Survey of Industry

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Is the Department of Agriculture carrying out a survey of the dairy industry, and if so, what are the terms of reference adopted in the survey?

- (2) Is it proposed to conduct an inquiry into the manufacturing milk section of the industry?
- (3) Has any private firm indicated that it is prepared to assist with the financing of a survey of the manufacturing milk section of the dairy industry, and if so, what is the name of the firm and what amount of finance has the firm offered?
- (4) If the reply to (3) is "Yes" what is the total cost anticipated for such a survey and does the Government intend to assist with such a survey, and if so, in what way and to what extent?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

- (1) Yes. To provide such cost information on the production, processing and distribution of market milk as will enable conclusions to be drawn on margins which could be applied at each stage of the production and sale of market milk.
- (2) The Department of Agriculture does not currently propose to conduct an inquiry into the manufacturing milk sector of the industry.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has completed a national dairy industry survey covering costs for 1973-74 (with estimates for 1974-75). The report will be presented to the Industries Assistance Commission on 24th April and the bureau is willing to make the results available to those interested after that time. The report by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics includes results for the manufacturing and market milk sectors of the Western Australian industry.

- (3) The department has not received any such offer. Two dairy companies have indicated to the Dairy Industry Authority that they would be prepared to assist financially in the conduct of a survey of the dairy industry, provided the Farmers' Union agreed such an inquiry was warranted and indicated its readiness to participate; and provided the terms of reference of the survey were acceptable to the dairy companies.
- (4) No estimate has been made of the cost of such a survey nor has there been any request to the Government for assistance with such a survey.

32. *This question was postponed.*

33.

EGGS

Production, Imports, and Price

Mr H. D. EVANS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) What was the total egg production of Western Australia in 1974?
- (2) By what number did this amount exceed or fall short of the State's requirements of fresh eggs?
- (3) In what months were fresh eggs imported into Western Australia, and what was the quantity in each month?
- (4) On what date were the prices of eggs in Western Australia adjusted in 1974, and by how much for each grade on each of these occasions?
- (5) Has there been any price changes in 1975, and if so, when and by how much?
- (6) What are the names of the members who comprise the Egg Prices Advisory Committee?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

The Western Australian Egg Marketing Board has advised as follows—

- (1) Total recorded egg production was 15 914 155 dozen.
- (2) There was a surplus of 1 326 433 dozen eggs over requirements.
- (3) March, 1974—11 700 dozen eggs.
April, 1974—53 895 dozen eggs.
- (4) —

	60 g	55 g	50 g	45 g	2nd
April 1, 1974—	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)
Wholesale	74	71	68	65	58
(difference)	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Max. Retail	80	77	74	71
(difference)	nil	nil	nil	nil

	60 g	55 g	50 g	45 g	2nd
August 26, 1974—	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)
Wholesale	78	75	72	69	60
(difference)	4	4	4	4	2
Max. Retail	85	82	79	76
(difference)	5	5	6	6

	60 g	55 g	50 g	45 g	2nd
December 23, 1974—	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)
Wholesale	83	80	77	74	64
(difference)	5	5	5	5	4
Max. Retail	90	87	84	81
(difference)	5	5	5	5

Note: The "difference" is the change from the previous price.

(5) —

	60 g	55 g	50 g	45 g	2nd
January 27, 1975—	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)
Wholesale	87	84	81	76	66
(difference)	4	4	4	2	2
Max. Retail	94	91	88	83
(difference)	4	4	4	2

(6) Mr R. N. Hubbard—Chairman.

Mrs L. Adams—Consumers' representative.

Mr W. S. Gash—Producers' representative.

Mr J. Ripley—Department of Agriculture's representative.

Mr E. K. Lindorff—Secretary.

34.

RAILWAYS

Bunbury, Albany, and Geraldton Services: Financial Results

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

What were the profits or losses on the following trains for years 1964 to 1974 inclusive—

- (a) *Australind*;
- (b) *Albany Progress*;
- (c) *Geraldton Midlander*?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Separate profit and loss statements for individual passenger services are not recorded.

Where the Railways Department wants to determine whether it is profitable or not to continue running passenger trains it has to undertake separate economic exercises.

It segregates the passenger and freight proportions where these form joint costs and using what is commonly called the "incremental" approach can determine the avoidable costs and revenue losses for each service.

A study on these lines was carried out in 1972 and based on the then level of costs and revenue—and without taking into account the annual costs of future capital expenditure—the assessed annual loss on an incremental basis of operations of the services in question were—

- (a) *Australind* \$62 400.
- (b) *Albany Progress* \$102 000.
- (c) *Geraldton Midlander* \$47 300.

With the present inflationary cost spiral these losses are increasing.

35.

RAILWAYS

Metropolitan Passenger Services: Financial Results

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Transport:

What have been the profits or losses on the metropolitan passenger train services for years 1964 to 1974 inclusive?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

Railway accounts are not set up to segregate the profits or losses on passenger or goods services separately.

However, indicative figures taken out on a statistical basis and which include arbitrary allocations for administration and other

overheads give the following assessed losses—

			\$ million
1964	2.260
1965	2.436
1966	2.656
1967	2.482
1968	2.604
1969	3.123
1970	3.206
1971	3.535
1972	4.163
1973	4.326
1974	5.919

These figures should not be confused with the savings that would be achieved if the services were discontinued. On 1974 figures this has been calculated at roughly \$2.2 million.

36. ABORIGINES

Police Patrols in Warburton: Newspaper Report

Mr T. H. JONES, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is he aware of an article in *The Sunday Times* of 13th April, 1975 headed "Report urges police patrols", which referred to a report which he had received from the Warburton area?
- (2) Does the report state that petrol sniffing among Aboriginal teenagers was fast assuming massive proportions and that "Young boys and teenagers swarm around every petrol motor in droves as soon as the backs of staff are turned"?
- (3) Did the report criticise a community adviser who suggested that the easiest way of overcoming the problem was to accede to requests for petrol and did it state that "boys could become crazed by too much petrol sniffing and this could lead to serious trouble"?
- (4) Did the report also tell how Aboriginal teenagers had—
 - (a) broken into the school and stolen equipment and caused hundreds of dollars worth of damage;
 - (b) raided workers' camps for liquor?
- (5) Was a copy of the report made available to anyone from *The Sunday Times* by him or any member of the Government?
- (6) If "No" will he request an explanation from *The Sunday Times* as to how it was in possession of the report?

(7) Will he table the report?

(8) If not, why not?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

(1) to (5) Yes.

(6) No.

(7) It was a report sent to me personally.

(8) Answered by (7).

37.

IMMIGRATION

Miss L. Danker

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Minister for Immigration:

- (1) Referring to question 45, 9th April, what was the reason for the delay in forwarding completed formalities on behalf of Miss Lorna Danker from the State Immigration Department to the Commonwealth Department?
- (2) Did this delay severely affect Miss Danker's prospects of entering Australia in that it stretched over a period in which the Australian Government altered its policy towards the entry of certain applicants?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) There was no delay caused by the State Immigration Office. Miss Lorna Danker's nomination forms were forwarded to the nominator by the State Immigration Office in January, 1974, with advice to return the completed forms direct to the Commonwealth Immigration Department.

This was done by the nominator and the completed forms received by the Commonwealth Department on 6th February, 1974. Any subsequent action was the responsibility of the Commonwealth department.

38.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTRES, FREMANTLE

Kwinana and Rockingham Students

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

How many students who have as their home address any centre within the Shires of Kwinana and Rockingham presently attend any technical education centre within the City of Fremantle?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

Shire of Kwinana 276.

Shire of Rockingham 231.

39.

HOUSING

Fremantle and Kwinana Areas

Mr TAYLOR, to the Minister for Housing:

- (1) How many applications remain unsatisfied in respect of—
 - (a) purchase;
 - (b) (i) rental;
(ii) pensioner rental;
 - (c) transfers,
 - (i) in the Fremantle area.
 - (ii) in the Kwinana area?
- (2) From what date are applicants being assisted for both purchase and rental—
 - (a) in the Fremantle area;
 - (b) in the Kwinana area?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

(1) —

	Fremantle	Kwinana
a) Purchase	997	298
(b) (i) Rental	723	118
(ii) Pensioner Rental	117	27
(c) Transfers	Not readily available	33

- (2) (a) Fremantle—Purchase: January, 1967 for 3-bedroom and July, 1968 for 4-bedroom.
Rental: Dates range from March, 1968 to March, 1975 depending on bedroom accommodation.
- (b) Kwinana—Purchase: June, 1969 for 3-bedroom and September, 1970 for 4-bedroom.
Rental: Dates range from June, 1971 to March, 1975 depending on bedroom accommodation.

40.

POLICE

Dorothea Flatman: Liquor License

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Police:

Further to my question 76 of 10th April, 1975 and his reply thereto, has he now drawn the attention of the Commissioner of Police or any of his servants or agents or any member of the Police Force, and if so, whom, to the contents of the statutory declaration of Dorothea Flatman which he tabled on 5th September, 1974?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

No.

41.

LIQUOR LICENSES

Kimberly John Flatman, and Police Objections

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister for Police:

- (1) Did the police object to the application of Kimberly John Flatman for the transfer of the cabaret license at 104 Murray Street, Perth, granted on 15th November, 1974?
- (2) Will he supply the names of the persons whose applications for liquor licenses have been objected to by the police since 1st April, 1974?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) No, but only one application has been objected to since 1st April, 1974.

The SPEAKER: Can the Minister for Police tell me whether there is any court case pending or any writ issued regarding the person named in this question?

Mr O'CONNOR: No, Mr Speaker. If there had been I would not have answered the question in any detail.

42.

LIQUOR ACT

Payments under Section 168 (1)

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

What moneys, if any, has he earmarked for payments to be made pursuant to subsections 168 (1) (a) and (b) of the Liquor Act, 1970?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

I have no authority to make payments pursuant to subsections 168 (1) (a) and (b) of the Liquor Act, 1970.

43.

ELECTIONS

One-person-one-vote-one-value Basis

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

Referring to question 71 of 10th April, 1975 and his reply thereto in which he said that comparison of a referendum and a general election for representative government is not valid, will he give each of the reasons said by him as Premier to justify his answer?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The import of the Member's question is not understood. If he seeks my reasons for saying that "Comparison of a referendum and

a general election for representative government is not valid", I would have thought the Member would appreciate that, when one is conducting a referendum, such as on daylight saving, on a State-wide basis, and on a single subject, it is an entirely different proposition from the continuing representation on an electorate basis when the differing needs and circumstances of widely-separated communities are involved.

Mr Jamieson: Oh, come on now! The ruling class!

44. ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Redistribution under Labor Government

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

Further to his answer to question 71 of 10th April, 1975 and since no Labor Government in this State has ever been supported by a Legislative Council comprising a majority of Labor members, is it not a fact that the Tonkin Government had no practical alternative other than to redistribute the electoral boundaries according to the then existing law?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:
No.

45. CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Instrument

Mr BERTRAM, to the Minister representing the Minister for Community Welfare:

(1) Does he approve of the use of sticks from an oleander bush for the corporal punishment of Aboriginal males aged 10½ to 15½ years and young women aged 12 to 15½ years pursuant to section 34 (c) of the Child Welfare Act?

(2) If "Yes" why?

Mr RIDGE replied:

(1) Personally I do not approve of the use of oleander bush for this purpose, but Children's Courts are not required to seek my approval of their decisions.

(2) Answered by (1).

46. CHILD WELFARE

Vietnamese Orphans: Adoption

Mr BERTRAM, to the Premier:

Is it true that his Government is considering prosecuting certain persons, firms or corporations under the Adoption of Infants Act,

or any other Act, and if so, which, relative to publicity given to Vietnamese orphans in this State?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

No decision has been made to prosecute anyone.

Senior departmental officers recently met media representatives to remind them of the provisions of the Adoption of Children Act concerning confidentiality of adoption matters.

At this meeting, the Director of the Department of Community Welfare outlined circumstances under which prosecution could be made for breaches of the Act.

47.

FIRES

Insurance Companies' Accounts: Inclusion of Fee

Mr B. T. BURKE, to the Chief Secretary:

(1) (a) Is he aware that insurance companies are rendering accounts specifying a fire fee as part of their premium notices;

(b) If "Yes" does the W.A. Fire Brigade Board permit this practice?

(2) Is it a fact that the present system of funding of fire fees by insurers is operating only in Australia, New Zealand and Greece?

Mr STEPHENS replied:

(1) (a) Yes.

(b) The W.A. Fire Brigades Board has no jurisdiction in the matter.

(2) I believe this to be so.

48.

MEAT INDUSTRY INQUIRY

Public Health Department Papers

Mr MOILER, to the Minister for Agriculture:

Would he table copies of the two papers provided to the Meat Industry Inquiry by the Department of Public Health on 21st and 24th February?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

I am pleased to make available copies of these papers to the member.

The papers were tabled (see paper No. 150).

49.

EDUCATION*Dental Clinics*

Mr CARR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

Further to his answer to question 20 of 9th April, will he please advise—

- (a) the reasons why only one country school has been provided with a dental clinic, while eleven metropolitan schools have them;
- (b) the criteria for allocation of these clinics?

Mr RIDGE replied:

- (a) Eight of the initial clinics established under this programme were placed in readily available vacant classrooms in selected schools. The development of the school dental service in country areas requires the provision of housing for staff as well as school clinics. Arrangements for the development of country housing for school dental service personnel are presently under construction.
- (b) Schools in which clinics are placed are selected after a consideration of many aspects, including socio-economic factors, geographic location, number of children attending primary school, numbers of pre-school and secondary school children, number of adjacent State and Government schools and primarily the dental state of children disclosed by examination.

50.

TEACHERS*Secondary: Unemployment*

Mr CARR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

How many trained secondary teachers is he aware of for whom his department is unable to provide employment?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

The exact number cannot be stated with certainty because some applicants are only interested in teaching certain subjects in specified schools or in localities of their choice.

At the present time there are less than 25 trained secondary teachers who are prepared to accept an unrestricted appointment. These teachers are available in

such exigencies as sickness, accident, resignation, and accouchement. The number is thus subject to daily fluctuation.

51.

BLUFF POINT SCHOOL*Enrolment*

Mr CARR, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) What is the present enrolment at Bluff Point primary school?
- (2) How many of these students live north of the Chapman River Bridge—
 - (a) including bus children;
 - (b) excluding bus children?
- (3) How many live east of the ring road?
- (4) What are the department's intentions concerning development of the Anderson Street school site?
- (5) Is there a school site north of the Chapman River Bridge?
- (6) If "Yes" to (5), where is it located and what are the department's intentions regarding its development?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) 524 at 11th April, 1975.
- (2) and (3) This information is not available at the Education Department and will necessitate an actual count at the school.
- (4) There are no immediate plans to utilise this site.
- (5) Yes. A primary school site has been identified in the area north of the Chapman River Bridge.
- (6) (i) In the Sunset Beach estate area.
- (ii) Future planning will depend on developments in the area.

52.

HIGH SCHOOLS*Refrigerated Cold Rooms*

Mr MOILER, to the Minister representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Would the Minister list the high schools which have been provided with refrigerated cold rooms at no cost to the parents and citizens' associations of the schools concerned?
- (2) Is it his department's policy to provide refrigerated cold rooms during construction of new high schools; if so, for how long has this policy been adopted?
- (3) Would the Minister indicate the estimated amount the Eastern Hills High School Parents and Citizens' Association would have to contribute towards the cost of providing a suitable refrigerated cold room at that school?

Mr GRAYDEN replied:

- (1) and (2) The Education Department does not provide a refrigerated cold room. The space for the cool room is provided during construction of the building but the responsibility for provision of the cool room door and the refrigeration equipment does not rest with the department, although a subsidy is available for it. Where the space has not been provided in some of the longer established schools, on request from the school such space will be provided, usually at the time of more major works being undertaken at the school, at departmental cost.
- (3) With subsidy assistance, approximately \$1 000.

53. LAMB

Domestic Requirements, Storage, and Exports

Mr BLAIKIE, to the Minister for Agriculture:

- (1) Can he advise the approximate weekly requirement of lamb to meet domestic needs of Western Australia as indicated by the Lamb Marketing Board?
- (2) Commencing January 1974, would he advise the total monthly receipts of lamb by the Lamb Marketing Board to present date?
- (3) Would he advise—
- monthly storage of lambs;
 - monthly sales of export lambs and destination since 1st January, 1974?

Mr McPHARLIN replied:

The Western Australian Lamb Marketing Board has advised as follows—

- (1) These vary during the year. From 1st January to 31st March, 1975 it has averaged 12 237 carcasses per week.

(2) 1974	Lambs
January	54 367
February	40 713
March	40 157
April	56 327
May	58 444
June	55 540
July	90 419
August	140 698
September	226 783
October	280 003
November	200 884
December	63 569
1975	
January	52 493
February	47 037
March	50 736

- (3) Carcasses in storage at close of each month:

(a) 1974	Lambs
January ..	25 062
February ..	24 203
March	23 110
April	22 142
May	17 797
June	17 215
July	40 376
August	112 440
September ..	253 582
October ..	440 177
November ..	398 564
December ..	245 084
1975	
January ..	233 765
February ..	209 532
March	61 108

- (b) The information sought is not readily available on a monthly break-up basis but will be provided to the member as soon as possible.

54. PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICERS

Employment by Government

Mr T. J. BURKE, to the Premier:

Would he please provide the information concerning the employment of Government public relations officers sought in question 32 of Tuesday, 26th November, 1974?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

If the member clarifies whether he means public relations officers attached to ministerial offices only or all State Government activities including semi Government and other statutory authorities, the appropriate information will be supplied.

If the honourable member will let me know about this verbally today I can give him the appropriate information tomorrow.

55. ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES

Mains: Undergrounding

Mr MAY, to the Premier:

- (1) What action has been taken by the Government in respect of its election promise to encourage the underground reticulation of power lines by private developers and the siting of overhead power lines away from street frontages?
- (2) (a) Has the Government yet undertaken an urgent study of underground power lines to determine the best way to make it standard practice in urban developments as soon as possible;

- (b) if so, when will the study be completed;
- (c) has a target date been set, after which all future lines must be placed underground;
- (d) when will the separate programme for replacement of existing overhead power lines with underground be phased in?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) Reduced charges by the State Electricity Commission for the undergrounding of domestic electrical reticulation came into effect in June, 1974.

This reduction is a most direct step in the encouragement of the underground reticulation of power lines by private developers.

The present level of charges compares favourably with the rest of Australia. A developer may have underground mains provided at less than \$300 per block on today's prices.

Overhead power lines away from the street frontage are encouraged but depend on the provision of a paved laneway 16 ft wide so that modern construction and maintenance plant may be used. The SEC is prepared to co-operate with any sub-divider who wishes to make use of this type of construction.

- (2) (a) A senior engineer of the SEC has made an investigation of practices concerning the underground construction of power lines in the U.K. Other officers have examined practices throughout Australia.

Work is continuing, to determine the best way to make the provision of underground reticulation standard practice in urban development.

- (b) It is expected that the Government will be in a position to make an overall statement concerning the policy of underground power lines towards the end of 1975.

(c) No.

- (d) A decision regarding the timing and extent to which existing overhead lines will be replaced with underground, will form part of the overall statement on the subject of underground which is referred to in 2 (b), and will, of course, depend on the availability of expanded loan funds.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Government Policy

Mr J. T. TONKIN, to the Premier:

- (1) Has his Government formulated a policy with respect to nuclear power?
- (2) If so, will he give particulars and indicate the steps which have already been taken or which it is proposed to take for the use of nuclear power in Western Australia?
- (3) Is he prepared to set up a non-partisan committee as early as practicable for the purpose of investigating the case for and against the use of nuclear power?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

(1) Yes.

- (2) Subject to the necessary environmental and social safeguards it is the Government's policy to introduce nuclear power to Western Australia when it can make significant contributions to the economy and reliability of the State's energy supplies.

We will continue to press for, and co-operate in meaningful studies of the future potential of nuclear and solar energy at both State and national level.

Work now in progress is directed to the determination of the time when nuclear energy is likely to be economical and practical for Western Australia. Particular attention is being concentrated on the prospects of using nuclear energy for the combined purposes of electricity production and the provision of process heat for industry.

- (3) When the stage is reached that specific proposals can be formulated for nuclear facilities in Western Australia, the Government will ensure that full and searching examination of all issues will be undertaken.

Opportunity will be provided for adequate debate and for the participation of all appropriate organisations and persons in the examination of any proposals when the time is opportune.

QUESTIONS (4): WITHOUT NOTICE

1. FLUORIDATION OF WATER SUPPLIES

Potent Meiotic Mutagen

Mr RIDGE (Minister for Lands): I wish to seek your guidance, Mr Speaker. On Tuesday, the 8th April, the Leader of the Opposition asked a question of the

Minister representing the Minister for Health, part of which was as follows—

Will the Minister for Health have the article studied and in due course report the result to Parliament?

In my reply I indicated that the Minister for Health would, and he has now provided the information. Should I now read the answer?

The SPEAKER: The Minister may proceed.

Mr RIDGE: The Minister for Health has supplied the following additional information in relation to the second part of that question—

The article entitled "Sodium Fluoride as Potential Mutagen in Mammalian Eggs" which appears in the Archives of Environmental Health October, 1974, Vol. 29, No. 4, has been studied.

The authors Georgiana Jagiells and Ja-Shein Lin only claim to have shown that in an in-vitro experimental situation the oocytes of the ewe and the cow are more sensitive to heavy toxic concentrations of sodium fluoride than are the oocytes of the mouse. That is, the authors have demonstrated that there are in-vitro variations in species' sensitivities.

In-vivo experiments using oocytes of the mouse produced no conclusive results.

Any application of in-vitro experimental results to in-vivo situations must be invalid until proved otherwise.

2. ELECTION PROMISES *Implementation*

Mr CARR, to the Premier:

On the 9th April this year, in answer to a question asked by the member for Ascot, he advised the House that he would early this week table a copy of the Liberal policy document from the last election, in which he would have marked the promises he claims to have fulfilled. When can we expect this so that we can judge the matter for ourselves?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I understand from my office that it has completed the marking and the document will be tabled here tomorrow and next week in another place.

3. YORK HIGH SCHOOL *Oval*

Mr McIVER, to the Minister for Works:

- (1) Will funds be made available in the 1975-76 financial year to upgrade the school oval at the York Junior High School?
- (2) If the answer is "Yes", would he advise when the work on the upgrading is likely to commence?
- (3) If the answer is "No", would he inform me the reasons?

Mr O'NEIL replied:

I thank the honourable member for prior notice of the question, the answer to which is as follows—

- (1) to (3) It is desirable that the work be undertaken in the next financial year, as the honourable member has said. However, it must be appreciated that this will be an expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. It has been listed as a preliminary item by my department, but the approval will depend on the availability of funds when the expenditure of revenue is being calculated. I do have reason to believe the work will be undertaken next year.

4. ELECTION PROMISES *Rubbish Conversion*

Mr JAMIESON, to the Premier:

In reply to question 14 yesterday the Premier indicated that the answer to parts (d) to (f) would be supplied at a later stage. Does he have the answers?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for giving me an opportunity to supply the answers to parts (d) to (f) of question 14 which contained two different departmental subject matters. The answer is as follows—

- (d) (i) Yes. Two reports have been prepared on refuse disposal.
 - (a) "Report on Refuse Disposal in the Perth Metropolitan Area"—by Maunsell 1974.
 - (b) "A Report on Community Waste in the Perth Metropolitan Region"—Public Health Department.

(ii) Answered by (i).

- (iii) That recycling was not economical at this stage but that further investigations should be continued.

Both reports referred to in (i) were tabled in the House on the 10th October, 1974.

- (e) Not at this stage, but inquiries have been made.
(f) Not at this stage.

BILLS (4): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Consumer Protection Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Grayden (Minister for Consumer Affairs), and read a first time.

2. Police Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Police), and read a first time.

3. Railways Discontinuance and Land Revestment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr O'Connor (Minister for Transport), and read a first time.

4. Government Employees (Promotions Appeal Board) Act Amendment Bill.

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr Grayden (Minister for Labour and Industry), and read a first time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: ELEVENTH DAY

Motion

Debate resumed, from the 10th April, on the following motion by Mr Old—

That the following Address-in-Reply to His Excellency's Speech be agreed to—

May it please Your Excellency:

We, the Legislative Assembly of the Parliament of the State of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign, and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to address to Parliament.

To which Mr Bryce had moved an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion—

We are compelled by recent events in Australia and South East Asia to advise the administrator that—

"Liberal and Country Party Members and Governments throughout Australia must now accept full responsibility for the decision, based upon a philosophy of fear

and hatred, which led Australia to become an active participant in the civil war in Vietnam".

It now rests upon the conscience of all Liberal and Country Party Members that—

- (a) theirs was the decision to become part of a war of massive foreign intervention in Indo China;
- (b) their national Government's disastrous handling of Australia's role in the Vietnam conflict (prior to its demise in December 1972) resulted in:—
 1. widespread destruction of property and innocent human life including the needless sacrifice of more than 600 young Australians;
 2. cruel continuation of the conflict because of Liberal Government's opposition to efforts by the United States Government to refer the Vietnam conflict to the United Nations Organization;
 3. the diminution of Australia's standing in the eyes of its Asian neighbours, all of whom (with the exceptions of South Korea and Taiwan—acting as United States satellites) steadfastly refused to become involved in the internal affairs of another nation;
 4. an extension of the conflict which has produced two million deaths and countless orphans, homeless refugees and maimed people;
 5. a devastating attack upon a peasant people involving the heaviest bombing and the greatest level of fire power used in history;
 6. some of the world's finest old centres of civilization being transformed into cities of death and disease;
 7. a loss of confidence in western civilization;
 8. pressure upon the Vietnamese people to surrender their cherished independence from China and all other foreign countries;

and that now, Liberal and Country party members have failed to disguise the blatant insincerity of their headlong rush to squeeze every drop of cheap political mileage from a campaign of fear and hatred.

This present insincerity is illustrated by—

- (1) their refusal to assist financially (in any meaningful way on a State level) the Australian Government's efforts to relieve the problems of refugees and orphans in Vietnam;
- (2) their refusal to face up to and support the logical extension of their policy which is the recommitment of young Australian soldiers to the war;
- (3) their approval—as proved by their silent acceptance of plans by extremist groups to raise private armies to fight in Vietnam;
- (4) their long stand in the continued and irrational support of the corrupt and cruel Thieu regime which does not enjoy the support of even the people it purports to rule.

MR B. T. BURKE (Balga) [5.08 p.m.]: I would first of all like to touch briefly on the Press coverage—or lack of it—following the moving of this amendment by the member for Ascot. I was surprised to see that this was the only amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply which failed to attract even scant Press coverage in the daily papers.

Mr Grayden: It was not worthy of comment.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The only reason I can advance for the failure in this case lies perhaps in the search of some journalists and news-gathering organisations for spurious balance with which to temper their behaviour. It might have been that certain news gatherers or reporters considered the item should not be reported prior to the Government having an opportunity to answer the case presented.

The only comment I would make is that it seems to be undesirable to adopt this fruitless search for some spurious sort of balance if it leaves unreported the facts of the situation which has occurred.

In moving the amendment, the member for Ascot dwelt for some moments on the League of Rights. I intend also to touch upon the league in its context as a fertiliser for some of the more extreme right-wing views held by members opposite. There is no doubt that the League of Rights is an extreme fanatical and dangerous organisation.

Sir Charles Court: What has that to do with the amendment?

Mr B. T. BURKE: Ken Gibbett, who is a member of the small but dangerous Nazi Party, is also a member of the League of Rights about which he says—

The League is obviously very sympathetic to Nazism. At League of Rights meetings we talk about the same things as at Nazi Party meetings. The only difference is that there are no uniforms, no flags and no references to Adolf Hitler.

So it is quite plain that even the germ of the League of Rights is a very potent fertiliser capable of producing extreme views once it has trickled its way down through the different layers of opinion-forming to result in extreme views at even the highest level of decision making.

During 1974 a well liked and respected member of the community I represent approached me with a letter he had received. The letter was from a doctor in Dianella and it referred to a seminar organised by the League of Rights. The seminar was to be held in the suburb of Morley and the pamphlet which was received by my friend invited him to attend.

The seminar boasted as one of its major speakers the member for Moore! This is the background to the conservative and cruel platitudes which came forth and which, when translated into Government policy, produced the slaughter of millions of people. This is the background to the sort of statement made by the member for Moore in this Chamber recently and the sort of statements that were at once appalling and pathetic—appalling, pathetic, and ill suited to this Chamber in 1975.

The one undeniable fact regarding Vietnam and its military struggle is that there is just one country involved. Vietnam has never consisted of two political entities; Vietnam has ever been one country. There are certainly parallels which stretch over a period of 19 years in Vietnam's history. The final declaration of the 1954 Geneva conference laid down that there was just one country and provided for reunification after free elections. The 1973 Paris peace talks laid down also, in article 15, that the military demarcation line between the two zones—the seventeenth parallel—was only a provisional, and not a political or a territorial boundary as provided for in the final declaration of the 1954 Geneva conference.

There can be no doubt that the existence of North Vietnam and South Vietnam was a provisional existence that was catered for firstly at the Geneva conference and, secondly, at the Paris peace talks, which would allow for the reunification of the country and the participation in responsible government of the parties involved in the conflict.

The second parallel I would like to draw attention to concerns the provisions made by both agreements for the political reunification of the country. As I have mentioned, the Geneva conference in 1954 laid down quite clearly that free elections should be held to reunify the country. The Paris peace agreement also foresaw free elections and responsible government by the parties involved in the conflict. That agreement provided for a national reconciliation council, in article 6, which reads as follows —

Immediately after the cease-fire, the South Vietnamese parties shall hold consultations in a spirit of national reconciliation and concord, mutual respect, and mutual non-elimination to set up a national council of national reconciliation and concord of three equal segments . . . After the National Council of National Reconciliation and Concord has assumed its functions, the two South Vietnamese parties will consult about the formation of councils at lower levels. The two South Vietnamese parties shall sign an Agreement on the internal matters of South Vietnam as soon as possible and do their utmost to accomplish this within ninety days after the cease-fire comes into effect.

So we see the existence of two parallels. The first was that at Geneva, and subsequently some 19 years later it was agreed in Paris, there was one Vietnam. The second parallel was that at both conferences provisions were made that following a ceasefire free elections should be held.

The third, and perhaps most crucial parallel that can be drawn, is that the regime in South Vietnam was responsible for causing a breakdown of the provisions and the arrangements which had been foreseen by the conferences.

Sir Charles Court: Do you intend to tell us your grounds for that statement?

Mr B. T. BURKE: Yes.

Mr Grayden: That statement has been contradicted by the Prime Minister.

Mr B. T. BURKE: After the 1954 Geneva conference the Saigon regime stated quite clearly that it would not hold free elections and that is why the provisions laid down were not complied with.

Mr McPharlin: Has there ever been a free election?

Mr B. T. BURKE: After the Paris peace agreement the Saigon Government refused to take into the reconciliation council, as foreseen in the agreement, the Provisional Revolutionary Government. On both occasions then the South Vietnamese Government refused to obey the provisions of the peace agreements which laid down conditions for a political settlement.

What happened subsequently cost millions of lives. The two greatest powers in the world lined up behind the combatants in that terrible conflict. On the one hand there was Russia, intent on a North Vietnamese victory, and on the other hand America supporting South Vietnam. Both countries were quite willing to use one of the oldest and most civilised countries in the world as a pawn in the game.

The present situation is one to which this Government has often alluded in its deprecation of the actions of the Australian Government. The present situation is that the Thieu regime provoked the massive communist successes in South Vietnam.

Mr McPharlin: Millions have been slaughtered.

Mr B. T. BURKE: According to United States Defence Secretary Schlesinger—as he was reported on the 31st March—

It was Saigon's withdrawal rather than a communist general offensive which was the primary cause of the government of Vietnam's present difficulties.

So, if it was the slaughter of innocent people, as the Deputy Premier would claim, the United States Defence Secretary says that the Saigon Government is responsible for the slaughter.

On the 3rd April, President Ford said—

A unilateral decision to withdraw created the chaotic situation that exists now. It was a unilateral decision by President Thieu.

So, if there was a slaughter of millions President Ford claims that the Saigon Government was to blame.

One of the most experienced political correspondents to have reported the conflict in South Vietnam is no doubt Denis Warner.

When speaking about the success which North Vietnam has achieved in recent weeks, he said—

The shattering loss of central Vietnam, which has swung the balance of forces entirely in Hanoi's favour, was not caused by enemy action but by hideous blunders in Saigon.

So if the Deputy Premier wishes to maintain his stance and say that someone must be blamed for the slaughter of millions, or of thousands, let him line up in opposition to President Ford, Mr Schlesinger and Mr Warner.

Mr McPharlin: Who is the aggressor?

Mr B. T. BURKE: Let the Deputy Premier line up against those who have different views. If he does we will see him assume his natural stance on the far right of the political spectrum.

Now let us talk about the democratic Government which has been quoted by the Minister for Immigration. This State Government is so keen to prop up the

Government of South Vietnam that it runs to the ridiculous lengths of saying that the South Vietnamese Government was democratically elected. That is what has been said in this House by a spokesman for this Government.

Mr Young: By observers throughout the world.

Mr B. T. BURKE: We will hear about it. In 1971 President Thieu was re-elected unopposed with the sort of majority that not even this Premier would lay claim to. A total of 87.9 per cent of the people polled, and of those 94.8 voted in favour of Thieu.

Mr Hartrey: He is naturally popular.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I will quote from *Keesing's Contemporary Archives*, November 20-27, 1971 as follows—

Foreign observers, however, were sceptical of the official figures. In Da Nang 76 per cent of the electorate was said to have voted, despite the fighting in the streets, and in Hue, where local officials described the poll as "extremely light", the provincial authorities claimed that 67.1 per cent of the electors had voted. The *Daily Telegraph* correspondent pointed out that in Binh Dinh province, where 92.6 per cent of the electorate was officially stated to have voted, not more than 60 per cent of the population lived in areas firmly controlled by the Government.

So we are propping up a Government which claimed to have had massive success with a 92 per cent poll in an area where only 60 per cent of the population were controlled by that Government. Vice-President Ky, who by no manner of means can be expected to occupy the far left or pro-communist stance, says this about those elections—

Vice-President Ky described the result on Oct. 6 as "a flagrant fraud", and 70 senators and deputies announced on Oct. 14 that they regarded the election as "illegal".

I am amazed that President Thieu does not import to practise as the opposition in his country the Minister for Immigration, who would have been very happy to see the way the election was carried out. In fact, he refers to it as "a democratic decision".

Mr Grayden: The Australian observers considered it was carried out democratically.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Vice-President Ky and General Minh, both of whom have held a non-communist stance throughout the entire conflict, withdrew from the presidency, saying they could not trust Thieu. The article goes on to say—

General Minh announced on Aug. 20 his decision to withdraw from the election, describing it as "a contemptible farce which will make the people

lose all hope of a democratic regime and prevent a reconciliation among the Vietnamese people". At the same time he released a document alleged to have been sent to province chiefs instructing them to work for President Thieu's re-election and to intimidate supporters of other candidates.

If that is the kind of democratically elected Government which the Minister for Immigration wants to support, let that sin be on his head.

Mr Grayden: I will shortly quote some comments of reputable observers.

Mr B. T. BURKE: If the free elections to which the Minister is so fond of referring took place, why did both of President Thieu's opponents withdraw from the race?

Mr Grayden: For many reasons.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Most of them concerning the graft, corruption, political pressure, and terrorism which the man the Minister claims to be a paragon of virtue and justice implemented in his wild attempts to retain the presidency.

Let us now talk about the refugees—one of the issues the Minister so often wants to talk about—and see what *Time* magazine had to say in its latest issue. *Time* has some reputation for being an accurate reporter and interpreter of events, although hardly one which would line up on the side of the Labor Party in this House. This is what *Time* magazine says in regard to the refugees—

It would be a mistake to conclude, however, that the majority of refugees are fleeing south for purely political reasons. Caught between two warring systems, most would probably prefer to avoid both. Unfortunately, very few are rich enough or sufficiently well connected to do so.

Mr McPharlin: Why are they fleeing?

Mr Taylor: For the same reason that you and I would.

Mr B. T. BURKE: For the benefit of the Deputy Premier, I will quote again the first few words—

It would be a mistake to conclude, however, that the majority of refugees are fleeing south for purely political reasons. Caught between two warring systems, most would probably prefer to avoid both.

Mr McPharlin: That does not answer my question.

Mr Stephens: They could have gone north to get the benefit of the Government you seem to be supporting.

Mr B. T. BURKE: From the wilderness comes the voice of the Chief Secretary, putting it to me that the South Vietnamese people should flee from the fighting by crossing the front lines of the advancing North Vietnamese. General Jubilation

T. Cornpone led his troops in somewhat the same manner—retreating by advancing over the enemy's front lines. *Time* magazine continued—

Panic implanted only one compelling, overriding desire in the minds of its victims: to flee and then flee again until they were safe beyond the fighting.

That is what *Time* magazine reports—

Sir Charles Court: What do you say?

Mr B. T. BURKE: —from its experienced correspondents, informing the world of the situation which exists.

Sir Charles Court: Why are you so keen on supporting and trying to vindicate the actions of these communist Governments?

Mr Jamieson: You were silly enough to let him introduce it.

Sir Charles Court: This is your motion.

Mr Taylor: You let him go.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Jamieson: You do not like it.

Mr B. T. BURKE: With your forbearance, Mr Speaker, I would like to continue my speech and refer to those politically tinted subjects which the Premier so often throws into the debate. *Time* magazine says quite clearly that panic-stricken refugees were intent only on fleeing, and fleeing again, until they were safe.

Mr McPharlin: If the North Vietnamese are the benefactors you say they are, why do they not stay there? They are not the benefactors you indicate they are.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The fact of the matter is that people who were confronted with an oncoming mass of North Vietnamese regular army troops had no alternative but to take to their heels and flee the fighting. The Chief Secretary would have them cross the front line of the North Vietnamese and settle at the rear. In any situation like this it is reasonable to expect people—

Mr Clarko: To run where they will do best.

Mr B. T. BURKE: That is right—to run away from the centre of conflict.

Now let us talk about the situation of the refugees and this Government's attitude towards them. It was only yesterday the Government announced its intention to do anything—

Mr Grayden: Rubbish!

Mr B. T. BURKE: —and then, in response to the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said it was the intention of the Government to donate \$10 000. By the time the Government gets around to doing anything the \$10 000 will be gratefully received by the North Vietnamese in Saigon.

Sir Charles Court: Do you know how much South Australia and Tasmania are going to donate?

Mr B. T. BURKE: I have not heard the Premier of South Australia (Mr Dunstan) raising the hoo-ha which the Premier of this State consistently raises. If the Premier is so concerned, upset, and aggrieved, let him put his money where his mouth is; let him do something concrete to relieve the plight of the refugees; and let him not gain any relief by referring to what other States are doing.

Sir Charles Court: We have made our decision—and a more generous one than that of most other States.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Furthermore, the Government's decision is not in accordance with what it so often says. On the other hand, the Australian Government, in its efforts to relieve the situation suffered and endured by the refugees, is leading the world. The Australian Government has donated \$3.4 million to international organisations offering humanitarian aid to South Vietnam.

Mr Stephens: It also gave economic aid to North Vietnam to assist in the aggression south, I believe.

Mr B. T. BURKE: It seems this Government, which is not prepared to do anything worth while, is constantly prepared to criticise a Government which says, "Past national Governments led by the Liberal and Country Parties have committed very grave sins in the name of Australia; notwithstanding our complete lack of involvement in those decisions, we will make reparation and lead the world by donating \$3.4 million towards refugee relief." This State Government does nothing.

The amendment in particular mentions four points. The first is as follows—

This present insincerity is illustrated by—

- (1) their refusal to assist financially (in any meaningful way on a State level) the Australian Government's efforts to relieve the problems of refugees and orphans in Vietnam;

Now if anybody on that side of the House believes that a donation of \$10 000 is appropriate—

Mr Grayden: It went beyond that. I will tell you about it later on.

Mr B. T. BURKE: —let him say so; let him release details to the public. If the Minister for Immigration has another missing file mystery up his sleeve, do not let him hide his light under a bushel. Let him come forward to tell us of the sterling work that is being done by this Government.

Mr Grayden: That is precisely what I am going to do.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The facts of the matter are that precisely nothing at all was raised until yesterday when the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier what the

Government intended to do. The Premier had already been confronted with this particular amendment, and he also knew what the other States were going to do.

Sir Charles Court: I believe that \$10 000 from this State is quite adequate when composed with the amount given by the Commonwealth with all its facilities.

Mr Jamieson: That is only part of it.

Sir Charles Court: He asked for a specific figure. How much do you want us to donate? You are trying to fool the public again.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Paragraph (2) refers to the refusal of Liberal and Country Party members in this House to face up to the logical extension of their policy which they espouse so frequently.

If the Government is so keen to attack the Australian Government, and if it is so keen to protect the South Vietnamese, then let it stand up to say that it will recommit Australian troops to the conflict.

Mr O'Connor: To the slaughter, you mean.

Mr B. T. BURKE: Why does not the Government follow its policy to its logical conclusion? Why will it not say that Australian men should be sent back to Vietnam? Of course it will not.

Mr Speaker, this Government will do nothing unless it stands to gain some percentage. There is no political percentage at all in recommitting Australia's best young men to the war in Vietnam. This Government will refuse to do so, but at the same time, it criticises volubly the honest and sincere attempts of the Australian Government.

Our Australian Government has been unequivocal on the position of Vietnam since the conflict first started. The members of our Australian Government have said consistently that Australian troops should not be engaged in that war.

The exponents of this war philosophy said it was right for us to be in Vietnam. Well, let them have the sincerity to continue to say things of that sort. Let the Government stand up and say that it is in favour of sending our troops back, and if it does not favour that, then let it keep its peace.

In the past few weeks we have seen extremist organisations making plans to return to Vietnam in a private capacity. These plans have been roundly criticised by the Australian Government, as surely they should have been. However, there has been complete silence on the part of the Liberal Party representatives and spokesmen. Does this mean that the Premier of this State, along with those other people who share his ideals and philosophies, hope that these private armies will succeed; hope that these private armies will bring upon Australia a similar sort of shame that we endured as a result—

Sir Charles Court: Did you say that I had advocated private armies?

Mr B. T. BURKE: —of the decision first made by the Menzies Government.

Sir Charles Court: Did you say that I had advocated private armies?

Mr B. T. BURKE: If the Premier wishes to talk to the Deputy Premier, I ask him to cease interjecting because obviously he is not listening to what I am saying. As a result, his interjections do not make sense.

Sir Charles Court: I am trying to find out what you said. We never advocated private armies.

Mr B. T. BURKE: The point I want to make is this: The Liberal Party's long and lone stand in supporting a corrupt and cruel regime has brought Australia into disrepute. There is no doubt that the Thieu regime is as cruel and as heartless as that which the Government claims persists in North Vietnam. There is no doubt that the Thieu regime is far more insensitive to the feelings of the people it pretends to rule than that in North Vietnam; and there is no doubt that by supporting this sort of regime we do nothing for Australia's reputation in the eyes of the world.

We know, and we have heard on previous occasions, the florid and inflammatory remarks which are the stock in trade of the Minister for Immigration. On one occasion we were led through the maze of the second World War, to see stakes cut from the bodies of still quivering Australian soldiers. No doubt today we will be treated to a similar exhibition; no doubt today, with great bluster and very little aplomb, this Minister will stand up to tell us how the Thieu regime was democratically elected. No doubt the Minister will tell us of the mass slaughter of refugees, ignoring the fact that we have heard from reliable sources that refugees have as much to fear from the South Vietnamese as they have from the North Vietnamese.

No doubt the Minister will use an emotional basis to talk about the cost in human lives, ignoring the fact that this Government has failed to make good its idle boast about what should be done.

Mr McPharlin: Your speech will be a great morale-booster to the people of South Vietnam. You are supporting the communists.

Mr B. T. BURKE: I am beginning to believe that if the Deputy Premier did not have the firm hand of the Premier on his shoulder, he would stand up to recommit our troops at one blow.

Mr Bertram: His shoulder or his neck?

Mr B. T. BURKE: No, that is a foot on his neck. We have also heard the statements made by the Deputy Prime Minister (Dr Cairns) and we have also experienced the manner in which those statements are referred to by this Government and its spokesmen as being alarmingly anarchistic.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. It will be difficult to try to divorce the motion to be moved by the Minister from the amendment now before the House. I ask members to endeavour with all the means at their command, to refrain from referring to Dr Cairns and his statements in this particular debate. I ask members to divorce the two matters in so far as they are able.

Mr B. T. **BURKE**: Let me just say that Dr Cairns has been consistent throughout this whole conflict.

Sir Charles Court: I'll say he has; consistently pro-communist in his sympathies.

Mr B. T. **BURKE**: Let us trace back through the factors that have influenced so vividly the attitude of this Government. Let us trace back to the potent fertiliser of the League of Rights. There has been no denial about the League of Rights from members on the other side of the House. I have no doubt that if any member on this side of the House appeared on the platform at a meeting arranged and organised by the Communist Party, we would never hear the end of it. However, the fascist right wing is able to boast that, amongst its hardware, it has members who sit on the other side of the House. Of course, we hear no denial from the Deputy Premier, because certainly he is—

Mr Young: Can you name some of the members you said that the right wing boasted amongst its numbers? Can you name any members who sit on this side of the House?

Mr Blaikie: Who are they?

Mr B. T. **BURKE**: At the risk of upsetting the Secretary of the Cabinet, I refuse to fill in the gaps in his information caused by his constant absences from the Chamber. Let us look at the fertiliser; let us see the result—the plant that has been nourished and has flourished with the fertiliser. This man now occupies one of the highest positions in the topmost decision-making body in the State. This now explains the cruel and pathetic attitudes so often expressed. It now explains why the Leader of this State, the Premier of this State, is not prepared to follow on from his wild outbursts to say that we should recommit our troops.

Sir Charles Court: What is this all about? God, you are just ranting and raving, like your man from Ascot.

Mr B. T. **BURKE**: In the same way as millions of people were slaughtered during the bombings of Haiphong and Hanoi, thousands are now losing their lives in Vietnam, and that is something everyone in this Chamber deplors. However, what has happened on this occasion is that the State Government, to attract political advantage, gave notice of a motion, and has been caught—as Mr Fraser so aptly put it—with its pants down. This Government

has been beaten to the punch, and it is now embarrassed—

Mr Rushton: Is that all you are worried about?

Mr B. T. **BURKE**: —by its inability to confront the arguments presented from this side of the House.

The Minister for Urban Development and Town Planning interjected and asked whether that is all I am worried about. Of course it is not. However, the introduction into debate in this Chamber of a motion by the Minister for Labour and Industry is a deliberate attempt to gain political mileage. It is a deliberate attempt to gain political mileage at the expense of a situation that should never have found its way into debate in this House. The attitudes and philosophies of the Western Australian Government are riddled with contradictions. There can be no escaping the fact that politicians of the philosophy and ideology of members opposite forced Australia into a conflict in which it should have had no part. There is no doubt that the then Australian Government—which was a Government of the philosophy of the present State Government—lied to the Australian people; and it lied and lied and lied.

Sir Charles Court: On what basis do you make that allegation against the Federal Government?

Mr B. T. **BURKE**: I will tell the Premier the basis. That Government lied and lied by saying repeatedly that we were invited into South Vietnam in 1973. When the relevant papers were tabled in the House of Representatives they showed quite conclusively—

Sir Charles Court: To you.

Mr B. T. **BURKE**: —that South Vietnam accepted the initiative offered on our behalf.

Sir Charles Court: That is your interpretation of it.

Mr Jamieson: It is not an interpretation; it is a fact.

Sir Charles Court: It may be your interpretation and Mr Whitlam's interpretation, but it is not the interpretation of the world.

Mr B. T. **BURKE**: The facts of the matter are facts that are on record. This Government has assisted to maintain and prolong the disrepute into which our name was plunged by a national Government of its political complexion.

I conclude by sounding a warning: the intemperate remarks of the Minister for Labour and Industry, that will surely follow as night follows day, should be digested with perhaps more than a grain of salt.

Mr Hartrey: It makes them more palatable, anyway.

MR GRAYDEN (South Perth—Minister for Labour and Industry) [5.42 p.m.]: Before I get onto the amendment I would like to place the debate in perspective by reminding members of the reason that Australia gave assistance to Vietnam. We were in Vietnam because we believed in the right of people to be free.

Mr Bertram: Who did?

Mr GRAYDEN: We were in Vietnam because we responded to an appeal for aid against aggression, and because the security and stability of South-East Asia is so vital to the security and stability of Australia.

Sir Charles Court: That is the vital thing members opposite overlook.

Mr GRAYDEN: We were there because we wanted peace and not war—

Mr Jamieson: Peace at your price.

Mr GRAYDEN: —and because we wanted independence, not serfdom, to be the lot of the people of Asia.

Mr Davies: Yes, they had good independence; I remember.

Mr GRAYDEN: We were there because we believed that our great Pacific ally, the United States, should not stand alone for freedom. Those are virtually the words of a previous Prime Minister (Mr Harold Holt); and they are the reasons that America and Australia went to the assistance of the South Vietnamese.

Turning to the amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply by the member for Ascot, I would like to say at the outset that the statements it contains are so ridiculous and so patently false that in actual fact the amendment does not warrant comment or debate.

Mr Skidmore: Then sit down.

Mr GRAYDEN: Many of the comments contained in this remarkable amendment—

Mr Skidmore: Now it is a remarkable amendment.

Mr GRAYDEN: —appear to be lifted straight from the pages of *Pravda*, the *Tribune*, or some other communist document.

Mr Davies: Mao's red book?

Mr Bertram: Would you supply evidence to support that statement?

Mr GRAYDEN: The amendment is a reflection on the Labor Party. It does the party a great disservice.

Mr Skidmore: We have a great champion at last!

Mr GRAYDEN: The fact that it has been presented in this Chamber indicates to me the extent to which the radical new members opposite now dominate the Opposition. There is absolutely no doubt of that because whenever reference is made in this Parliament to South Vietnam, for instance, we invariably see these radical new

members congregating in a little group; and shortly afterwards we see action taken, such as an amendment of the kind we are now discussing. We constantly see such action taken, and it is taken over the heads of those who sit on the front benches of the Opposition.

Mr Taylor: Do you know that they took part in moratorium marches before they even arrived in Parliament?

Mr GRAYDEN: We see this small group of radical members constantly coming forward, and the rest of the Opposition simply goes along with what they put forward.

Mr Skidmore: Name the radicals.

Mr GRAYDEN: Mr Speaker, I think the amendment has a value. It will remain forever, in black and white, a reminder to the people of Australia that the views of the Labor Opposition in this House at present are synonymous with those of the communist insurgents who at the moment are endeavouring to overthrow the constitutionally elected Government of South Vietnam.

Mr Jamieson: History will show what a clot you are.

Mr GRAYDEN: So the amendment definitely has some value. It will be a permanent reminder to the people of Australia that the views of the Opposition on this issue are synonymous with the views of the communists.

Mr Hartrey: And those of the United States at this present minute.

Mr Skidmore: Don't get technical.

Mr GRAYDEN: For that reason I express gratitude to the member for Ascot for the insight he has given members of this House into the views of his party. I express my gratitude to him for giving the people of Western Australia an insight into how Labor members feel in regard to the issue of South Vietnam. At the same time I express my abhorrence of virtually every sentiment mentioned in the amendment.

I have in my hand a copy of the *Tribune*, an Australian communist weekly.

Mr Davies: Where did you get it?

Mr GRAYDEN: It contains many statements—

Mr Skidmore: I will get you removed from Mao's list.

Mr GRAYDEN: —which are virtually identical with the sentiments expressed in the amendment to the Address-in-Reply moved by the member for Ascot, which clearly has the support of the Opposition. Just listen to some of the comments in the editorial of this publication and see how they are almost identical with some of the comments made by members opposite. It states—

The war in Indo-China is almost over, though the fighting continues. The crushing defeats inflicted upon the disintegrating Thieu and Phnom Penh regimes are irreversible. They are

beyond salvation, no matter what the United States may yet do. With true class instinct, reactionaries everywhere are shaken to the core.

Further on, it says—

Learning nothing and forgetting nothing, US imperialism and its followers are searching desperately for a new way of fighting the national liberation revolutions and working class struggle in the capitalist countries.

Australian reactionaries were always among the most pro-American and anti-Asian, shown in their active support in Korea and Vietnam. They always crudely exploited anti-Asian sentiment to push through their military expenditures and conscription, and as a political device.

It goes on to say—

The controllers of US imperialism, the men of the multi-nationals, of the Pentagon and of the administration see the end of imperialism as the end of civilisation. "Better dead than Red" is the essence of this imperialist policy, and of Fraser's. It is false and stupid, but it is also dangerous.

This newspaper is riddled with comments of that kind. So far we have had two speeches on the amendment from the Opposition; one from the member for Ascot, and one from the member for Balga.

Any person going through the speeches in this debate made by members of the Opposition will find comments which are virtually synonymous with the sentiments expressed in the communist newspaper from which I have just quoted. This amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion contains the same sort of sentiments. In fact, the Labor Opposition in Western Australia has aligned itself with the Communist Party.

Mr Bateman: Rubbish!

Mr GRAYDEN: It is not rubbish; anyone going through this communist paper, or the many other publications of a similar type, will find the same sort of sentiments expressed as have been put forward by members of the Opposition during this debate. So, quite clearly, the attitude of members opposite is synonymous with the attitude of the communist insurgents in Vietnam.

I was rather interested to hear the member for Balga refer to the fact that this amendment did not receive any Press publicity. I would have thought that after the member for Ascot moved the amendment, members opposite would have discovered the error of their ways and realised to their dismay that the amendment would remain forever in the pages of *Hansard* as a permanent indictment of the Labor Party. It is there in black and white to

tell the people of Western Australia the views of the Opposition. Members opposite moved an amendment—

Mr B. T. Burke: And we are proud of it.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Balga says that he is proud of it; proud to stand behind the communist invaders from the north in Vietnam who are now in the process of overthrowing a constitutionally elected Government

If one consulted the *Webster's Dictionary* or any other dictionary one would find the words, "anarchist" and, "insurgent". "Anarchist" means a person who is in opposition to the law and an insurgent is someone who is actively trying to overthrow a constitutionally elected Government. So, members of the Opposition brand themselves as insurgents; by taking such an attitude they are in sympathy with insurgents.

Mr B. T. Burke: They did not overthrow Diem; they simply murdered him!

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Balga referred to the elections which have taken place in South Vietnam; I would like to make a couple of points in relation to that matter. The honourable member very conveniently forgot to make any reference to the position in North Vietnam. We all know that North Vietnam has a totalitarian Government; no free elections are known to have taken place in North Vietnam under the present administration. There is censorship in North Vietnam and, therefore, we do not receive reports of the massacres, atrocities, and other happenings which have taken place in that country.

Mr Skidmore: How do you know they have occurred?

Mr GRAYDEN: Neither the member for Balga nor the member for Ascot referred to the fact that North Vietnam is a totalitarian regime and that no elections take place. Instead, members opposite are virtually saying that the elections which took place in South Vietnam—which has a parliamentary system closely approximating systems in our own type of western democracy—were not conducted in a satisfactory manner. They overlooked the fact that while the elections were taking place, South Vietnam was under attack by the communist insurgents from the north. The South Vietnamese were subjected to all sorts of terrorist activities by the Viet Cong, which was trying to prevent the success of the elections.

As the member for Balga has placed such emphasis on this point, I should like to give the House a brief history of the elections which have taken place in South Vietnam. Nationwide elections were held on the 11th September, 1966. As a result, a nationally constituted assembly with 117 deputies was formed, a new constitution

was drafted and a president, a vice-president, and members of the Senate and House of Representatives were elected. The presidential and senatorial elections were held on the 3rd September, 1967, and those for the lower House were held on the 22nd October, 1966.

At those elections— notwithstanding the fact that South Vietnam was under attack from the north and that all sorts of terrorist activities were taking place as a result of Viet Cong operations—President Thieu was elected for a four-year term. Following the elections for the lower House in August, 1971—at which, incidentally, Opposition candidates increased their strength—President Thieu was returned unopposed as President for a second four-year term, which was due to expire at the end of August, 1975.

Mr Hartrey: He will not last that long.

Mr Skidmore: He will not last three weeks!

Mr GRAYDEN: This Government was constitutionally elected; observers from all over the world were present.

Mr Barnett: He may have been constitutionally elected, but his own people are bombing him out of office now.

Mr O'Connor: Are you a communist sympathiser?

Mr GRAYDEN: Observers from 41 countries were invited to observe the elections to ensure that they were carried out in a free way. However, only 10 countries accepted the invitation; they were the United States of America, Australia, New Zealand, Belgium, Great Britain, Morocco, Greece, Laos, Japan, and the Philippines.

I should like to refer members to some of the Press comments relating to those elections. For instance, the *New York Times* printed the following comment in respect of the elections—

Despite Viet Cong terrorism, the turnout of voters was substantial. Most observers believe that, on the whole, the voting was fairly conducted.

Mr Skidmore: On the whole!

Mr GRAYDEN: Yes, on the whole, because all sorts of terrorist activities were taking place. The Viet Cong was going out of its way to prevent the elections from being held; South Vietnam was under constant attack from the north. Nobody has ever claimed that the Government of South Vietnam is perfect, or that it is identical with the sort of Government one would expect to find in Western Australia. However, it was making a valiant attempt to attain that standard of democracy.

We contrast the situation in South Vietnam with the totalitarian regime in North Vietnam, where there have never been free elections of any kind.

Mr Skidmore: Is it wrong for countries not to have elections?

Mr GRAYDEN: Let us have a look at some of the comments which have been made in respect of those elections. I refer firstly to the proceedings in the Commonwealth Parliament at the time; many questions were asked about these elections. A question was asked by Mr Uren of Mr Hasluck, who made the following extremely relevant reply—

The team of observers appointed to observe the elections in Vietnam was drawn from a corps of people who are professionally trained and experienced in the job of reporting events in foreign lands.

Mr Barnett: The CIA!

Mr GRAYDEN: To continue—

In that respect they have qualifications as high as could be found anywhere else in Australia. As for impartiality, they belong to a Public Service which, when it thinks of the Government of Australia, I am sure does not think of a government drawn from any party but is prepared, in the traditions of the Public Service—

He was referring to the Australian Public Service. To continue—

—to serve whatever government of Australia is created by the people of Australia. I would hope that this House generally would not assume that because any officer is a member of the Commonwealth Public Service he ceases to be capable of complete political impartiality. Furthermore, the job to be done is one that requires some experience of foreign countries.

In addition to a report from the team we have appointed we will receive as an official report to the Government the report from our own Ambassador. That will be a confidential report as his reports normally are.

Here is Mr Hasluck, a responsible Minister in the Commonwealth Parliament, indicating at that time, in reply to a question, that Australia was sending to Vietnam its own observers, drawn from the Public Service—and he went to great pains to stress that our Public Service is impartial. He pointed out that when those observers returned they reported extremely favourably on the elections held in South Vietnam. As a consequence, Mr Hasluck was able to make the statement that the reports had been reasonable, fair, and proper and had been supported by the Australian ambassador in Saigon, Mr L. H. Raven.

A great deal more was said about this matter in the Commonwealth Parliament. Later on, in a ministerial statement, Mr Hasluck said—

The Australian observers visited Vietnam from 27th August to 16th September. Either as a group or individually they visited each of the

four military corps areas and twelve of the country's forty-four provinces, almost entirely on inspections of their own choice.

Further on in his statement he went on to say—

In all, on election day, Australian observers inspected 38 polling stations, 93 polling rooms and 9 counting places.

Again, in the same statement, he said—

The report which I have tabled provides a balanced and careful assessment of the electoral processes, based on a comprehensive study of the relevant texts.

He also made the following statement—

The Australian observers recognise that time and distance inevitably set limits to the personal observations and discussions on which their findings are based. At the same time they note that their collective conclusions were not markedly different from those of other foreign government observers and of many correspondents. The main conclusions of the Australian observers are outlined in paragraph 82 of their report. In particular they concluded that the election laws had been drafted very carefully to fit Vietnamese conditions and to ensure, so far as laws can ensure, that the elections would be genuine. Secondly, they found that the election preparations and actual voting and counting procedures had been thoroughly prepared with a system of checks at every level. Thirdly, they found that, with some exceptions, these arrangements had been properly put into practice and that the safeguards had been effective.

Those are some of the comments made by members of the team that Australia sent to supervise the elections in South Vietnam. I go further to emphasise again that of the 41 countries that were invited to send observers to these elections, only 10 accepted the invitation. Therefore, in this House, how can the member for Balga, the member for Ascot, or any other member at this particular time try to discredit the present Government of South Vietnam—

Mr Jamieson: What did the American commission say?

Mr GRAYDEN: —which has been elected with popular support? How can those members do this? Here we have a constitutionally accepted Government under attack from communist insurgents bent on overthrowing that Government and massacring many of its people, and yet, despite this, we have in this State of Western Australia a Labor Opposition supporting those communist insurgents. Does

that make the members of the Opposition insurgents, or does it simply make them insurgent sympathisers?

Mr Skidmore: It would be interesting to know what you consider an insurgent to be.

Mr GRAYDEN: An insurgent is one who would overthrow a constitutionally accepted government. Every communist supporter in Australia and throughout the world is advocating precisely what the Opposition members are advocating; namely, the overthrow of the South Vietnamese Government which, as I say, was constitutionally elected.

The Opposition members take pride in the fact—one even moved an amendment to the Address-in-Reply debate which indicated this—that it is in favour of the South Vietnamese Government being overthrown. The Opposition has spelt that out and what it has said will stand in black and white in *Hansard* for everyone in this country to see; that is, that members of the Opposition in this House went out of their way to make it clear that they support the communist insurgents in Vietnam in their attempts to overthrow a constitutionally elected Government.

Mr Bertram: Nonsense!

Mr GRAYDEN: We all know what happened in other countries such as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. In those countries a situation similar to that in South Vietnam has occurred; the overthrow of a constitutionally elected Government by communist insurgents. Yet we have the members of the Opposition supporting that sort of action.

Then we hear of people criticising the fact that an amendment to the Address-in-Reply, moved by a member of the Opposition, does not receive any publicity in the Press. I should have thought that, having had a second opportunity—that is, following the publication of the debate on the amendment in *Hansard*—they would be thoroughly ashamed of it and would remain quiet in the hope that it would be glossed over, but they have not. Instead they have criticised the Press because the debate on the amendment to the Address-in-Reply motion was not publicised. They are proud of the fact that they support these communist insurgents who attempt to overthrow a constitutionally elected Government.

Mr Jamieson: You and your Premier would have kept going the carnage in that country.

Mr GRAYDEN: Earlier I referred to the term "insurgent" and its meaning. I now have it before me. The definition of the word is—

Rising in active revolt.

That is precisely what has happened in Vietnam. There we find the communist insurgents, and members of the Opposition

support those communist insurgents and mouth the same phrases which those people have mouthed. I contend that makes every member of the Opposition an insurgent. The case is as cut-and-dried as that.

Mr Bertram: Absurd.

Mr GRAYDEN: How can members of the Opposition advocate and engage in anarchy, and not be anarchists themselves?

Mr Jamieson: Who is recommending anarchism?

Mr GRAYDEN: In this House we have members who have given their acknowledgment to the insurgents in Vietnam.

Mr Bertram: You had better get the person preparing your notes to put in words which you can read.

Mr GRAYDEN: The first part of the amendment moved by the member for Ascot—

Mr B. T. Burke: Is quite exceptional.

Mr GRAYDEN: —does not warrant any particular comment. I have referred to the preamble to the amendment. There were good reasons for Australian participation in the troubles in Vietnam.

Mr Barnett: Do you think we should go back into that country?

Mr GRAYDEN: I now refer to the part of the amendment which states—

2. cruel continuation of the conflict because of Liberal Government's opposition to efforts by the United States Government to refer the Vietnam conflict to the United Nations Organisation;

Of course what is stated in that part of the amendment is completely false. On the last occasion when the United States of America referred this question to the United Nations, it was bitterly denounced by the Viet Cong for taking that course of action.

The next part of the amendment is as follows—

3. the diminution of Australia's standing in the eyes of its Asian neighbours, all of whom (with the exceptions of South Korea and Taiwan—acting as United States satellites) steadfastly refused to become involved in the internal affairs of another nation;

The countries to which that part of the amendment to the motion refers are relatively small countries, and naturally they were busy defending themselves and trying to cope with the situation there. They remained out of the conflict in Vietnam, but their leaders were not hesitant to say what they thought of that conflict.

For instance, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the Prime Minister of Singapore, made a number of statements in relation to this very situation. He is on record as having

declared on more than one occasion that the communists were the aggressors, and that if South Vietnam fell all the little fishes in Asia would fall too. That was what the Prime Minister of Singapore said about the position in Vietnam. He was not prepared to intervene, for the reasons I have given and for certain other reasons. However, he did not hesitate in coming forward to say that in Vietnam the communists were the aggressors, and that if South Vietnam fell all the little fishes in Asia would fall too.

I wonder what Mr Lee Kuan Yew is thinking today! I also wonder what are the thoughts of the leaders of the other countries which he described as little fishes in Asia, in view of the deteriorating situation in Cambodia and South Vietnam! Mr Lee Kuan Yew made his view absolutely clear. Only the other day in Sydney he made a comment to the effect that statements made by some Ministers in the Commonwealth Government of Australia could have no other effect than to boost the morale of the communist insurgents, and destroy the morale of those striving to preserve freedom in South Vietnam. In the process he was directing his comments to the present Labor Government of Australia.

Notwithstanding all that, the member for Ascot has moved an amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply which includes the following—

3. the diminution of Australia's standing in the eyes of its Asian neighbours, all of whom (with the exceptions of South Korea and Taiwan—acting as United States satellites) steadfastly refused to become involved in the internal affairs of another nation;

Mr Hartrey: That is true.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Ascot included that statement in his amendment, despite the comments of the Prime Minister of Singapore, and the situation in South Korea, Taiwan, and all the other little countries which Mr Lee Kuan Yew referred to as the little fishes of Asia. I do not know what comments the leaders of those small countries have made, but certainly they have expressed views similar to that expressed by Mr Lee Kuan Yew.

We ought to get down to the crux of the amendment to the motion, and this appears in the concluding part of the amendment.

This present insincerity is illustrated by—

- (1) their refusal to assist financially (in any meaningful way on a State level) the Australian Government's efforts to relieve the problems of refugees and orphans in Vietnam;

Of course, that assertion can be refuted completely. In respect of this question the Western Australian Government has done everything asked of it by the Prime Minister of Australia, and in fact it has offered more in aid and contributions. For the benefit of the member for Balga I refer to a telex sent to the Prime Minister on the 3rd April.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr GRAYDEN: Prior to the tea suspension I was dealing with the first paragraph concerning the alleged insincerity of the Liberal and Country Party members. Part (1) reads—

This present insincerity is illustrated by—

- (1) their refusal to assist financially (in any meaningful way on a State level) the Australian Government's efforts to relieve the problems of refugees and orphans in Vietnam;

The member for Balga went a little further and gave the House the impression that the paragraph was completely justified. Therefore I would like to point out at this stage that the Western Australian Government has done everything asked of it by the Prime Minister and has, in fact, gone beyond that and has offered more than was asked of it by him.

We have heard all sorts of criticisms by the member for Balga of the Deputy Premier. It was the Deputy Premier who sent a telex to the Prime Minister on the 2nd April. At that stage he was Acting Premier and in the telex he stated that Western Australia was prepared—

... to assist through medical and technical services ...

He went further and said—

Please advise urgently of other ways we can help.

That was the action of the Deputy Premier.

In addition, and contrary to the submission of the member for Balga, the then Acting Premier (Mr O'Neil) replied in the following terms to a telegram he received from the Prime Minister about Vietnamese orphans—

Western Australia will be able to cater for 150 Vietnamese war orphans. We are prepared to receive the children sent to us in spite of the fact that some might not be accompanied by normal documentation... We will guarantee accommodation and care for any not chosen for adoption. Glad to maintain close liaison with your Dept of Labour and Immigration. We will attend to all medical needs and quarantine arrangements where necessary. We have alerted our regulatory authorities to step up adoption processing procedure.

In that reply, a further offer was made. This substantiates what I said earlier—that the Government has done everything required of it and has, in fact, gone further and asked the Commonwealth Government to suggest ways in which it could help.

That, of course, deals with that particular paragraph in the amendment.

Mr O'Neil: We also made a substantial cash donation.

Mr GRAYDEN: Yes. From what I have said it can be seen that the first paragraph is patently and palpably false and that alone would justify the rejection of the amendment.

Let us have a look at the next paragraph which reads—

This present insincerity is illustrated by—

- (2) their refusal to face up to and support the logical extension of their policy which is the recommitment of young Australian soldiers to the war;

That is a straightout false statement; there is not a vestige of truth in it. In those circumstances it is not worth while considering it any further, so we now come to paragraph (3) which reads—

This present insincerity is illustrated by—

- (3) their approval—as proved by their silent acceptance of plans by extremist groups to raise private armies to fight in Vietnam;

That statement also is completely untrue. There is no acceptance by the Liberal Party of plans by extremist groups to fight in Vietnam. Such an acceptance would be absolutely unthinkable, yet the statement is contained in an amendment to the Address-in-Reply. Again I say it is clearly false, and again this is justification for the amendment's rejection out of hand.

Mr Harman: It is false only in your opinion.

Mr GRAYDEN: There is not the slightest vestige of truth in it, and the member for Maylands knows that only too well.

Mr Harman: No he doesn't.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Maylands should know and of course he could not produce any evidence to prove what is contained in this particular paragraph.

Mr Harman: We are waiting for you to disprove it.

Mr GRAYDEN: I can tell the member for Maylands that I have been in the Liberal Party for a long time as have many other Liberal Party members on this side and there has never been a suggestion of a thing like that. It would be absolutely

unforgivable and I repeat that it is completely false, yet it finds a place in this amendment which is being supported by the Labor Opposition in this House.

The amendment goes on and states—
This present insincerity is illustrated by—

- (4) their long stand in the continued and irrational support of the corrupt and cruel Thieu regime which does not enjoy the support of even the people it purports to rule.

Again, a completely false statement. We have pointed out earlier that South Vietnam has a constitutionally elected government.

Mr Jamieson: Can you quote the Constitution?

Mr GRAYDEN: The Vietnamese forces now moving into the south come under a totalitarian government under which there are no elections of any kind. The elections in South Vietnam were conducted in front of observers from 10 nations. Actually, 41 nations were invited to send observers but only 10 attended. Australia sent a team of public servants and highly reputable individuals. Those observers came back and made it quite clear that the elections were conducted in a very reasonable manner indeed. Yet members of the Opposition want to include, in an amendment to the Address-in-Reply, a statement of the kind I have just quoted; one which is a straight-out falsehood. I do not think we need talk much longer in answering that particular amendment.

There are a few points I think we should touch on in view of the fact that they were mentioned by the member for Balga. The member for Maylands has been interjecting. He was not present for a half-hour before the tea suspension, and he does not know what has been said. He is being extremely vocal but if he had been here and heard some of the comments perhaps he would be less vocal. I will be interested to hear what he has to say on this subject.

Mr B. T. Burke: Why was not the member for the South-East Metropolitan Province allowed to move his own motion; why did the member for South Perth have to do it in this House?

Mr GRAYDEN: I do not know what the honourable member is talking about.

Mr O'Neill: We never do.

Mr GRAYDEN: We welcome the opportunity to reply to the amendment moved to the Address-in-Reply.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRAYDEN: I intend to quote some comments made by a very prominent member of the Labor Party on which I

would be interested to hear the remarks of the member for Maylands, or any other member on the other side of the House. I will quote from *The West Australian*, of the 9th September, 1966. That is some time ago, when the Vietnam campaign was in full swing. The article was headed, "Beazley Attacks Labor Policy On Viet Cong." Mr Beazley is the Federal Labor member for Fremantle. The article reads as follows—

CANBERRA, Thurs.—The Australian Labor Party policy of recognising the Viet Cong as a negotiating authority in Vietnam has been strongly criticised by a member of the party's federal caucus executive, Mr Beazley (W.A.).

He said that the acceptance of the Viet Cong as negotiators was the seal of approval on the strategy of war by subversion.

His comments are contained in a critical review of "Labor and foreign policy" in the current issue of *Australian Outlook*, the journal of the Australian Institute of International Affairs.

Mr Beazley was not misreported; he actually wrote this article and it is published. The article continues—

In the article, Mr Beazley also condemned the Victorian executive of the A.L.P.

He said that right from the earliest days of federation the Victorian executive—"and I mean a succession of ideologically contrasting Victorian executives—has developed the Midas touch of failure to the level of irresistible genius."

Later in the article it is stated—

He said that a party that was always resolving was always explaining.

He asked:

"How do you explain a strong defence policy while abolishing national service?"

"How do you explain respect for an alliance while withdrawing troops from the side of your allies?"

That is what the Federal Labor member for Fremantle said of Labor policies.

Mr B. T. Burke: When?

Mr O'Neill: In 1966.

Mr GRAYDEN: The article is dated the 9th September, 1966, and was published in *The West Australian*.

Mr O'Neill: Ask him his opinion now.

Mr GRAYDEN: His comments appeared in the journal of the *Australian Institute of International Affairs*. So we have a very prominent Federal Minister—a member of the Federal Caucus Executive—making statements such as these.

The SPEAKER: The Minister has five more minutes.

Mr GRAYDEN: I am sorry to hear that because I was informed I had unlimited time. Nevertheless, in the circumstances I will have to proceed a little faster through some of the points that have been raised. An interesting aspect, when dealing with the same article which I have already quoted, is what Mr Beazley said. The article continues—

... the Communist Party had a tripartite strategy, every point of which involved the Labor Party in a dilemma of extrication.

One point of the Communist Party policy was to make Marxism-Leninism the thinking of the Labor movement.

"The alienation of Roman Catholics is essential in this," Mr Beazley said:

"By the withdrawal of Roman Catholics to the D.L.P. in Victoria the Marxist-Leninist ideology has been enabled to occupy the vacuum.

"There are 230,000 who vote D.L.P. in Victoria and 6,000 who vote Communist.

Dr Cairns, in his book *Silence Kills*, emphasised there were 700 000 Roman Catholics who had fled from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. What will happen to those 700 000 people if there is a takeover of South Vietnam by the communists? The figure of 700 000 Roman Catholic refugees was supplied by the Labor Deputy Prime Minister of Australia.

Apart from those 700 000 Roman Catholics who fled to South Vietnam, there were, of course, already a large number of Roman Catholics living in South Vietnam. We have heard all sorts of comments. The Federal Minister, Mr Beazley, has referred to the question of how the Roman Catholics will fare in Vietnam.

Mr Harman: What about the Buddhists?

Mr GRAYDEN: So we have the situation I have described. The Opposition is completely contemptuous of the plight of the refugees in Vietnam. Included amongst those refugees, as Dr Cairns has stated, are 700 000 Roman Catholics. That is an extreme situation, in itself. In addition, of course, there are a large number of other refugees and the actions of the Opposition in this House are completely contemptuous of those people. The Opposition is supporting, to the limit of its capability, the efforts of the communist insurgents in their attempt to overthrow the constitutionally-elected Government in South Vietnam.

Mr Harman: We have moved out of that country. It is only because of interference by other powers that it is in its present situation.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Maylands is aware that is not true. What does he think the North Vietnamese are doing?

Mr Harman: What have we been doing?

Mr GRAYDEN: Who is causing all the casualties in Vietnam at present?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! One speaker at a time.

Mr GRAYDEN: The member for Balga spoke in terms of Vietnam being one nation. I would like to point out that North Vietnam is one nation. In the south there is the South Vietnam Republic. Each has its own constitution.

I would like to make brief reference to the fact that the other day the Prime Minister of Australia could not wait to recognise Prince Norodom Sihanouk and his Government in Cambodia. He also asked all the surrounding countries to recognise this person—not the constitutionally elected Government, I remind members, but somebody who has been put forward by the North Vietnamese as the leader of that country. The Prime Minister of Australia could not rush in quickly enough to recognise him. That is an extraordinary situation.

As my time has nearly expired, I would like to repeat that I am horrified at the attitude of the Labor Opposition in this Parliament in respect of this particular amendment to the Address-in-Reply. I am quite certain it does not represent the true feeling of most members on that side of the House. It represents the feelings of a radical minority who have come into this House relatively recently and who now obviously dominate the Parliamentary Labor Party in this Parliament.

Mr T. H. Jones: How long have they been here?

Mr GRAYDEN: Not too long. However, whatever they say goes as far as the Labor Opposition in this House is concerned, even to the extent of supporting an idiotic amendment of this kind. The amendment cannot be justified. It is full of statements which are patently false, and in those circumstances it should be rejected out of hand.

Mr HARTREY (Boulder-Dundas) [7.52 p.m.]: I address this House with a grave sense of responsibility, to the House itself and to my fellow countrymen, to denounce as strongly as I can the ghastly war which was inflicted upon the people of Australia by a Liberal Federal Government some 10 years ago and which has been supported unjustifiably thousands of times since then by the same type of politician as originally instituted it. I would describe that war by five highly complimentary epithets. It was unprovoked; it was unconstitutional; it was unscrupulous; it was unhallowed; and it was unpardonable.

Mr McPharlin: How do you have a constitutional war?

Mr HARTREY: I will tell the Deputy Premier presently.

Mr McPharlin: I know about an unconstitutional war but I do not know about a constitutional one.

Mr HARTREY: The Poet Laureate of the nineteenth century, Lord Tennyson, with that patriotic fervour which was so characteristic of jingoes in those days, has written these words—

Not once or twice in our rough island-story,

The path of duty was the way to glory.

But I would remind my fellow members in this House that far more often than once or twice the warpath has been the bloody and rough road to pain, poverty, distress, and desolation. Tonight we are dealing with one such episode on the warpath, and I hope we are pronouncing the last requiem for it, saying the last word on it, and leaving it to rot in its grave as it should have done long ago.

Mr Coyne: There is no shame in defending ourselves.

Mr HARTREY: What a funny remark! A burglar is living in his own house; he goes 300 miles from there to my house to break into it; and there is no shame in his defending himself! Who invaded us? Did we go to Vietnam to invade that country, or did the Vietnamese invade ours?

There have been innumerable instances in history which emphasise the literal truth of the divine warning which Our Lord gave to the principal apostle in the Garden of Gethsemane—

Put up your sword into its scabbard: for he that takes the sword shall perish by the sword.

What better illustration of those words can we have than the war which has devastated North and South Vietnam—it is only the one country—in the last 10 years, and in which we have so ignobly participated?

When I say "ignobly", I reflect not at all upon our troops, some of whom were there against their will, and some of whom were there as volunteers; but in whatever capacity they were there, the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force conducted themselves as brave young Australians in an unhappy situation, and of them I speak only with pride. But of the blasted politicians who sent them there I speak with the greatest vituperation, and always will. In referring to those politicians I use the words which Tallien uttered to Robespierre who was stuttering in fear of death. He was terrorised, and he stuttered, stammered, and choked, and Tallien shouted, "It is the blood of Danton choking him." When the members of the Government speak tonight about this monstrosity, I say it is the blood of Vietnam that is choking them.

Mr O'Connor: What do you think about Hungary?

Mr HARTREY: I am not interested in Hungary at the moment. I am speaking about Australia, which is my country as well as the Minister's.

I said I was going to point out how this war was a disaster. I remind members that it started on an even worse pretext than one of the most disastrous and foolish wars in which England ever took part. It is attributed in history to Sir Robert Walpole, the first British Prime Minister, that when he was listening in 1739 to the jubilation of London at the outbreak of the War of Jenkins' Ear, he remarked, "They are ringing the bells now: soon they will be wringing their hands." That is exactly what is happening to us in Australia.

The Liberal Party was ringing the bells, counting the votes, and winning the election in 1966. It did not win the election in 1972. The blood of Vietnam choked it then and will continue to choke that party for a long time to come. It will be quite a long time before the Liberal Party returns to power as the Federal Government of Australia, because it took advantage of the power it had to disgrace the country.

This was an unprovoked war. The pretext for the war of Jenkin's Ear was that a Spanish ship was supposed to have captured a British ship, and its crew to have cut off the English captain's ear, although it is now believed that in fact he lost his ear in the pillory. It was a fine pretext for a war, but no more ignoble than the one put forward by the Minister this evening; namely, that we could not let our great Pacific allies stand alone. It is like a little poodle dog running to my rescue because I am attacked by an Alsatian. How ridiculous! No, it was an unprovoked war; there was no pretext for it at all.

Time and time again we have become involved in war for no other motive than loyalty to the Queen and the Motherland. The Queen and the Motherland were not in this war; that is why I say it is unconstitutional. I will deal with that later.

The Queen has no interest in this war; she was never at war with any part of Vietnam—north or south—she was not interested in it at all. As I understand constitutional law, and I do understand it, the Crown is one and indivisible. The Queen cannot be at war as far as Britain and Australia are concerned, and not at war as far as Canada and New Zealand are concerned. When I made that remark, even today to a judge, he said, "Of course, we were not really at war." I said, "No, we were not in a declared war; that is for sure." We were in such an unscrupulous adventure against an Asian people as is usually fought with the aid of mercenaries.

Our Government—not our troops, I speak of them again with respect, friendship, and appreciation—forced our troops to take part in a completely foredoomed and foredamned adventure, and it was not out of loyalty to the Queen. It was not even out of loyalty to the American alliance, for what greater harm could any of the bitterest enemies of America have done her than to encourage the United States to embark on this war.

At the height of his power, in or about 1807, Napoleon Bonaparte had Europe throttled, and then he fell upon Spain. From then onwards he was destroyed, by what he himself called the “Spanish ulcer”. It broke down the entire fabric of his empire and he was ruined completely.

That is exactly what happened in the United States which was at the peak of power 25 or 30 years ago. At that time it was the only possessor of the atomic bomb, it had the greatest navy in the world, it had the greatest air force in the world, it had the most military power, it had the greatest manufacturing capacity, and it was the greatest nation on earth without a doubt. Where is it now? Is it now the greatest nation in the world? No, it is not. And why not? Because the blood of Vietnam is choking it, too, and that is a fact. And then members opposite ask: why are we in such a hurry to have Prince Sihanouk back in Cambodia? I will deal with Cambodia in a moment. It is the United States that is rushing to get Prince Sihanouk back, to patch up the terrific damage this war has done to the entire fabric of the American Republic. Their main concern is not the damage and misery inflicted on the comparatively few Cambodians. Millions of them may suffer much, but they are still only a few by comparison with many more millions who will still remain in China and many other nations of Asia.

The mighty damage has been done to the United States itself by the division of its people. They have always been divided—recently between black and white, but their people are now divided also between “hawks” and “doves”, between “minute men” and communists, between rich and poor, and between every kind of faction imaginable. Their problem has become more than anything else the bitter dissension in their own ranks over the violent atrocities performed in Vietnam. I cannot talk too scathingly about this matter.

I said the war in Vietnam was unconstitutional, and I have explained my reasons for saying it was unscrupulous. However, the most unscrupulous feature of the whole matter has not yet been mentioned in this debate, and I think it should be.

Over 100 years ago a phrase was current in the United States, and this phrase is very apposite to the present debate. Before the Civil War the phrase was used, “The

crime against Kansas”. The Southern States were trying to thrust slaves and slave owners into a free territory of the United States, the free territory of Kansas. The idea was that there would be enough slaves and enough slave owners to have it turned into a slave State when it finally obtained representation in Congress. The balance of power was very close in those days, and gangs of ruffians were sent from the Southern States into Kansas to crush the free people and to take power with the aid of imported rough-necks from the Southern States. This was called the crime against Kansas.

Let me remind members about “The crime against Cambodia”! Nothing worse has been perpetrated in this century, including two world wars. Here was a peaceful Asiatic country, not troubled by communists or disturbed by divisions. It did not have any bother at all with anybody. It was ruled by a man who had been its king, but who thought he would exercise more real influence by becoming a popular politician. He handed over the position of king to someone else, and he took on the rank of Prince Sihanouk. He did his very utmost to steer a perilous path of neutrality in a very dangerous situation. What did the United States—our glorious ally—do? First of all, surreptitiously it called on Prince Sihanouk to side with it. When he would not do so it called in the CIA—the fine and glorious Central Intelligence Authority; what intelligence and what a glorious organisation.

When the United States could not get rid of Prince Sihanouk, it raised a revolution to destroy the peaceful neutrality of Cambodia—that beautiful and fortunate country. This country had many attractions as a tourist resort, but the United States brought its unfortunate inhabitants down to the lowest form of refugee. Why? For what purpose? We were told that if one country fell to communism, they would all be overrun.

Are we all to look under the bed every night, like the Minister for Immigration does, to see whether there are any communists here? Cambodia was overwhelmed by a hero—a hero indeed! A hero who the other day, general as he is, commander-in-chief of all the military forces—blah, blah, blah—ran away and attempted to take a large amount of gold into Switzerland. A fine example of heroism! Wonderful heroism—this has been a wonderful war!

Now I said that it was also an unhalloed war. Just let me recite a few features of it. We know them, we have heard them, but it is worth while hearing them for the last time, I hope. It is the last time I will talk of them in this House, anyhow. What has happened to the troops of the United States who were in Vietnam? A large number of them, poor devils—and I

say this in sorrow, not in exultation—became the victims of the drug habit which has long run rife in East-Asiatic countries. The Asian people can handle drugs much better than the white people, in the same way that we can handle drink much better than the Aborigines can.

The American troops became disease-ridden, and especially with various kinds of venereal disease. Many of the troops could not be immediately repatriated to America; they had to be staged in camps time and time again before they could be repatriated to the United States to mix with their own people. Quite a substantial percentage of them had been so degraded in Vietnam—not wounded in battle but degraded by their surroundings—that they will be disease ridden and drug-addicted for many years.

Does the blessing of God appear to be on those unfortunate, unhappy people? Could this have happened if the war had not been an unhallowed and unholy war?

We have heard of the tiger cages. About 2½ years ago the news was suddenly sprung that most brutal atrocities were being performed by Mr Thieu's Government, not only on wretched Viet Cong prisoners, but on members of his own following—these loyal people who rushed down to the ballot box to give him 90 per cent of the votes. These poor wretches were being put into horrible cages in which they could not even stand up. When they were finally released they could no longer stand up—they had lost the capacity to do so.

These atrocities were hushed up, but they still go on. When Saigon finally falls and these poor devils come out of the cages, it will be "The night old Dixie died". That is precisely what I hope will happen, and I hope it will happen speedily indeed. If that is treason, my friends, make the most of it!

Besides the crime against Cambodia, the United States used the most powerful Air Force in the world to defoliate the territory not of the enemy, but of their allies, the ones we sent our troops to rescue. People have to eat; whether they are allies or enemies they will not survive unless they eat. They will not eat in an agricultural country unless they grow their own food. They cannot grow their own food if we destroy with poisonous chemicals the fertility and productivity of the land. By deliberate policy the Government of the United States sent wave after wave of aircraft to bomb in Vietnam; and on top of all this was the deliberate and complete destruction of the foliage of the beautiful jungle lushness of the country. So the people cannot now grow rice.

Another necessity for the people to grow rice is water in abundance. In a tropical country like Vietnam water is found in

abundance. The Vietnamese have channeled the water by an ingenious but elementary system of canals. However, wave after wave of bombing deliberately smashed those canals in order to deny them to an enemy advancing into the territory. But it was the territory of their allies that the Americans destroyed; and we are asked to believe that this is a good war and that we should give the former Federal Liberal Government a vote of thanks for participating in it. They will get that from me on my dying day; if I have a spare breath on my deathbed I may use it for that purpose.

This is the sort of thing we are discussing tonight. It is the sort of thing I hope we are condemning tonight. It is the basis of the amendment moved so ably by the member for Ascot and subsequently supported so eloquently by the member for Balga, and which is now receiving my support to the best of my humble ability.

We were told even less than a fortnight ago that the constitutionally elected President who is still the legitimate Government of Saigon, according to my learned friend over there, caused one of his generals to die suddenly in a very mysterious way. It is supposed that he committed suicide. However, he was described in the Press as a devout Roman Catholic.

Mr Grayden: Do you believe everything you read in the Press?

Mr HARTREY: I do not believe any of the damned propaganda the Minister's mob put in the Press, to start with.

Mr Skidmore: The Minister certainly tried tonight to convince us to believe what we read in the Press.

Mr HARTREY: All I can say is that no Roman Catholic who is devout in his beliefs commits suicide, for that is the final impenitence. The general in question had a decent family and was in an honourable position, but he had expressed discontent with the Thieu Government and he was subsequently found with a bullet in his head. It was said he put the revolver to his head. If members opposite believe that they will believe anything. I certainly do not believe it. I believe many people have been similarly assassinated.

Mr Grayden: By whom?

Mr HARTREY: The Thieu Government.

Mr Grayden: How do you know that?

Mr HARTREY: How does one know anything? Who assassinated that general? Who placed people in the tiger cages to which I referred?

Finally, the war itself was unpardonable and still is unpardonable. The Romans had a phrase for a war such as this: *bellum inexpiabile*, or the inexpressible war; the war that is never to be forgiven. It will be a long time before we will be forgiven for

helping our glorious allies to destroy Vietnam. I refer to the CIA, the FBI, President Nixon, and the other fine fellows who were running it.

I say that with proper respect for the American people, because I was privileged as a member of the Royal Australian Air Force to associate time and time again with American military personnel, both Navy and Army. I have the greatest respect for their ratings and officers. They were all fine fellows. The officers were very well spoken and educated, and the ratings were excellent in their behaviour and discipline. However, the United States has been turning out the wrong type of politician for the last 100 years, and that is nothing to be proud of.

Mr Rushton: Oh!

Mr HARTREY: The Minister for Local Government can laugh if he likes. If he knew half the history of America that I know he would not laugh. Tammany Hall is a notorious example, and Nixon is another notorious example of the wrongs they have done.

Mr Grayden: A Labor Prime Minister was screaming to them for help in the last war.

Mr HARTREY: The Minister for Labour and Industry is always screaming about something. The Prime Minister of Australia at that time did not scream; he was a far better Prime Minister than ever was put up by the Minister's mob.

Mr Grayden: What did he do?

Mr HARTREY: He did a hell of a lot more to help win the war than many people I know.

I hope I have said sufficient to convince members opposite—or if not to convince at least to persuade them against their will—that this war has been a monstrous experience for Australia, and that it has been the hateful and horrible legacy of a Federal Liberal Government aided by the Federal Country Party. "Blackjack" McEwen was just as much responsible and as much to blame as Sir Robert Menzies, because he acted as Menzies' satellite and stooge.

Mr Laurance: Are you saying everything will be all right in South Vietnam when they take over?

Mr HARTREY: I am saying nothing of the sort; I am saying everything would have been all right if we had not gone there.

Mr Laurance: Then why are you worried about South Vietnam?

Mr HARTREY: I am not worried about Vietnam. I am an Australian, and I am worried about Australia. I am deploring in this House the fate that befell Australia and saying it is a monstrous disgrace to

Australia that it was responsible for helping to inflict agony upon South and North Vietnam. As an Australian—and, I hope, a patriotic one—I will take some time to recover from the disgrace of being in any way associated with the destruction of crops in Vietnam and the destruction even of the ability of the people to grow rice. That was a shocking thing. The tiger cages were shocking things, and all the other atrocities were shocking.

However, I am not worried about those things from the point of view of the Vietnamese but rather from the point of view of Australia, for this is an Australian Parliament.

Mr Laurance: Don't you answer cries for help?

Mr HARTREY: Is the member for Gascoyne making a cry for help; or what the hell is he talking about?

In conclusion I wish to say that I heartily support the amendment to the Address-in-Reply moved by the member for Ascot. I will not recite the amendment because members are able to read it for themselves. I approve of the amendment without dealing seriatim with its features. I hope we will not again have any further debate on the miserable attempt by the Liberal Party to justify President Thieu or in any way to mitigate the atrocity of what Federal politicians inflicted upon us from the year 1965 to the end of the year 1972.

MR CLARKO (Karrinyup) [8.19 p.m.]: I rise to oppose the amendment—

Mr Jamieson: Here is a young ridicule, and not a young radical!

Mr CLARKO: —moved by the member for Ascot and supported by the member for Balga. In his speech the member for Balga said there is one Vietnam. I question that because if one goes back some 2 000 years into the history of this particular part of the world one finds that in the northern section there was an area known as Tonkin. One should be careful how one pronounces that word! That area is what we now refer to as the northern part of North Vietnam. The country of Tonkin at a later date attacked the central region, which in various times has been called Annam. In later times these aggressors from the northern part of what we call Vietnam attacked the area which was known as Cochinchina.

They did in fact attack this particular area; namely, the mouth of the Mekong Delta, which had belonged to the Cambodians. So, there has been aggression from the north in this country in the past on many occasions.

It is also true that many of the people who are opponents of the support in the 1960s by Australia and the United States have said it was a great pity that this

action took place, because it reduced the traditional opposition of the Vietnamese to the Chinese. In the preceding 2 000 years, the Chinese dominated that country for at least 1 000 years of that time.

The question of Vietnam from the point of view of somebody who believes in democracy rests to a large extent on the agreements arrived at between the two parties at Geneva on the 20th July, 1954. Amongst the major articles of that agreement of 1954 is one whereby both parties agreed to the withdrawal within 300 days, by stages, of the forces of both parties to regroupment zones on either side of a provisional military demarcation line.

Mr T. D. Evans: Note the word, "provisional".

Mr CLARKO: This was the line at the 17° north parallel. The line was drawn between the opposing forces of the north and the south and, in fact, it is very interesting to see what the people of Vietnam thought of that decision.

The member for Balga said it was not possible in the present invasion of Saigon for the people to retreat through the attacking lines of the North Vietnamese forces. In 1954, at least 800 000 people—some say it was more like one million—voted, as they say, with their feet; they moved from the northern area to the south.

However, there is no record of any significant number of people choosing voluntarily to go to the north. One million people—about the population of Western Australia—voted with their feet to go into the south.

Mr T. D. Evans: Was Thieu one of those?

Mr CLARKO: I believe that is very clear evidence of what the Vietnamese people wanted.

Members have talked about free elections. No true democrat can actually speak of free elections and communism in the same breath. I am sure members opposite would know that in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—they call themselves socialists, because that is what they are; and, of course, a lot of people who sit opposite also call themselves socialists—

Mr Hartrey: Including me.

Mr CLARKO: —a very different sort of voting procedure is adopted. This is how one votes in Russia: One gets a ballot paper on which there is the name of a communist candidate. The voter does not have any choice; the party simply selects that particular candidate. The voter then has the choice of voting for that communist candidate or of writing in the name of some other person. That is very easy to do, but it is a little dangerous because to do so one must go into a large room, go

up to the table, pick up one's ballot paper—

Mr Hartrey: How do you know? Have you ever been to Russia during an election? Have you ever voted in a Russian election?

Mr CLARKO: No, but I suggest that the honourable member read a book written by Merle Fainsod, probably one of the leading commentators on the Russian system.

Mr Skidmore: You should go and have a look at it for yourself. I was there during an election, and I know what happens.

Mr CLARKO: The political scientist to whom I have just referred says that the voter has an option; if he does not wish to cast his vote for the communist candidate, he must move to the other side of the hall and write on the ballot paper the name of the person he supports. It is also true—there is evidence to support this statement—that many people who do that sort of thing disappear shortly afterwards. That is the system adopted at a Soviet, socialist, communist, Russian, election.

There is only one statement we can believe from a communist; when he says he aims to take over the world by any means, fair or foul, he means it.

Point of Order

Mr SKIDMORE: Mr Speaker, I fail to see the relevance of the remarks now being made to the motion which is before the House. The motion contains no reference to a comparison between the system of elections in the USSR and anywhere else; elections are not mentioned.

The SPEAKER: I rule that the member for Karrinyup is in order in developing his argument and in making comparisons as other speakers have done. However, I ask him not to dwell on the comparisons; he must return to the topic before the Chair.

Debate (on amendment to motion) Resumed

Mr CLARKO: We in this House know that the member for Swan is very well disposed towards the Russian communists. I am not surprised he rose to defend them when I commented on their electoral system. The honourable member may have been to the Soviet Union, but I challenge him to produce any sort of electoral system in that country which is comparable with the system we have in Australia, where the voter gets a fair go.

Mr Jamieson: Oh yes! Loaded voting! A fair go!

Mr CLARKO: I challenge members of the Opposition on this point; the Australian electoral system is regarded by the political scientists of the world as one of the fairest which exists. In fact—

Mr Jamieson: You would be the only political scientist who thinks that.

Mr CLARKO: —the secret ballot system operating in Australia is described by the Americans as, "the Australian ballot".

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the member for Karrinyup that he is allowing himself to be carried away.

Mr CLARKO: Mr Speaker, I believe my remarks go right to the core of the subject; one is the question of elections and the other is the question of communists; these are the two central issues within the argument relating to Vietnam.

A great deal of criticism has been levelled at the fact that an election was not held in Vietnam two years after the agreement of 1954. The reason that the south did not hold an election is not, as members opposite like to say, that President Eisenhower had been advised that 80 per cent of the people would vote communist.

In fact, I am tremendously intrigued by the support of the Opposition for recommendations of the CIA, because that was a CIA recommendation to President Eisenhower. I would have thought that members of the Opposition had no respect whatever for recommendations made by that body; in fact, there are a few recommendations of the CIA for which I do not have a great deal of respect, either.

I now wish to discuss the question of the communists of North Vietnam attacking and killing the people of South Vietnam—killing not just the women and children but also the teachers in the small villages of South Vietnam, the chiefs, the civic leaders and, in fact, anybody with any potential influence, particularly anybody who spoke out against the North Vietnamese communists. Thousands of them were done away with by these terrorists from the north.

I do not need members of the Opposition to tell me that there was an element of nationalism in Vietnam; very clearly, there was. Certainly in terms of principle, one must support Asian nationalism. However, what happened in Vietnam was that communism laid itself as a parasite right over the top of Vietnamese nationalism. It could not move independently; the whole direction, purpose, aims, ammunition, support and so on became totally communist.

In the earlier days, there were Vietnamese nationalists who sought to drive out the French and other forms of foreign domination; however, these people were either done away with or pressurised by communists. Some of them no doubt were even converted to communism. But what Vietnam has finished up with is communist aggression. We have this overtaking of nationalism throughout Asia; it is what is happening in Vietnam at the moment.

Let me say this—I am happy to receive any criticism for my philosophy—I very much believe in the domino theory. If

one looks at the northern parts of those countries just below Vietnam, one can see the same thing happening. Who controls the north of Laos? That part of the country is controlled by people who are led by Chinese communist cadres. Certain people from that area have been taken to Peking, trained and returned.

I could also refer to the northern part of Thailand; the Government of Thailand in the south has no control over this area. In the early days, Burma was the same; in fact, in socialist Burma today, one will find that the far north of that country, on the underbelly of China, is dominated by Chinese communists.

I ask Opposition members: Do they believe that communists seek to take over the world? Perhaps they do not know that is what the communists themselves say. However, that is their aim. I am amazed when the member for Swan says that theory is out of date, because if we look at the map of the world and delineate those countries that have been taken over by communists in 1920, 1930, and every 10 years thereafter we have an excellent guide to determine whether the communistic world is either expanding or contracting.

I repeat, they have said that their aim is to take over the world and if one viewed a map of the world one would have to be blind not to realise they are gradually achieving their aim. When I was a boy, countries under the rule of the British Empire were coloured red, but if one looks at a map of the world today, the countries that are coloured red are those that have been taken over by communists and are now under communist domination.

Communists have no respect for human life, and no respect for human freedom. In the USSR it is generally regarded—and I have figures here to confirm this—that some 2.5 million people lost their lives while the communists established themselves in the Soviet Union. The situation today in South Vietnam is that thousands and thousands of people have lost their lives from the guns of the North Vietnamese communists. It is a pity that the nationalism of the South Vietnamese has been totally obscured by the action of communism overlaying their nationalist movement.

After the outbreak of World War I, John Curtin—who was not a Western Australian—made known through the medium of local newspapers, his philosophy against the policy of conscription. If we read the arguments put forward by John Curtin at that time against conscription in World War I we will find he was totally and diametrically opposed to conscription. His conscience would not allow him to accept it. However, when World War II broke out, and Australia declared war on Germany—and later Japan—not only did he introduce conscription for home defence,

but also he devised the ruse of drawing a line well north of Australia through South-East Asian countries and stating that our home defence began at that line. He did that because he was obliged to do it.

Our State Minister for Health referred to John Curtin, who in the early 1940's had no hesitation in saying, "We look to America", without any reservation or consideration of our past associations with Britain and other countries. John Curtin knew full well that America saved Australia during World War II. I ask the members of this House to read our history books to ascertain whether or not that is true.

The member for Boulder-Dundas has asked: What are we doing in Vietnam? A similar question could have been asked during World War I; what were we doing in Germany? When our troops went into Germany there was no question of any attack being made on Australia, and when we became involved in World War II, Australia was not under attack at that stage. In short, what I am saying is that when we went to war against Germany during the Great War and the World War our country was not under attack. If we believe in a theory of defence which states that the only time to become involved in a fight is when people land on our front doorstep, this is tantamount to putting ourselves in a totally adverse position in which our homes would be in danger of being wiped out; to say nothing of our lives.

Even the Australian socialistic Government today believes in a defence force, and though it has let it run down to practically nothing, it will not say that we do not need a defence force. Unfortunately, if we find the communists moving further southwards and we find ourselves in danger, I feel Dr Cairns would find no difficulty in moving in support of them.

People have been trying to put the blame on me for what Federal Governments did when I was a boy, but I cannot accept any responsibility for their actions. I mention that because it points to the weakness in this amendment that has been moved by the Opposition and which is portrayed by the following—

"Liberal and Country Party Members and Governments throughout Australia must now accept full responsibility for the decision, based upon a philosophy of fear and hatred, which led Australia to become an active participant in the civil war in Vietnam".

Who amongst us here made the decision that Australia should enter the Vietnamese war in April, 1965—10 years ago? In my opinion the responsibility for the lives that have been lost rests with those people who support international communism, whether they are communists themselves, fellow travellers, or, alternatively, those

in Australia who are supporters of communists. I say that those in Australia who support communists, despite their great influence in Hanoi, are not prepared to make any effort to deter North Vietnamese or South Vietnamese communists, who are at present attacking the area adjacent to Saigon, from killing women and children, elderly people, and anybody else who gets in their way. If we are to blame anyone for the slaughter that is going on at the moment in South Vietnam, why should we not blame them?

We have learnt that in South Vietnam there are at least a certain number of people who are anti-communists. Mention has been made by the Minister of Catholics in South Vietnam. I would not hold out much hope for their future under a communist government in South Vietnam. I am certain the communists will give no representation or any support to people who are non-communists, let alone to anti-communists in South Vietnam, if they achieve the domination of Saigon.

After they take control these communist Vietnamese will not allow the people to speak out as they wish. They will not allow people to read what they want to read.

Anyone who has studied the history of Russia will know that one can find case after case where the communists have recalled thousands of books and rewritten them in accordance with their current ideologies. That is the sort of practice indulged in by all communistic governments, and I challenge any member of this House to deny it. If members wish to confirm what I say they have only to read some books on the theory and practice of communism, because there is no doubt that from time to time communists seem to change only their theoretical approach.

Mr Jamieson: Have you ever studied the history of Christianity. It is so similar to the point you are making that it is laughable.

Mr CLARKO: That may be so. I have done some study on Christianity. I was a lecturer in history before I came into this place. I cannot say that I have studied every aspect of world history; in fact, I do not know of anyone who has.

We find today, and at present, the communists are shelling the refugees as they travel southwards to Saigon. I have heard Senator Wheeldon say—although it has been said by many people—that it is better to be "red" than dead. What will occur in South Vietnam is that a person will either be red or dead. It is not much of an alternative.

It is an alternative similar to that given to the people of Hungary. Ask those people about the communist armies and aggressors who entered that particular country.

Ask the people of Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia what they think of the communist aggressors. In fact, ask them what they think of our particular brand of politics in Australia when Mr Whitlam had the gall and the indecency to recognise Soviet control over the Baltic States. After the next election I would be interested to learn how many Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian immigrants vote for Mr Whitlam.

The North Vietnamese prefer war to negotiation. The only reason any communist forces have entered into negotiations and agreed to get round the conference table, has been to let things cool off for a while so that they may build up their forces, and then commence again to work for their cause.

Much has been said about the desire of the Vietnamese people to be free from any form of foreign interference. If a new Vietnam arises out of the ashes in the next few years its people will not be free from the communist influence that comes from either Peking or Moscow. One way or the other they will be dominated by this ideology—the most harmful, hateful, and destructive force that exists in the world today.

It is true that the communists are only extreme socialists. Of course, in those particular countries the communists say they are socialists. We have representatives in Australia who call themselves socialists but they do not say that in the pamphlets they issue at election time.

In regard to the amendment to the motion which blames the Liberal Party and the Country Party of Australia for intervening in the Vietnam war, no mention is made of the fact that New Zealand was also involved in that war; but as far as I know there was no Liberal Party or Country Party Government in New Zealand.

It is very easy for some people to say in 1975 that a country's foreign policy in 1965 was either partly wrong or fully wrong, or whatever else they may claim it to be. Anybody who studies the foreign policy of a nation, and reads books on the subject, will find that movements or changes in foreign policies take place. What happened in the case of Vietnam was that the United States of America went into the war in Vietnam in the 1950s with only two objectives in mind.

Firstly, the Americans were trying to achieve peace for the people of South Vietnam—the noncommunists. Secondly, they were trying to develop some form of negotiated solution. I am afraid to say that at times the Americans are not very hard-hearted. Of course, in both World War I and World War II, excluding the Japanese attack during the latter war, the Americans went to the aid of Britain and Europe. I wonder where the people of Paris would be today if they were under communist domination.

One has only to go to Europe today to see how the peoples of countries in Western Europe are free to live under non-communist Governments. The USA went to the aid of those countries in both World War I and World War II; and similarly it went into the war in Vietnam for the same reasons. Much has been said of the great might of the USA, and how it was able to rain down a huge load of bombs on Vietnam.

Mr Hartrey: On South Vietnam.

Mr CLARKO: I am talking about the bombs on Hanoi—

Mr Hartrey: They bombed their own allies in South Vietnam.

Mr CLARKO: —and the bombs on Haiphong. Nobody can say that the Americans seriously tried to wipe out the people of Hanoi. They dropped bombs all around the place, but they did not use their full power. It would be interesting to read what the historians say the Americans might have done! In the role they played in Vietnam the Americans were the kindest enemy one could find anywhere. They could have exerted, with their total air superiority, their full might on Hanoi and wiped it out. However, the Americans did not do that; what they wanted to do was to maintain the peace of the people of South Vietnam who were noncommunists.

I do not give any credence to the fact that 98 per cent of the people of Vietnam voted for Ngo Dinh Diem. Somebody did throw doubts on certain election percentages, but if we look at the election figures of the USSR we find the candidates invariably received 97 or 98 per cent of the votes.

Mr Skidmore: That is not so. You do not know anything about this matter.

Mr CLARKO: I am dubious when I see percentages as high as that received by candidates.

In July, 1968, Sir Paul Hasluck, who later became the Governor-General of Australia, said there were four dominating influences in the world, including the countries of Asia: namely, rising nationalism in Asia and Africa; the power politics of the big three nations—the USSR, the USA, and the People's Republic of China—the ideological conflict, and the prime group in this role were the communists; and worldwide expectations of a better life—which all people in Australia subscribe to, but which is not possible in countries dominated by the communists—of a life where there is freedom. However, the communists do not grant such freedom.

Geoffrey Fairbairn wrote an article which appeared in *The Bulletin*. At the time he was a lecturer in history at the

Australian National University. This was what he had to say about the Australian commitment in Vietnam—

... our commitment grows out of these characteristics of the Australian tradition: "A human concern for the bullied, a sense of solidarity with mates in danger, a pride in fighting wicked and expansionist powers, an awareness that what is being fought is as dreadful and destructive of the human spirit as Nazism; and a courageous understanding of the fact that for the rest of its history Australia cannot contract out of the agonies of its near neighbours."

I have heard members opposite interjecting and outlining events that took place in this war which I certainly do not support. I do not support any inhumanity of man to man.

If those members of the Opposition have any conscience, then instead of moving this amendment they should take action to try to persuade the Australian Government to intervene with the Government of Hanoi, to get it to draw back its forces and stop this butchery of the people of South Vietnam.

Mr Skidmore: Do you think the South Vietnamese will stop there?

Mr CLARKO: If we look specifically at the amendment to the motion we will find the following—

Mr Skidmore: I am glad that at last you are looking at the amendment.

Mr CLARKO: The amendment states—

- (a) theirs was the decision to become part of a war of massive foreign intervention in Indo China.

There was a great deal of foreign intervention in Indo-China, but it was not only by the countries with which we were proud to be allied. There is also foreign intervention by the communist countries—I refer to the People's Republic of China and Russia—which pour in tremendous quantities of ammunition and arms to support the Vietnamese communists.

I wonder whether members opposite are genuinely concerned about the loss of life of the Vietnamese people. If they are I do not believe they should move frivolous amendments to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, like the one before us. Instead of doing that they should be doing something about the thousands of deaths taking place in that country.

I conclude by pointing out once again that when the day comes that the communists rule South Vietnam, firstly, there will be very little safety to the people of the other parts of South-East Asia, who will see coming closer to their front doors

a falling domino. If we look at those particular countries we find that the communist groups in them are well prepared for future struggles. To take the Philippines we find the existence of communist groups in islands outside Luzon, who are fighting against the central Government. To take other countries I have named, such as Thailand and Malaysia, we find that at present there still exist small groups of communist guerillas who were pushed out of the peninsula of Malaya back into Thailand.

Mark my words! As the pressures come closer towards Malaysia these communist groups will be activated, and will be given increasing help from other Asian communists who occupy the countries north of them.

These Chinese communist dominoes are trying to establish themselves everywhere. They have already taken over Tibet. I wonder if the member for Boulder-Dundas agrees with the taking over of those very simple, peaceful people.

We all know what they did in India. They marched down the Brahmaputra Valley and attacked India. We also know the situation in Indonesia where the rulers are very much aware of the need to keep on guard against the communist guerillas who still exist in parts of that country.

All these things are of tremendous concern and represent a threat to Australia. Australians do not want to become involved in wars.

For between two-thirds and three-quarters of its history, Australia has been governed by non-Labor Governments, but during the whole of that time Australia has not been at any time an aggressor against weak neighbours, and it never will be.

But this does not gainsay the fact that we must maintain an adequate defence force. We must have allies and the result of the actions of the present Australian socialist Labor Government is that it has destroyed all our old alliances including our relationship with the mighty United States of America, the country which, in both world wars, was the chief supporter of what we call the free nations of the world. That relationship has been destroyed and instead the present Labor Government has been all around the world making a variety of deals with the socialist communist countries, yet not one of us would want to live in any of those countries except, perhaps, the member for Swan who considers that a certain fish factory in Russia is the finest in the world! Personally I would rather go to Lancelin!

What we need to establish in Australia is a country free from communist domination. We have communists in our unions. We had one in the parliamentary dining room today—a great friend and workmate of members of the TLC.

If the Labor Party was only smart enough it would remember what occurred in the 1940s in Victoria. The reason the DLP came into being was that certain right-wing Labor men realised they were being taken over by communists and they got together to defeat the communists at their own game.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CLARKO: This is the typical reaction of those who are not doing too well!

I conclude on this note: None of us in this country wants to be under the control of the communists. Members opposite jump up smartly when someone on this side suggests they are communists or semi-communists. Members opposite are gullible and allow the communists to penetrate their unions. I suppose that as long as members opposite get handouts from the unions at election times, they do not mind!

We want Australia to be free of communists and I suggest that if the countries of the near north of Australia are taken over by communists, the security of Australia will be dangerously threatened.

Mr T. H. Jones: Have a look under your bed tonight.

MR FLETCHER (Fremantle) [8.54 p.m.]: Someone asked why this amendment had been moved by the member for Ascot. It was moved as a consequence of the motion proposed by the Minister for Labour and Industry. Why the Minister intends to move it, I still do not know. I do not know why those on the other side of the House permitted it, because the issue is as dead as the dodo. Whether or not it was the Minister's own idea, I do not know, but it would be a totally futile exercise as the motion should not be debated in this House.

Mr Harman: I wonder why the Premier intends to allow him to move it.

Mr FLETCHER: Yes, I do, too. And I still wonder why the Minister—
Several members interjected.

Mr FLETCHER: When the cross-conversation is concluded—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Fremantle.

Mr FLETCHER: I want to know why the Minister is trying to resurrect the anti-communist issue and breathe life back into it in an effort to disadvantage those on this side of the House. As I have said, the issue is worn out and no political mileage is to be gained by it. However, because of the Minister's intention, the present amendment is before us and I am on my feet principally as a consequence of the fact that the Minister happened to mention what my Federal counterpart said, or was alleged to have said—it was probably read out of context—in 1966.

Subject to your indulgence, Mr Speaker, and that of the House, I will acquaint members opposite with what I said in Ottawa in 1966. My remarks are recorded in *Hansard* No. 2 of 1967, because that was the first opportunity I had to speak in the House and indicate what I said in Ottawa where I represented this Parliament. What I said then was alleged to have been almost treacherous, but it is now regarded as being quite respectable because many, including members of the clergy, now support what the radical member for Fremantle said in 1966.

What I said about this particular matter during my speech on the Address-in-Reply debate is recorded at page 1202, and it is worth reading—and I say that without any desire to be egotistical.

I was in Canada at the time as a delegate from this State Parliament to a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. In my speech in *Hansard* I mentioned that the member for Fremantle was a delegate representing a portion of those 760 million people represented by all delegates. I explained to the House at the time that the subjects discussed were the Commonwealth and the world, international affairs, and Vietnam. I said—

I will now read the consensus of opinion, though I will not go into a great deal of detail. It reads as follows:—

The danger of escalation of the war in Vietnam was generally recognized. United States military action in South-East Asia and the mistrust existing there and elsewhere between communist and non-communist blocks were poisoning international relations. All effort should be directed to bringing an end to hostilities in Vietnam and to bridging the dangerous gulf between East and West.

Certain delegates—

Let me interpolate here to indicate that the member for Fremantle was included. To continue—

—strongly criticised U.S. policy. As self-appointed policeman of the world, the U.S. misconceived the problem in Asia; it hinged not on communism but on whether Asia should or should not continue to be dominated by the West.

That, fundamentally, was, and still is, the issue in the world today and that is how I see it. I would like members to look on me, not as an elder statesman, but as a sincere person. I admit I am not young, but, as members will recall, the Minister stated that these radical ideas emanated from the radical young members on the other side of the House. I am giving an

opinion of a person who is rapidly approaching the stage of being a superannuated member.

I marched in the moratorium parades and I am proud that I did, because I deplored the fact that our youth were being taken from this country—

Mr Hartrey: Hear, hear!

Mr FLETCHER: —to fight, on foreign soil, an undeclared war that had nothing at all to do with us. They were fighting simply because we were tied to the American war machine.

As I have explained previously, if one country is tied economically to another it is under some obligation to support that ally, or so it was assumed. As a consequence, we became involved simply because the Australian Government was in that position. In respect of Australia, as I have also said previously, if a country which is dominant in trade with another country has that trade withdrawn, it ends up in trouble. A country in such a position can then either join the country with which it trades, as an ally, or lose that financial assistance. Australia, under an anti-Labor Government, capitulated to such a threat and so we became involved.

Prior to the first session an ex-Federal member, Mr Peter Howson, attempted to tell me in a hotel room one night what I would say at the conference. I clearly told him I had travelled 10 000 miles to express my own thoughts and I am proud of what I said because what I said is indeed relevant now. We were associated with an issue which has since totally discredited us.

I wish members had listened to the 7 o'clock news tonight; they would have heard a commentator saying that Da Nang had returned almost to normal, and all the events envisaged had not occurred. Kiddies were back at school and everything else was almost normal. The member for Rockingham was present with me and heard the news item and, as I have said, I wish other members, too, had heard it. These comments are not my own; they were stated on the news service tonight. The commentator said that the situation was returning to normal and people were being looked after. All those things that were to happen did not happen. As a matter of fact, the commentator was told he could move about as he wished, and that he would be able to go to Saigon in the near future.

I am aware that repeating what I had to say in 1966 does smack somewhat of saying, "I told you so". It is easy to be wise with hindsight but, for some reason or other, I happened to be wise with foresight, and I could see the situation developing. I went on to say—

If as a consequence of my few minutes address—

Here I am speaking in Ottawa. To continue—

—any delegates are convinced that Australia's role in international affairs in Asia is inimical to her own and Asia's, and the world's best interests, then I ask those delegates to request their various Governments to endeavour to influence Australia away from her present involvement in Vietnam.

Some of my comments were printed in *The West Australian* in a paragraph which occupied about two inches. That is why I had my comments recorded in *Hansard*. Even if my comments do nothing more than gather dust here I am able to refer to them as I am doing tonight. I would not have spoken tonight if my remarks were not pertinent to what has already been said.

I spoke about being a white-skinned Asian among a billion coloured Asians. I said that it was stupid for us in Australasia—Austral meaning south and Asia being self-explanatory—to be involved in Vietnam. I went on to say that our action in Vietnam was tantamount to slapping a swarm of bees immediately above our heads. We do not have to crawl to our Asian neighbours, but we do not have to antagonise them either. I consider that if we attack one coloured Asian we attack all coloured Asians. I thought that as a patriotic Australian it was my duty to put this point of view, whether or not I was authorised to do so. My remarks went on—

I want delegates to know that Gallup Polls—

I am talking about 1966. To continue—

—reveal that a majority of those of the 11,000,000 questioned, are opposed to the negation of democracy in the sending of our conscripted youth to invade any part of Asia in an undeclared war.

I would like to emphasise that: It was undeclared war. How did it come about? Because Johnson was highly imaginative and claimed that the whole might of the American Navy had been attacked. The only vessels which could have attacked the American Navy were a few Vietnamese canoes and the attack was alleged to have taken place in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Whether the attack ever took place or was by a few canoes, or by torpedo craft, the reaction was not justified. The Americans intended to attack, and so they looked for reasons, even imaginary ones. The Americans tried to do what the whole French nation failed to do in one century. Like the French, they suffered ignominious defeat, in a situation I did not want to see happen to a western world nation. We were part of that defeat, and that concerns me. That was my attitude then, and it still is. It is a notorious fact that not one of the Governments which have ruled South Vietnam since 1954 has been democratic. The country has been ruled

by military forces which have forcibly suppressed opposition. I went on to say—

Yet here we are an allegedly democratic nation—a party to an invasion of an Asian neighbour's soil to assist any but a democratic regime.

I reason the situation this way. Asians have as much right to repel invasion from Australia as Australia has to repel invasion from Asia.

That is simple logic to me. I went on to say—

Like many thousands of other Australian volunteers I joined forces with others some 20 odd years ago to repel imminent Asian invasion of Australian soil. I submit that Vietnam today is attempting to repel an American-Australian invasion force which has crossed thousands of miles of ocean to ensure continuation of the Western presence and influence in that part of Asia.

Why cannot members opposite open their minds to such logic and be less conservative in their attitudes of sticking to causes which are long dead? I went on to say—

Should we be surprised if the State of North Vietnam comes to the aid of South Vietnam when invaded? Do they all become "Commies", or "Commos" because they object to being invaded and having their children, parents, homes and property bombed and burnt?

The quickest way to get people, who are not living in the western way of life, into a communist camp is to bomb them into that camp. They arrive at the conclusion that they have the choice either to accept the western way of life complete with bombs, napalm, bayonets, and so on, or to go the other way. The quickest way to drive them that way is to take the action we took.

That was the argument I was developing. I went on to say—

I believe there is an obligation on such a gathering as is here convened, to remind those who profess and subscribe to democracy, and accompanying Parliamentary system that something more than lip service is expected from signatories of the United Nations Charter . . .

Further down I said—

. . . I see little purpose in electing myself or Federal colleagues to Australian Parliament, if decisions over which we have no control or opportunity to debate, are made and imposed upon us by representatives in Washington or elsewhere.

These interjections then followed—

Mr Court: I hope you made it clear that was your personal view.

Mr Graham: He would not be alone in that opinion.

Mr Brand: You would share it.

Mr Graham: As do a number of people everywhere.

Then I said—

I did. I would like to continue so that this can appear in print, because I am not ashamed of it.

I will not repeat the speech I made before, but later on I said—

Let us briefly investigate what America and her reluctant allies are fighting. Principally the N.L.F. assisted now by Northern relatives.

If Western Australia were attacked we would expect to be assisted by South Australia, Victoria, or any other State of Australia. If we would expect that to happen in Australia, why would we not concede to North Vietnam the right to help cousins, friends, and relatives in the south in repelling an invasion?

I do not wear an RSL badge—some members opposite would wear it on their pyjamas because they are that way inclined—but if Australia were invaded by Asians, despite my age I would reach for a gun, as would members on the other side of the House. That being so, why do they deny to the Vietnamese the right to do likewise?

It was not a Labor Government which sent our troops to Vietnam. I say the troops went there as part of the anti-communist crusade; and anybody who objected to those troops going to Vietnam was automatically branded a communist sympathiser. The issue divided the nation and the Liberal and Country Parties won election after election on it. To my way of thinking, it was no more than a gimmick, and it won election after election. And what was the cost of it? About 600 Australian lives. In effect, we paid for those election results in Australian blood and in American blood, 55 000 Americans; were killed. Millions of Vietnamese were killed; their irrigation schemes were bombed in order to deny the people water with which to grow their crops, and defoliants were dropped on them. I cannot imagine people who are supposed to be civilised supporting such a policy or being party to it. Surely we are not so divided in our ideologies that members on the other side would condone what was done.

Mr Laurance: Would you support the North Vietnamese who are slaughtering the South Vietnamese with the latest Russian equipment?

Mr Hartrey: Rubbish!

Mr Laurance: That is the way you are putting it.

Mr FLETCHER: I did not say that at all.

Mr Laurance: You said it was more acceptable to you.

Mr FLETCHER: I think the honourable member knows I am more sincere than to say that. To continue with what I said in Ottawa in 1966—

The National Liberation Front is a coalition of three political parties opposed to the Saigon dictatorship. It is led by a non-Communist lawyer.

I mentioned this for the benefit of the Premier and members on the front bench opposite. I went on to say—

On its committee are Buddhist and Catholic Priests, Protestant Clergy, small business men and professional people. It has its own Government in the South Vietnamese countryside with its own laws, taxation system and health and education services.

That always existed there, and as their countrymen approached from the north southern troops dropped their arms.

Mr Laurance: You know they are communists.

Mr FLETCHER: I pointed out the kind of people who comprised the National Liberation Front. Does the honourable member mean to say because he defends his own country a person is a communist? I wish the member for Gascoyne would listen rather than interject.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Blaikie): I think the member for Fremantle should address the Chair.

Mr FLETCHER: It is very natural that the honourable member should take exception to what I am saying because he is young and conservative, and young and old conservatives will not accept the fact that what we on this side of the House have said all along has been vindicated. We cannot implant the western way of life in anybody's mind. It cannot be thrust onto people with a bayonet. We may kill people but we cannot kill an idea with bombs, bayonets, and the other frightful weapons that were used by us and our allies. The National Liberation Front was not then communist, and many associated with it today are not communists. Many intellectuals support it. I went on to say—

The Democratic Party of Vietnam . . . a violently anti-communist group, who had formerly supported the discredited Bao Dai, estimated in July, 1963, that the National Liberation Front had the support of a least 75 per cent. of the people of South Vietnam, and ruled about 90 per cent of the country.

That was the situation, but the American umbrella of B52 aircraft dropped a great tonnage of bombs on a State the size of a pocket handkerchief in comparison with the size of Europe, in trying to smash those people into submission. Yet the member for Karrinyup says these people

were communists. If ever they had justification for anything, they now have justification for being communists, because that huge tonnage of bombs would disillusion anybody about the western way of life. On page 1204 of *Hansard* for 1967 I listed the objectives of the National Liberation Front, as follows—

- (1) Overthrow of the military dictatorship within Saigon.
- (2) Election of a National Assembly with universal suffrage, freedom of opinion, Press, assembly, trade unionism, and religion.
- (3) General amnesty for all political prisoners—dissolution of all concentration camps.
- (4) Suppression of foreign monopolies and encouragement of national industry.
- (5) Agrarian reform on the basis of "land to those who till it."
- (6) Education—to liquidate illiteracy from all.
- (7) To establish a National army, to abolish the draft, and to abolish all foreign military bases.

And I refer members to the last one in particular. The American war machine was not satisfied with the foothold it had in South Korea; it wanted an additional foothold in Asia, in Vietnam, and that is how the cause developed; the cause of war, because American bases were required in South Vietnam.

At that time I wanted to know who appointed America the policeman of Asia. It was the first time I had heard that expression, and I used it myself. I have since seen it used, and I would like to think I was the originator of it. I have seen it quite often in print since. A prestigious American who was not a delegate but an observer wanted to know who had asked: Who appointed America the policeman of Asia? I said I had. I might add that observer, Senator William Fulbright, shook me by the hand. I told him that he was as good as a breath of fresh air to Australia because of the policies he espoused about the American intervention in South Vietnam. He is a delightful man, a humanitarian man, who, despite the opposition and vilification he received in his own country, was proud enough to carry a flag in opposition to the Vietnam war.

I am proud I carried that flag in 1966, even if I was condemned by members opposite for doing so. I have read only part of what I said on that occasion. Let me say that not only the coloured people of Asia clapped me when I sat down, but also many of our own white people clapped me to endorse what I had said.

I find it strange to come back here all these years later and still fight the same fight as a consequence of the motion

which the Minister for Labour and Industry proposes to move. As I say, our amendment would not have been moved had it not been for the notice of motion.

Let us look at the declining support being received by the Americans and the Thieu Government. I wish to refer to *The West Australian* of the 10th April, 1975. I do not want to alarm members opposite, so I will read only a small portion of the article. It is headed, "Attack on city close to Saigon", and I wish to quote the following paragraph—

A moderate Buddhist group which has been a steadfast supporter of the Saigon Government over the past few years has called on President Thieu to resign.

In a letter dated April 1 but made public only today, the Venerable Thich Tam Chau criticised President Thieu for failing to deploy his troops to prevent what he called a disaster among the armed forces and people.

This comment came from a Buddhist source. I point out to the House that many Buddhist priests tipped petrol over themselves, and then set alight to themselves to demonstrate opposition to what the west was doing to the east in Vietnam.

Mr Jamieson: What did Madam Neu say about that?

Mr FLETCHER: The priests did that because they were opposed to the war. However, there are conservative buddhists just as there are conservatives on the other side of the House, and this conservative element did not tell the people what to do until what they considered to be the enemy was on the doorstep.

In *The West Australian* of the 4th April, 1975, under the heading, "Thieu in peril as Reds near", we see the following—

As communist troops rolled almost unchecked towards Saigon today pressure mounted on President Nguyen Van Thieu to hand over the leadership of South Vietnam.

The pertinent paragraph in this report is the following—

South Vietnam's Roman Catholic primate, Archbishop Nguyen Van Binh, lent his weight today to the move for political change.

A brief statement bearing the primate's signature called on President Thieu to "respond to the people's hopes for an immediate and orderly change in leadership."

He cited an appeal by the Senate yesterday which called for new leadership and said this appeal reflected the people's aspiration for change.

Now those two distinguished venerable gentlemen were very quiet while the west was winning; and while Thieu's troops were winning they were significantly quiet. However, as I say, since there has been a

reversal, they have deserted the sinking ship. As pointed out by the member for Boulder-Dundas, one of the leaders, Lon Nol, attempted to leave the country via Swissair, with \$54 million-worth of gold. Yet his troops were hungry and the people were hungry.

Mr Rushton: Do you think they could eat gold?

Mr FLETCHER: The report was that these leaders wanted to ship 16 tonnes of gold to a Swiss bank.

Mr Rushton: Do you think it wise to leave it to the communists?

Mr FLETCHER: That is the cause the State Government is supporting. That money belonged rightly to the people, and their leaders were trying to desert them. Now perhaps members understand why the troops are not enthusiastic about the war. It is little wonder that refugees are being slaughtered and the troops are throwing down their guns.

I saw the figure the other day of the cost of America's recently lost equipment in the war in Vietnam. It was given as \$15 000 million—\$15 billion—of the American taxpayers' money. This money and equipment have gone down the drain; the troops threw down their arms because they had no cause to fight; and they were totally disillusioned with the cause and the leadership. And yet we sent troops to back them up—for nothing more than political gain. Our nation was divided—one Australian against another—simply so that elections could be won. That may be said to be drawing a long bow, but I cannot see it otherwise, and nor can many other people.

In tonight's issue of the *Daily News* we have a report from a commentator in Saigon. He is there, and not safely in this place as I am. This is part of his report—

He said the city was "strangely calm—almost fatalistic," but Government troops were abandoning positions en masse.

The troops are abandoning their positions simply because their officers have accepted the troops' pay whilst the troops deserted the front lines and went home. Now no doubt the officer class has done very nicely out of the war, but the unfortunate troops do not have a cause for which to fight, and naturally they are deserting.

In *The West Australian* of the 12th April, 1975, we find the following—

There are tens of thousands of other South Vietnamese intellectuals, professors and teachers, editors and opinion leaders who have supported the South Vietnamese cause and the alliance with the U.S. We have a profound moral obligation to them.

This American commentator is saying that we have a moral obligation to these people, not only to get the 6 000 American people

out of Saigon, but also to take their quislings and collaborators with them. Of course, these people have a vested interest in collaborating with the Americans because of the associated payola. The article goes on to say—

The immediate reaction in Congress, embittered by the billions of dollars spent and the 55,000 American lives lost in the Vietnam cause, was mainly cold and antagonistic.

It is antagonistic to suggest to people that they should contribute hundreds of millions, or even thousands of millions of dollars to be poured down the drain in Asia. The next paragraph says—

Senator John McLellan, of Arkansas, a Southern conservative Democrat who heads the powerful appropriations committee, said: "Further aid will just prolong the conflict and perhaps postpone, briefly, the inevitable."

This statement could be more appropriately used in connection with the motion to be moved by the Minister for Labour and Industry, because it emphasises what the Minister is criticising someone else for saying. I draw members' attention again to the senator's comment. "Further aid will just prolong the conflict and perhaps postpone, briefly, the inevitable." As I said, our Deputy Prime Minister passed a similar remark, for which he is being vilified by the Minister for Labour and Industry.

Much of my thunder has been stolen by those who have spoken before me. Members opposite have tried to point out that President Thieu was elected at a democratic election; but he was the only candidate. Conservative and all as members on the other side of the House are, at least they give us the opportunity to contest elections. President Thieu did not have an opponent; his opponent was conveniently in gaol.

Mr Mensaros: How many opponents did the North Vietnamese fellow have?

Mr FLETCHER: This situation was repeated in South Korea when Pak was elected; his opponent was in gaol with a fractured skull—the result of a very convenient accident.

Mr B. T. Burke: I am sure you mean he was in hospital.

Mr FLETCHER: I do not think they were humanitarian enough even to put him in a hospital gaol. It is people with that sort of politics we assisted by sending our men to die in Vietnam. We sent them there to bolster up a rotten regime like that.

I did not want to have to speak on the issue again, but I was provoked into doing so. I support the amendment moved by the member for Ascot.

MR CRANE (Moore) [9.31 p.m.]: Firstly, I am sorry I have to rise to waste further time tonight when there is so much business before the House. However, as I

have been named in the debate this evening I feel it is only reasonable that I should make at least some response to the remarks made.

The member for Balga named me as having addressed a seminar on inflation at Morley on the 10th August, last year. He was quite right; there is no doubt that I did address the seminar. However, I just wonder tonight, if what I said at that seminar is in issue. What has this to do with the amendment before the House? I wonder whether the member for Balga is embarking on a little crusade of character assassination. I would hope not, because I can assure all members—and I am sure they will believe me—that I shall never stoop to such tactics in this House. I know for a positive fact many members on both sides of the House would not do it, either. I see the Leader of the Opposition sitting opposite; I have a great deal of regard for him, and I am sure he would not be a party to such tactics.

However, during the course of the debate the member for Balga mentioned that I had not responded to his comment; that I made no interjection, and therefore I must be guilty, or words to that effect. May I remind all members that possibly I would be one of the few members in this House who does not interject. Perhaps I will learn the habit as time goes on, but I would hope not. I have always been a firm believer in the right of every person to put his point of view, and I behave accordingly. I believe we all have a right to be heard and that we have a right to respond to what has been said about us. Those are the tactics I adopt, and I hope I will always continue to adopt them. I recall some words spoken by a famous and great statesman many years ago. I cannot recite them exactly as they were spoken, but they were to this effect: Whilst I do not agree with what you say, I will defend to my death your right to say it.

Mr Fletcher: It was Voltaire.

Mr CRANE: That is right, it was Voltaire. I believe those few words contain a great deal of principle. I hope to enunciate that principle here and I will respect all other members who make an endeavour to do likewise because I believe the conduct of this House would be ever so much better if we adopted that principle instead of allowing the debate to turn into a dog fight as sometimes happens. So I have defended my right not to interject tonight.

I refer to the seminar to which I was quite rightly accused of speaking. My reason for so doing is that I was invited by a member of my electorate to speak as his elected representative in Parliament. It was requested that I speak on the politicians' dilemma of inflation. With your permission, Mr Speaker, I would like to read a few short passages of my speech

on that occasion to give you some idea of the manner in which I spoke. These were my opening words—

Mr. Chairman, Ladies & Gentlemen,
I must confess that I was rather surprised, and perhaps a little flattered that a member of Parliament, so recently elected as I, should be offered the opportunity of delivering this address today.

Point of Order

Mr BARNETT: On a point of order, Sir, I understand that what the member for Moore is speaking about has nothing to do with the amendment.

The SPEAKER: I am inclined to agree that at the present time it has nothing to do with the amendment, but I am permitting the member for Moore to speak briefly on this issue as his name was mentioned in certain circumstances which had relation to the debate in hand. Therefore I believe the member for Moore is entitled to make a brief report on the matter. Of course, he must not base his speech on it.

*Debate (on amendment to motion)
Resumed*

Mr CRANE: Thank you, Sir. I might add I am quite prepared to table this address if the House so desires. In fact, I request permission to do so. I certainly will not take long to get to the point I was endeavouring to make. My address continued—

I considered the matter for some time before arriving at a decision, and then on realising that I was being asked by a member of my electorate, I felt it my responsibility to oblige if at all possible. My two main concerns were firstly, as a new member of Parliament, I do not have a great deal of experience from which to draw my conclusions professionally, and secondly, I felt I could not match the calibre of the other speakers you have here today.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the member should paraphrase his remarks to give the House an idea of what he said at the seminar. I do not think I can continue to allow him to make the quotation in full.

Mr CRANE: Thank you, Sir, I will not carry on with this line. I respect your ruling. As I said before, my address to the seminar is available for anyone to read.

If I may continue in my previous vein, I would say in defence of speaking at the seminar that I am sure that because a person goes to church it does not necessarily follow that he is a Christian. If I read the Bible I am sure it does not necessarily follow I am a Christian. And if anyone reads the communist manifesto I am sure that would not make him a communist.

We must learn from life. We must be prepared to listen to others because that is how we learn. For that reason I have never yet been afraid to stand and hear what people say so that from them I may learn and make my own judgements. I believe that is a reasonable conclusion for any person to come to.

I might mention also that the Reverend Father Justin of New Norcia was a guest speaker at the seminar. I do not know how members opposite would like to brand him.

The member for Ascot in moving his amendment mentioned during an exchange of interjections with the Premier that one cannot beat an idea with a bullet. I believe the member for Fremantle made a similar suggestion only a short while ago. I should like to point out that I believe there are times when it is necessary to beat ideas with bullets; it is necessary for survival.

I recall the 1930s, when the greatest scourge that ever faced humanity, the Nazi Party, came into power in Germany. The nazis had ideas; Nazi Germany had ideas. However, I do not believe as the member for Ascot said, that we had any chance of beating those ideas with a better idea. We had a better idea but we had to resort to bullets.

We remember at that time that Hitler, the leader of the nazis, always claimed he wanted peace, and many in the world believed him. He wanted peace, all right! He wanted a piece of Austria, a piece of Czechoslovakia, and a piece of Poland!

It was when he moved into Poland that Britain declared war on Germany, and Australia followed suit within a matter of a few hours. I would suggest that that example outrules the suggestion of the member for Ascot that we cannot beat an idea with a bullet, because we did.

I will not continue to discuss that period because it was a rather unfortunate period in our history and perhaps started many of the troubles we face today. However, we should remember that the idea Hitler had was to rule the world himself; in the process, he murdered six million Jews. I believe we had every right to take our bullets and beat that idea.

A very prominent person who was in the House yesterday—I will not mention his name—was disappointed that people had stood up in this House in defence of the senseless slaughter of human beings. Goodness knows, he has seen a lot of such killing.

He said, "It hurts me to hear people called nazis when in fact they fought the nazis and it hurts me to see people not appreciating the freedom we enjoy when they have never had their arses in a cockpit." I hope you will excuse me for using such an expression, Mr Speaker, but I am sure you understand what I mean.

We must appreciate what we have and the many people who gave it to us. This amendment has been moved to a motion we on this side of the House moved as an Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech. Reference has been made to comments I made during my speech in this debate, when I referred to communism. My philosophy towards communism is that I reject it at all costs; I make no bones about that. I do not accept communism and I do not accept anyone wishing to thrust it upon me or my own people against their will.

I would remind members of the House that since the last World War, the wars of the world have been civil wars. I refer, of course, to the wars in Korea, Cambodia, and all these other places. They have been the direct cause of communist unrest. We must remember that the communist works in a very definite and predetermined manner. He breaks down the moral fibre of a nation and then attacks it from within.

I believe it is up to us as responsible people to see that the moral fibre of this nation is not tampered with, because that would eventually lead to communists attacking us from within.

Mr Jamieson: Tell us something about the Chile situation.

Mr CRANE: What—the wheat we wanted to sell them?

Mr Jamieson: That is all you are interested in.

Mr CRANE: No, not really.

Mr Jamieson: You are not concerned about how many people are being killed over there.

Mr CRANE: I said earlier that I did not intend to speak for long this evening, because there is a lot of business before the House.

Mr Harman: Yes, 20 Bills!

Mr Young: Who is stopping them from going through?

Mr CRANE: I hope I have adequately defended myself against comments regarding my address to the seminar. I believe members opposite are entitled to put their views, just as I am entitled to put forward my views. I have already declared very firmly that I reject communism at all costs; I believe the members of my party reject it also.

However, I would hope the remarks made about me tonight were not meant to cast any aspersions on other members of my party. I accept all responsibility for any actions I may take and I assure all members that I am not afraid to stand up anywhere and defend myself for any of those actions.

It is regrettable that the debate has been so protracted by these matters. In

conclusion in speaking against this amendment I should like to restate my complete hatred—that would be a satisfactory word, when I consider what it does to people—of communism. I can assure you, Mr Speaker, and all members of the House that if there is any person in Australia at present or in the future who has any ideas that one day he may be the Commissar of Kununurra, well before he is the member for Moore will be dead.

MR SKIDMORE (Swan) [9.47 p.m.]: I wish to speak in support of the amendment and I should like to quote that part of it which is the very essence of the reason we on this side of the House believe the amendment should receive the endorsement of the Parliament. It states—

We are compelled by recent events in Australia and South East Asia to advise the administrator that—

“Liberal and Country Party Members and Governments throughout Australia must now accept full responsibility for the decision, based upon a philosophy of fear and hatred, which led Australia to become an active participant in the civil war in Vietnam”.

It may be felt that such an amendment would open up debate where emotions became aroused and people became irrational in their utterances in the House. I should like to refer to two such irrational utterances which have been made tonight.

Firstly, I refer to the comments of the member for Karrinyup, who, in his address, showed his lack of understanding of the harm wars do to people, nations, and all concerned. Because he dealt for so long not with the motion before the Chair but with communism, I felt compelled to raise a point of order so that the honourable member would be brought back to the matter before the House.

The hatred of communism which has been expounded by several Government supporters seems to be born out of a fear; a similar fear to that to which I have been subjected over the last 30 or 35 years. Even during my industrial life, I was accused of being the fellow traveller of the communists—for what that is worth. If I have been, then I have been. I have been accused of being a sympathiser with communist causes; if I have been, then so be it; I do not deny it.

However, members should look at the points of communist philosophy with which I sympathise. It is not the name of the party in which I believe; it is what is behind some of its philosophies. It is the connotations that others place upon the “red” bogey that I do not support. Members opposite have raised the socialist bogey; I am proud to be a socialist. I do not expound the theories of communism

that members opposite expound when they tell us of the hatred and greed indulged in by communists throughout the world.

This is not so and those members are well aware of that. This is the old bogey that has been dragged out over the years and it has become sickening to listen to it being raised again and again and again. In fact, the immaturity and the lack of knowledge of the member for Karrinyup has been shown by his constant reference to this bogey of communism. He said that he used to be a lecturer in political history, but I would suggest that the only political history he bothered to study or research was the question of communism which he raised time and time again to-night, because from all that research not one whit of wisdom has he gained.

The Minister for Labour and Industry made some statement, in rather heated terms, about communists. He may call them what he likes but I regard them, in the true sense, as being socialists in their own country, and history will reveal the accuracy of my statement whether or not the members on the other side of the House agree with me. Of course, I realise that they will never accept the theory that there is some good to be gained from socialism. Statements have been made that elections held in communistic countries virtually amount to a gerrymander because there is only one party for whom the people can vote. However, if the USSR desires to embrace an election system of its own, that is its business. The system is not made any better by drawing a comparison with the democratic system we have in Australia, because when it comes to a question of voting in elections under our democratic system, even in this State, it could perhaps be said that a gerrymander is in existence here.

However, I do not want to develop that theme of hatred because it has no merit and makes no sound contribution to the debate before the Chair. Nevertheless, that is all we have heard from members on the other side of the House tonight. They have done nothing but make an attack against communism when, in fact, it is socialism.

Frequently the Minister for Labour and Industry interjected by asking, "Who is killing whom in South Vietnam?" and every time he came back with the answer it was the North Vietnamese who were killing people in South Vietnam. If that is so I do not know why the war in South Vietnam did not end 10 years ago; that is, if there is only one group of people responsible for the killing of the South Vietnamese. How dishonest can a member of Parliament be in trying to claim that there is only one antagonist in a war? Of course people are being killed by the North Vietnamese and also by the South Vietnamese and I object to that in the same way as anyone else.

I have no time for war and the harm and death it leaves in its wake, apart altogether from the misery that is caused to those people who do not even take up arms in a war.

I ask those members on the other side of the House to take their minds back to a few short weeks ago and to think of who was doing the killing in South Vietnam. They will recall the terrible fate met by the refugees who tried to board an aircraft when trying to get out of Saigon.

Mr Clarko: It was not Saigon.

Mr SKIDMORE: Well, it was some other South Vietnamese town.

Mr Clarko: It does make a difference.

Mr SKIDMORE: No doubt the member for Karrinyup will get his name recorded in *Hansard* for posterity. I apologise. It was not Saigon. I have been properly corrected by the member for Karrinyup. However, these refugees were trying to board an aircraft at some airfield in South Vietnam. Members on the other side of the House may laugh when I make mention of only an airfield, but it is well known that those who shot down their own people and killed them were the South Vietnamese soldiers who tried to board the plane before the refugees. Therefore it is of no use Government members trying to say that only one group of people have killed South Vietnamese.

Several members interjected.

Mr SKIDMORE: The member for Karrinyup has had his opportunity to make his contribution to the debate and virtually all we got from him was an attack on communists during practically three parts of his speech and he made no contribution to the amendment to the motion that is before the Chair. If the member for Karrinyup would only keep quiet and let me get on with my speech we would all be much better informed.

It becomes patently clear to all of us that the proposition expounded by the members of the Government and those who are opposed to this amendment is simply one of posing the question: Who is doing the killing in South Vietnam? If the member for Karrinyup cannot be sincere, I can, and I say in all sincerity that it is not only the North Vietnamese who are doing the killing in South Vietnam.

Mr Clarko: If the communist aggressors left South Vietnam there would be no more killing.

Mr Jamieson: If one West Perth footballer left the State Subiaco would have no trouble on Anzac Day.

Mr SKIDMORE: All that members opposite wish to do is to raise that time-worn bogey of communism which I am trying to avoid.

Mr Clarko: You are avoiding it altogether.

Mr SKIDMORE: I am not trying to avoid it because I do not believe in it. I do not want to become involved in the matter because it has nothing to do with the amendment before the Chair. Therefore the question that was posed by the Minister for Labour and Industry as to who is doing the killing, certainly does not stand up when it is obvious that there are people on both sides who are doing the killing in South Vietnam, and I am afraid that this is often the outcome of any war.

I do not want to dwell on the history of the Vietnamese war, because in all probability I will be laughed at in view of the fact that I cannot pronounce some of the names of the people involved in that war. However, many people throughout the world could be in the same position, because there is difficulty in pronouncing many of the names of the leaders, presidents, generals, and other leading dignitaries in Vietnam. However, the difficulty a person may have in pronouncing such names does not make any less valid the point that people in South Vietnam are being killed by more than one group.

On the question of pronunciation I would say that even in this House the English language is used in some strange ways and I have no hesitation in saying that probably I would be one of the worst offenders. Nevertheless I think the principal aim is for a person to get his message across. I make mention of that simply because it is obvious that I have got my message across to members on the other side of the Chamber; judging from their interjections they are well aware of the point I am trying to make in regard to the killing of people in South Vietnam.

During his speech the Minister for Labour and Industry went on to outline what he considered would be the outcome of the war after the advancing hordes had taken over South Vietnam. He said that the communists would quickly come down on the little fish in the pond. He quoted that reference from an article, but I do not know the date of it. However, it seems to be a quote from statements made by Lee Kuan Yew when he arrived in Australia and addressed several assemblies in the Eastern States. I question as to whether or not he considered the communist hordes would come down on the little fish in the pond.

The *Australian* of the 9th April contains an article dealing with the so-called domino theory, which has been tossed out even by the American Government as being no longer valid, as having no essence of truth, and as not likely to take place.

Mr Young: But it has taken place.

Mr SKIDMORE: Let us see what was said by Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the Prime Minister of Singapore. The article states—

This is why Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the Prime Minister of Singapore, appeared to be blasé about the domino theory

after his talks with Mr Whitlam last week, when he dismissed the theory as "old hash." He is not worried about any southward thrust by communist troops and, being a strong man with tight control over his country, is not unduly disturbed about insurgency movements gathering strength either.

Yet the member for South Perth said that at the time Mr Lee Kuan Yew was disturbed about the little fishes in the pond and the fear of their being gobbled up by the encroaching hordes of communists.

I simply would like to make this reflection: If 850 million Chinese decided to march southward, they would do so with or without the support of members opposite or of anybody else. They would be able to do that through sheer weight of numbers, and practically without resistance. However, have the Chinese ever tried to develop the theory of marching south in a warlike way? Of course, members on the Government side will know what has happened.

Mr Clarko: What about the conflicts in Tibet and India?

Mr SKIDMORE: They have not made an attack, as some members on the Government side seem to think. I shall not swallow the bait of the member for Kar-rinyup by discussing the Tibetan situation. He might say that I am running away from the argument, but I am not.

I turn to another part of the speech made by the Minister for Labour and Industry, who has just returned to the Chamber. He made a remark about a statement attributed to Mr Lee Kuan Yew. In another newspaper, the *National Review*, of the 4th to 10th April an article appeared, which indicated that the reporters were spot on in their analysis of what Mr Lee Kuan Yew had said. The article fortifies the other article I have mentioned.

I shall paraphrase this article dealing with the statement made by Mr Lee Kuan Yew who happened to be in Australia at the time. In effect he said that the domino theory had already been discarded by the same people who had invented it—the American State Department—and that Singapore had not felt in the least threatened.

However, Mr Fraser, the Federal Leader of the Opposition, considered as authentic such on-the-spot authorities as *The Sydney Morning Herald* cartoons which depict, for example, Mao Tse Tung pushing over a line of dominoes while Jim Cairns looked on in glee. Such are the means by which Mr Fraser is convinced that the domino theory is in existence, and this is one aspect which worries the Australian public. So much for the concern of Mr Lee Kuan Yew.

There then entered into the troubled situation in Vietnam a light comedy period,

in which three musketeers took up arms and sallied north into enemy territory, in order to see at first hand what was going on in the countries affected. They came back after spending about two days in those countries, and made great pronouncements about the problems of the refugees and the orphans; they gave a complete solution for a war that has defeated the efforts of many great statesmen. The three musketeers who came back to Australia with the answer were Peacock, Sinclair, and Sullivan.

They went to the trouble-torn country of Vietnam, and at the time much play was made in the Press of the fact that they paid their expenses out of their own pockets. Great play was made of the fact that these three persons went to South-East Asia in order to solve the problems of Vietnam, when in fact that was not their purpose. All that they were required to do was to get to Bangkok, from where they would be ferried around by American officials.

Those three persons were ferried around Cambodia and Vietnam on a fact-finding mission. Let us see how much these great men of wisdom—the three musketeers—did to solve the problems of Vietnam. I have a little run-down on their activities, which I prepared because I did not want to elaborate on the problems associated with those three persons.

What happened was that they landed in Bangkok, from where they were flown into the city of Phnom Penh. They were supposed to have made an in-depth study of the refugee problem. They landed at the airport in Phnom Penh, and after a few hours there they flew to Saigon. They then returned to Australia and made a profound statement that they had an answer to the refugee problem. That was the kind of in-depth study they made.

How irresponsible is it for the Minister to talk about our efforts, when in fact the previous Liberal Government should be held responsible for the sins that have been cast upon all Australians through the Australian intervention in Vietnam? If that is the sort of leadership we can expect in 1975 from the Liberals, then we certainly cannot accept the leadership that was given to the people of Australia when we were involved in the war in Vietnam. An analogy can be made with the leadership of the people whom we condemn by the very amendment that is before the House. In going to South-East Asia the three musketeers I mentioned made great play to the Australian public of the fact that they paid their expenses out of their own pockets, as though that was a magnificent gesture.

When we look at the question of the Vietnamese orphans and children who have been evacuated for adoption in Australia, I express the opinion that this is

a great tragedy for them—not that they should not be evacuated, but that they should be coming to Australia to be adopted. I say that after due reflection on all the things that might be said about me by people who read *Hansard*. I say with complete humility that it is very wrong to remove orphans from their home country, bring them to Australia, and have them adopted into our way of life. Even their own people say this is wrong, and history will bear out the fact that this is a great tragedy and a great mistake.

The SPEAKER: Will the member for Swan relate his remarks to the amendment?

Mr SKIDMORE: I am taking the same license to develop my theme as other speakers have taken. I bow to your wishes, Mr Speaker, and hope that I will not fall into the error you mentioned. The people I have been speaking about would be in the same situation as those who have been evacuated for the sake of safety; but I think they should be returned to their own country, so that they may grow up as Vietnamese, for that is truly what they are. There is no question that they should be returned.

I do not intend to continue speaking for much longer, but I do want to make some pertinent remarks about this terrible struggle taking place in Vietnam. Those on this side of the House have been accused tonight of propounding an amendment which brings ridicule on the House and brings Western Australia into disrepute.

Let us consider what prompted the moving of the amendment. It was prompted by the Minister's notice of motion on the notice paper. I do not have any desire to play politics over a war-torn country or the people in it who are suffering, and I am sure that this applies to all those on this side of the House. However, having had the gauntlet thrown at us and having been challenged, and told we were irresponsible, it behoves us as an Opposition party to take up the gauntlet, and that was the reason for the birth of the amendment now before us.

No doubt I will have another opportunity later on to speak to this subject, but I would like to make one further quotation before I conclude. Many books have been written and many theories have been submitted on the problems of Vietnam. We tried to solve the problems overnight. We have had the whole might of the American nation apparently in Vietnam, but all it did was escalate the war. There is no question about that because the American nation itself has now recognised the fact that it was an unwinnable war and should never have been fought. The indictment of that nation's President is a clear indication of how the country stands and the people have come out and said, that, no matter what mandate he had the Presi-

dent was wrong—and must go—and go he did, and quite rightly so. Other nations have adopted the same policy.

After the last election the Labor Party recalled all troops from Vietnam and stipulated that we would take no more part in the fighting. Again we were a leader of nations, but the suggestion was made that the Australian Prime Minister had brought nothing but ridicule upon us on the international scene. What a lot of hypocrisy! He stands head and shoulders above other Prime Ministers. He has been a man of great humane feeling on the question of the suffering of many people.

I do not want to make a comparison of Prime Ministers from various parties. I make this statement in a very broad sense. The Prime Minister stands head and shoulders above all others as being one of the greatest Prime Ministers we have had and, because of that, one would feel—I am trying to relate my remarks to the amendment by making an analogy—that the Government we represent should not be challenged for being devoid of any feelings and for not having made any efforts to keep peace. The blame rests with the accusers, and not with us.

As I said, I would like to make one final quote from a book written by a man vilified many times. He, too, would perhaps stand head and shoulders above those who in Australia have fought a cause on the question of our involvement in Vietnam. He has been attacked physically by the police and probably by some of the people in his own party for his stand. He has always steadfastly moved forward in the belief that we should not be involved in the war because it should be a war for the Vietnamese with no interference from us.

I agree with him and I have been very proud to be a participant in moratorium marches on this question. I have also witnessed what has happened to some of those students who took part in the marches. When they were marching peacefully through the streets of Perth they were roughed up by people who held opposing views. I have also seen films of similar incidents in other States.

It is to our shame that a man who so genuinely tried to demonstrate that we were wrong had so many aspersions cast on him and will probably have many more cast on him in later debates.

He wrote a book titled, *The Eagle and the Lotus* with the subheading, "Western Intervention in Vietnam 1847-1968". It contained a very comprehensive history of the whole of the problems which have faced that war-torn country for many years. Many of these have been mentioned tonight and most were substantially correct. The facts related by the member for Karrinyup concerning the history of that country were correct.

I think we should all take note of the quotation I am about to make and it is because of this I have risen to speak tonight on this amendment. I wanted to ensure there was no doubt where I stood on the matter. The quotation reads—

Mourn not the dead
But rather mourn the apathetic throng,
The cowed and meek
Who see the world's great anguish
and its wrong
And do not speak.

MR JAMIESON (Welshpool—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [10.17 p.m.]: Tonight the member for Karrinyup gave us quite a history of Vietnam. However, he missed a very important portion of the history; that is, the part covering the period between the beginning of this century and the present time. The honourable member stated that the forces of the north were against the forces of the south, but such a statement is not easily reconciled with the facts because Thieu and Ky, and the likes of those two come from the north and Ho Chi-Minh was more or less associated with the people of the south so the situation is not so clearly defined as the member for Karrinyup tried to make it out to be. Indeed, one must study the history of the Ho Chi-Minh regime to appreciate a little more of the nationalist movement which occurred there long before Ho Chi-Minh became embraced by communist elements about which I will say a little more later.

Ho Chi-Minh was very much a nationalist-movement man and had the support of the people of Vietnam and at the time of the Versailles Treaty he was given certain undertakings by the French that they would leave, but the undertakings were dishonoured and the French remained there, to their great regret. Up to about 750 000 people died in an effort to maintain some sort of law and order in the country which was in a state of national revolution against the usurpers. The French eventually held up their hands in holy horror and decided to get out of Vietnam and let the Vietnamese have their own way. This is the more recent history.

While the French were there no doubt Ho Chi-Minh was looking for friends because he required friends in need who would be friends indeed and he gained the friendship from Moscow. Of course he accepted it because possibly there was no other way for him and his nationalist movement to carry on to the extent they did. Ultimately of course people far and wide intervened; people who had not previously had a foothold in that particular area of the globe. Then of course his forces were raised in opposition, his headquarters being associated with Hanoi.

Somebody said that the bombs which were dropped in Hanoi did not do much damage. However, that person certainly

did not see some of the films which showed the terrific bomb damage and the completely devastated areas of Hanoi. I imagine that the bombing had a profound effect on the people of North Vietnam. To not admit that, would be to hide one's head completely in the sand.

We now come to the other side of the story. The member for Moore has joined forces with the member for Karrinyup. Only 30 years ago we were happy to have the communists on our side, as we were happy to have the Americans on our side, for our own salvation and for the salvation of the communists and the Americans.

Mr Coyne: They were happy to fight with us, too.

Mr JAMIESON: I am not denying that, but we had a very good reason to fight together. However, some people so easily forget recent history. We fought against forces we considered to be evil. However, the forces on the other side probably considered us to be evil because we were evilly stopping them. The forces of evil are in the mind's eye and in my conscience I assumed that the group with which I was associated, in the services, was the right group. Evidently the member for Moore, from what he said in his rather abstract remarks, was also associated with some of the forces which combined with the communists, and fought alongside them. At that time the Vietmin forces were fighting alongside us by harassing the Japanese whenever they could and giving us assistance. As a result of that assistance we promised them they would have a free country.

I ask: Who went back on their promises? Was it the communists, or the western world? I think that on examination it was the European countries which had made the promises but for some reason or other they saw fit not to carry them out. As a consequence, the nationalist movement was engendered into the people of Vietnam and it was bound to dominate them.

It is of no use the member for Karrinyup quoting what happened 1 000 years ago. During the last 1 000 years the English nation itself has been in turbulence and one has only to read history to learn of the bloody battles which took place in that nation. Indeed, I do not think it has altogether settled its problems up until today. Of course, that is another story.

I do want to warn Liberal Party and Country Party members in this House that they need to know exactly where they are heading. Last year, while in the United States, I had a run with a Democratic candidate. I was privileged one afternoon to be at an address where a representative from Minnesota, Don Fraser, who is not an inconsequential member of the Congress Foreign Affairs Committee—as a matter of fact, he is one of the vice-chairmen—addressed the meeting of

Democratic supporters. I was rather amazed to hear his comments when he was asked, during a question period, what he thought would be the future of America in foreign affairs. He immediately said that never again could the United States set itself up as a policeman of the world. That is what he said; an influential man on the Congress Foreign Affairs Committee.

He then went on to explain his theories on how the image of the United States Congress Foreign Affairs Committee could be improved. At the time it was at an all-time low. I tell members of this incident because it is factual. If members opposite intend to support somebody else they should know where they are going because a sad lesson has been learned. The French learnt the hard way that there was no chance of a military decision in the particular situation.

Mr Coyne: Only for the communists. They take advantage of a military decision.

Mr JAMIESON: That, of course, is wrong. If the communists were all of one happy family, as members opposite would make them out to be, that theory might be correct. However, members opposite know there is constant turmoil between the Russians and the Chinese. As a matter of fact, if one reads the literature which the Russians print and make available at their airports, and on their train services, one will find most of it attacks the Chinese.

The Russians acknowledge that the western world is somewhat different from Russia, but they feel the Chinese should be going along in concert with them on certain features. However, they could never reach agreement.

Mr Coyne: But they will, when Mao goes.

Mr JAMIESON: In turning to another field, Mr Speaker—and I am not asking you to be overtolerant—I suggest the forces in Rumania operate under a different scheme. One of the biggest worries to that country is Russia to the north. The Rumanians have a different system of a socialised republic, far different from the Russians. The systems are as alike as chalk and cheese, but I do not want to expand on that at the moment.

The Rumanian system is not nearly as sophisticated or developed as the Russian system and the Rumanian people are looked upon by the Russians as of a lesser orientation. Rumania has a different set-up but it is still within the bloc of communist countries referred to.

It will be several hundred years before the Asian group all become communists. I doubt whether it will occur within our lifetime, or within the lifetime of our children. Assuming they did become a communist group, there would be much

for them to do to put their own house in order. They would have to go down into Indonesia, and Singapore, and countries such as that.

Mr Coyne: That will not be long.

Mr Young: You seem to be giving up. I thought they were to stop at South Korea.

Mr JAMIESON: It will take the communists so long to get their own house in order, with all the things which will have to be done, that we do not need to worry about them. I have not examined the Asian situation thoroughly, but from what I have seen they will have a great many problems to overcome. By the time these problems are overcome I hope we are sensible enough to have adopted some form of socialism which would fit in with the general scheme of things.

It has been proved through history that as people are educated a system of socialism naturally manifests itself along the way. I have confidence in the people of the future to know that this will happen, and the more money that is pumped into education the more chance there will be of this occurring, as it has in other countries.

Mr McPharlin: A short step to communism.

Mr JAMIESON: I do not know what the Leader of the Country Party refers to as communism. If one gets down to basics, it means government by the community with which I think the Leader of the Country Party agrees in some sort of round about way.

Mr McPharlin: Or rule by terror.

Mr JAMIESON: The Deputy Premier is now getting into a different field. Some communist countries might be ruled by terror. Chile probably is; it was a left-wing country. The fact is that some countries, both right and left, are ruled by fear. I do not countenance this and in the ultimate I do not think anyone in the world should countenance it. However, the nationalist movement in Vietnam is the movement we must have regard for.

I think the amendment is quite justified. It pre-empt any attempt on the part of the Government to take advantage of a situation which might exist. Any further debate on the Government's proposed motion will be a repetition of the present debate, and you might not be very tolerant of that situation, Mr Speaker.

I support the amendment moved by the member for Ascot. I think it is quite justified and is well thought out, bearing in mind the nature of the motion which was to be proposed by the Government. It was necessary for the Opposition to state its position very clearly, and I think the various speakers have done that. They are not afraid of anything they have said but will

stand by it because they know where they are going. But if there were a change in the situation in South-East Asia tomorrow I do not know what policy Government members would follow because they do not seem to have a policy.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes—16

Mr Barnett	Mr Hartrey
Mr Bateman	Mr Jamieson
Mr B. T. Burke	Mr T. H. Jones
Mr Carr	Mr Skidmore
Mr H. D. Evans	Mr Taylor
Mr T. D. Evans	Mr A. R. Tonkin
Mr Fletcher	Mr J. T. Tonkin
Mr Harman	Mr McIver

(Teller)

Noes—23

Mr Blaikie	Mr Mensaros
Mr David Brand	Mr Nanovich
Mr Clarko	Mr Old
Mr Cowan	Mr O'Neill
Mr Coyne	Mr Rushton
Mr Crane	Mr Shalders
Dr Dadour	Mr Sibson
Mr Grayden	Mr Sodeman
Mr Grewar	Mr Stephens
Mr P. V. Jones	Mr Watt
Mr Laurence	Mr Young
Mr McPharlin	

(Teller)

Pairs

Ayes	Noes
Mr T. J. Burke	Mr O'Connor
Mr Bertram	Mrs Craig
Mr Bryce	Mr Thompson
Mr Davies	Sir Charles Court
Mr May	Mr Ridge

Amendment thus negated.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

MR DAVIES (Victoria Park) [10.36 p.m.]: Like other speakers, I take the opportunity to say a few words about two or three general matters which are of concern to me.

I would like to endorse the remarks of the member for Swan, who said he was having difficulty in getting his office properly furnished. I think this applies to all members. There has been some small movement since the member for Swan spoke, but if the Minister for Works could hasten action to get our offices furnished it would be appreciated by all.

More importantly, I believe, we need to review the position in regard to the taking of leave by our secretaries. When the secretaries go on annual leave—and they are entitled to four weeks' leave a year—no arrangement is made for relief in the office. I find this unbelievable. It has been accepted that there is benefit in having electorate offices, and it has been accepted that secretaries are necessary to maintain the offices, do the typing, and so on. Yet when the secretaries go on annual leave the Government says, "Bad luck! You cannot have anyone to relieve your secretaries. You can do what you like for one month." For 11 months of the year we apparently need staff in our offices, but for one month of the year when our secretaries go on leave we do not need anyone to do our typing, answer the phone, attend to the office, and look after our electorates.

Mr Sibson: I will have my secretary do your typing for you, if you like.

Mr DAVIES: Although the member for Bunbury kindly offered to have my typing done in his office, it would be inconvenient, to say the least, to take up his offer.

Mr Jamieson: The security would be pretty bad, too.

Mr DAVIES: I believe something should be done to provide office relief.

Another matter I wish to mention briefly is the position regarding traffic in the city. I have scanned the report of the committee the Tonkin Government appointed to consider a design for the central Perth area. In some respects I am a little disappointed in that the report seems to deal only with traffic and pedestrians, but perhaps I have taken more notice of the Press reports than of the contents of Professor Stephenson's report. I have the highest regard for him but I thought something more definite would come out of the work of the committee.

One aspect which needs immediate attention is the way traffic becomes congested in Hay Street east of Barrack Street at present. One cannot travel up Hay Street in a westerly direction but has to turn north into Barrack Street, which is a one-way street. At almost any hour of the day that I have had occasion to use this route, I found traffic banked up as far back as Pier Street.

I find that some people are becoming increasingly cross about the delay. We must think well ahead. If one comes in from the Causeway, one can travel around Riverside Drive, and then into Barrack Street to go to the north of the city, otherwise one has to drive along Hay Street because there is no right-hand turn out of St. George's Terrace. One cannot turn into Murray Street because it is a one-way street, and at least 90 per cent of the time there is no right-hand turn out of Wellington Street. So traffic going north along Barrack Street must enter it either from Riverside Drive or from Hay Street, and of course all this latter traffic banks up outside the Town Hall and causes unnecessary delays.

Professor Stephenson has drawn attention to some of the emergent problems, but of course the problem I am discussing is already there. I can see no immediate answer to it, unless we allow some right turns out of Wellington Street which would make the situation a little easier.

I want to say that the constant Press utterances of the Minister for Police appear to be having some effect on the road toll. We congratulate him for this. The policy of consistently bringing to the attention of people the need to take exceptional care on the road at all times is having its effect. We had a very good Easter in terms of the road toll, although

I believe the casualty section of the Royal Perth Hospital was very busy the following week. The total number of fatalities is down for the year, and that is something we all applaud; we hope it keeps up.

However, I feel it is time to review some of the penalties set out in the Road Traffic Code. One I wish to refer to particularly relates to traffic proceeding across level crossings while the boom gates are in motion. We all agree that once the boom gates move and the red light flashes traffic must stop immediately. However, it has been pointed out to me that some motorists have been booked for moving off before the boom gates are completely vertical again and the light has gone out. We all understand the safety involved in this matter, but once the train has gone and the gates are moving up, it is not unreasonable that motorists move off once they can get clear of the gates.

I believe the penalty for this offence is \$40—equal to the highest penalty imposed under the Road Traffic Code. A neighbour who complained to me about this matter said that he had moved off as he felt rather embarrassed because the people in the cars behind were tooting him. He was holding up the traffic by not moving off, and the police often tell us—and the Minister has told me in correspondence—that the aim is to keep traffic flowing and avoid unnecessary delay. I point out that a penalty of \$40 for such an offence is completely out of proportion to the other penalties under the code.

These are some of the matters referred to, I think, as "wood-and-water-matters", by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The matter I want to bring to the notice of the House particularly is once again an issue which I thought would have been resolved by now—it relates to the treatment of arteriosclerosis. On several occasions last year I asked questions about this matter, and I will mention all these questions so that we will have one concise record of the unsatisfactory position in relation to this treatment.

At the end of last session the Minister representing the Minister for Health in this House rose to his feet and told me very forcibly in effect I should mind my own business and that everything was under control. In fact, I heard one Government member say, "Well, he put Davies in his place", and perhaps he thought the Minister had. I would be delighted to be put in my place at any time if I felt I was achieving something. I hoped, having been put in my place, that I had achieved what I set out to do; that is, to start the ball rolling so that a certain machine, which had been lying idle since arriving in July last year, would be put into operation. However, the sad story I am about to relate will show that nothing of any consequence has happened since I was put in my place at the end of November last. It is about time someone else was put in his

place, because it is an indictment of the Government that someone has not got off his posterior, that the matter was not followed up, and that no further action was taken to use this form of therapy, or even for someone to say that it would not be used. The Government should not keep people dangling on a string.

Many people suffering from this disease are now immobile, and the treatment can afford them some relief. Certainly it will never provide a cure, but it can provide relief in many cases. If the Government takes any notice of my remarks tonight, I hope it will take action to ensure that there is no further unnecessary delay such as has already occurred.

I know for a fact that at least one member of the Government, and not a front bench member, supports me in what I am seeking to achieve. He is interested in this treatment because of information he received from an elector. He is anxious that the Government does something about Dr Möller's treatment for arteriosclerosis. In the medical dictionary I have, arteriosclerosis is defined as follows—

ARTERIOSCLEROSIS hardening of the arteries. A comprehensive term often used to include any chronic arterial disease or degeneration, but strictly applies to a slow, non-inflammatory degenerative condition of the arteries in which lime salts are deposited in the middle layer of the arterial wall.

There is apparently no known cause, and apparently no known cure for the disease. If members are interested I have other extracts from the dictionary which define some of the terms used. As I said, the cause of the disease is unknown, and there is no known cure. However, arteriosclerosis is widespread.

In an attempt to find out what was happening, last year I asked questions in the House about the mortality rate of the disease. On page 1774 of *Hansard* of the 1st October, 1974, the Minister representing the Minister for Health replied to my question. He was good enough to define the terms under which the statistics were kept, and he then said—

Hospital morbidity statistics are available in the same terms and show that the relevant figures for WA hospital discharges for 1971 and 1972 were 122 and 141 respectively where arteriosclerosis was the principal condition treated.

The Minister also told me that depending on the interpretation and classification, there were 138 deaths in Western Australia in 1971 and 126 in 1972. So if we take the latest figure, 126 people may have been alive today had Dr Möller's treatment been available. We did not have it in the State at that time, but as at least 100 people die from the disease each year, presumably many of the 100 people

who have died this year could have at least been relieved of their pain and suffering, and perhaps even given many more years of active life had they had the opportunity to obtain the treatment. They are the statistics.

I was not the only one interested in the treatment of this disease. On page 3568 of the 1973 *Hansard* the then member for Dale, the present Minister for Local Government, asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health—because I happened to be away at that time—the following question—

- (1) Will he take initiatives to enable persons in Western Australia suffering from arteriosclerosis to receive the Dr. Möller West German clinic treatment in this State?
- (2) What financial assistance is available from hospital benefits funds and Government agencies to assist a person to make the visit to Germany and to receive the treatment?

The member was going about it the wrong way of course, although he did ask whether the treatment was available in this State. He then went on to ask about the position of sending people to Germany to be treated.

The answer given by my colleague, the then Minister for Agriculture (Mr H. D. Evans), stated that any proposal in this direction put up by a responsible medical body would be examined and duly considered. That was in regard to the treatment being available in this State. Secondly, the Minister said that no financial assistance was available to enable a person to visit Germany for treatment. I suppose that is only proper because we could not run our medical system on that basis.

Some argument occurred regarding what eventually transpired, and you will recall, Sir, that a leading vascular surgeon who happened to be going to Germany offered to visit Kassel and to spend some time with Dr Möller and subsequently to make a report. That surgeon was good enough to do this and to bring back a report, and his letter to me was printed in *Hansard*, as I quoted it during my second last speech on this matter. It appears on pages 3547 and 3548 of the 1974 *Hansard*. Although he said there was need for caution, he said he felt there would be some advantage in bringing the machine to this State to be tested.

Subsequently argument occurred about what transpired, and in his speech on the 28th November, 1974, the Minister for Lands, representing the Minister for Health, said the machine was ordered by the department on the 30th May, 1974. That statement may be found at page 3999 of *Hansard* of last year. Yet I have in my hand a letter dated the 15th May, 1974,

which was written by a supposed agent of the department, who turned out to be a retired doctor employee who was in Germany receiving treatment at his own expense. A fortnight before the department was supposed to have ordered the machine this gentleman wrote to a colleague and said that the machine was ready for dispatch and that it had been fitted with a special thread to take Australian oxygen bottles. I do not think there is much point in becoming involved in an argument and saying, "We didn't know that you had ordered it." However, I point out that the Minister said it was ordered on the 30th May, yet the letter I have here—and I would be pleased to table it if necessary—states that the machine was available on the 15th May.

The machine was ordered and was sent to Western Australia and I understand it was eventually sent by air as a result of the dithering that occurred. Delivery was finally effected on the 4th July, 1974. The time taken to get the machine to Western Australia illustrates the ineptitude of the present Minister. But, as I said, all this is of little consequence now; it is only academic.

Once the machine arrived I asked a series of questions. On the 4th September, 1974, I asked a question which is recorded on page 1173 of *Hansard* for that year. I asked whether the machine had arrived and was in use, etc., and I was told the machine had arrived. Mind you, Sir, the machine arrived in July, and I asked this question in September, some two months later. The Minister informed me as follows—

No delay has occurred in the preliminary testing of a machine which was acquired by the Government from Dr W. Möller in July. Extensive mechanical tests have been necessary to establish the levels of performance and safety of the machine under different conditions. These tests are still in progress, but it is anticipated that a controlled clinical trial of suitable patients with peripheral arteriosclerosis will be able to commence in approximately one month.

I then asked a question on the 10th September regarding who was doing the testing and who was hurrying along the work, as I hoped this was being done. The answer I received was as follows—

The equipment has been placed under the management of the peripheral vascular unit operated by the visiting vascular surgeons at the Royal Perth and Sir Charles Gairdner Hospitals. No specific installation procedures have been necessary.

In fact, the answers I received to the whole question were very vague indeed, and threw suspicion on the action of the department even at that stage.

However, as I mentioned previously, I had been told on the 4th September that the machine probably would be available in about one month. So on the 17th October I asked what had happened, because more than a month had passed and I confidently expected that patients would be receiving treatment by then. That question appeared on page 2396 of *Hansard* of 1974, and the reply of the Minister was—

Progress in the developmental work necessary to establish the levels of performance and safety in use of the machine acquired by the Government from Dr. Möller is continuing. Lists are also being prepared of patients who may be suitable for inclusion in the controlled clinical trial which will be undertaken at the conclusion of the developmental work.

No indication was given as to when all that would come about, although the time-tabling was then at least a fortnight behind. But, patient as ever, I let the matter rest until the 26th November, 1974, when I asked what progress had been made. Incidentally, I referred my questions one to the other; I did not try to trap the Government into giving answers which would be at variance with one another. I made it easy for the Government to check what it had told me previously so that it could update the information. On page 3628 of *Hansard* the Minister supplied the following answer—

The format of the controlled clinical trial to be carried out using suitable patients on the machine acquired by the Government from Dr Möller—

That phrase was always used. The answer continued—

—is almost finalised and will be submitted shortly to the relevant University and hospital authorities for their approval.

As you will recall, Sir, I had a few words to say about the matter during the debate on the Estimates on the 21st November. My remarks at that time are recorded on pages 3547 and 3548 of last year's *Hansard*, and it was then I read out the report of the doctor who visited Kassel in Germany. I also mentioned that caution was necessary; in fact I used that word several times. However, I received no response.

On the 28th November, 1974, one week later, when dealing with the items of the Estimates I had another bash at the Government for its inactivity in regard to this matter. My speech on that occasion is recorded on pages 3998 and 3999. I considered then, as I do now, that it was a cruel hoax to keep people who cannot get out of their wheelchairs dangling on a string and waiting for treatment, hoping all the time that progress was being made

when obviously it was not. That is when the Minister came back and read beautifully the notes prepared for him.

I do not know who prepared his notes; I cannot begin to imagine who did because I do not know of any officer in the department who would prepare notes of that type and take such license with what I had already said. It is a matter of regret that apparently such an officer is in the Public Health Department. However, that is of little consequence because, as I indicated then, I thought we were getting somewhere. You will recall, Sir, that in September the machine was to be ready in one month, then I was told matters were proceeding; then later I was told it was almost ready, and then at the end of November the Government thought it would not be very long before the machine was in operation. Therefore I thought, perhaps foolishly, that it would not be long before the machine was in operation.

After Parliament opened this year I asked a question on the 20th March. In my question I referred the Government to the earlier questions and asked what progress had been made and how many patients had been treated, and if none had been treated when was it anticipated that treatment would commence. I confidently expected the Government to say the machine was then in use, that X number of patients had been treated, that the results were good or bad, or that the machine was still being evaluated.

It has been something like seven or eight months since the machine arrived here. The machine has been here; apparently we have had a team working on it, but to date no patients have been treated. I asked what the position was, and received the following reply—

- (a) Further progress has been made in arranging the necessary protection of the rights of patients—

This is something completely new; we have never spoken about the rights of the patients before. Previously, as soon as the Government could get the machine going, it was going to start using it; but now, we are talking about the rights of patients. The answer continues—

—who may be included in the controlled clinical trial of the machine acquired by the Government from Dr Möller.

I have never had a question answered which has not used that phrase. To continue—

It was agreed that the machine be placed under the management of the peripheral vascular unit operated by the visiting vascular surgeons to the Royal Perth and Sir Charles Gairdner Hospitals, that use of the machine on patients would be in accordance with appropriate requirements governing

human experimentation, including the protection of the patients and the satisfactory obtaining of his consent. The Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital has now come to an arrangement with the University of W.A. whereby the Human Rights Committee of the university will, on behalf of the hospital, review and ensure the protection of the rights and welfare of patients within the hospital involved in clinical trials of this kind. It is anticipated that the Human Rights Committee will be able to give early attention to this important aspect of the work to be carried out on the machine.

Part (6) of my question asked how many patients had been treated, and the answer was, "None as yet." The final answer to my question reads as follows—

- (c) The controlled clinical trial will be undertaken subsequent to and in the light of the advice of the university's Human Rights Committee.

Why wait until now to refer the matter to the Human Rights Committee of the university? I doubt that there was any reason to refer the matter; but if there were, why did not the Government do it immediately it knew the machine was here? It seems the Government has no intention of using the machine. I believe it is playing a cruel hoax on at least 100 persons who will probably die this year, who could receive some relief if treatment were given to them.

What pure humbug this is! I say that advisedly, because one of the members in this House, the member for Albany, raised the matter with the university on behalf of one of his electors. Unbeknown to me, he rang the university and asked whether it could hurry the matter along and I understand he was told that the university knew nothing about it.

Mr Watt: They knew about it, but they had not yet been given a submission to report on it.

Mr DAVIES: I was led to believe by the Minister that the matter was well and truly on its way. The university knew about it, but had received nothing!

Why does not the Minister answering these questions either tell me the truth or tell me to shut up, sit down, and mind my own business? I would soon tell him otherwise, of course! Why give me this continuing humbug? Why string me along, just as I am forced to string along people in my electorate by saying, "The Minister has told me this, and I believe it to be a fact"? I am being made to look as much a prevaricator as the Minister obviously is. He is certainly not giving me the truth, and many people are suffering because of it.

Mr McPharlin: Have you spoken to the Minister about it?

Mr DAVIES: Have I!

Mr McPharlin: I take it that you are talking about questions.

Mr DAVIES: Yes; I have spoken to the Public Health Commissioner, but not directly to the Minister. But let the Deputy Premier ask one of his Cabinet colleagues whether he has spoken to the Minister and see what answer he receives. I will give the Deputy Premier the Minister's name, if he likes; he has not been able to get any assistance from the Minister.

I do not know whether or not the Minister will agree to use the machine; certainly, the Sir Charles Gairdner and Royal Perth Hospitals have some control over its use; it is between the doctors and the vascular surgeons there. It may be that the Minister has no power to order the machine to be used, but if that is the case, why does the Government not take it away from them, get another machine, or send some German-speaking doctor to Kassel and start the whole damn thing again? The Minister could have patients treated within a month, if he really wanted to.

I suppose many people are asking, "Is this treatment of any value?" As members know, I am only a layman and can speak only on the basis of evidence made available to me. First of all, I refer members to my earlier quotations, which are well documented; they will see what I said about people who had allegedly received some relief. I have here a copy of the *Australasian Nurses Journal* of March, 1974, which includes an article by Dr Möller on oxygen as treatment for the vascular system. Any honourable member is welcome to peruse this article if he so desires.

Does the Minister or the Government believe in this treatment? The Minister must assuredly believe in it because in reply to a letter written to him by a lady living in Sydney, he said that the treatment was available. She wrote to the Minister on the 21st October, 1974, and, by the time a reply was posted—I do not know when it was sent, because it was undated—she had left for Germany to obtain the treatment there.

She was only a working woman, but because of lack of information relating to the treatment in Australia, she went to Germany on the 29th November. When she left, she had not received a reply from the Minister; it was only after a local man told the Minister it was time he replied to him that the woman received a reply from the Minister.

The Minister's letter stated—

Thank you for your letter of 21st October, 1974, enquiring as to when treatment by the method of Dr Möller might be available in W.A. to sufferers from arterio-sclerosis.

Although the machine used in this treatment has been acquired by my Government from Dr Möller it is still undergoing evaluation and it is not possible to give a definite date from which it will be possible to have patients accepted for treatment on the machine.

In any case, it will be used at first only on a limited basis for patients who are suitable for treatment under controlled test conditions.

I do not care how limited the treatment is, as long as the machine is used. To continue—

Cases for treatment will be selected by W.A. vascular surgeons from amongst patients whom they have examined and assessed.

It is probably of more relevance to you that similar examination and assessment of patients with arterio-sclerosis is carried out at St. Vincent's Hospital, Sydney, where a similar machine is in operation for the treatment of selected patients.

If you would like to find out whether your particular condition is suitable for treatment it is suggested that you make an appointment to see Dr T. P. Nash at his weekly clinic for out-patients at that hospital on a Tuesday afternoon.

The letter is signed by Mr Baxter.

Surely that indicates the treatment is known in Australia and is acknowledged by the authorities as a valid treatment. The Minister knows it is available in Australia, and that it is accepted by the medical profession. I have in my possession a photocopy of an aerogramme written on the 8th December from Germany by the woman to whom I have just referred, and included in her letter is a note from Dr Möller.

Although it is in German, I remember enough German from my years at school to be able to translate it roughly. Dr Möller says, "This lady is the 193rd patient from Australia who has obtained this treatment." One hundred and ninety three people from Australia have travelled to Kassel to obtain the treatment for which Dr Möller has become famous.

I have here both the photocopy of the original letter from Dr Möller and a translation. I cannot vouch for the translation; certainly my German is not sufficient to enable me to translate the letter accurately

enough to be able to say the translation is absolutely true. However, I am prepared to make the letters available to anyone who may want to translate the original.

I will read one or two extracts from Dr Möller's letter as follows—

The machine is now produced under licence by "Feinmechanische Werkstätten Adolf Möller" in Fulda (Hessen) and costs of course considerably more than the billed one.

It is now being manufactured commercially in Germany. He makes some comment to the effect that a clever person like a doctor should not have any difficulty in mastering the machine. He says—

With the right technic, over 1 million intra-arterial oxygen insufflations have been made in the last 2 decades, and that without any complications.

Therefore, from that, it can be seen that over one million insufflations have been made without any complication. That is what Dr Möller himself said. This letter, as translated, continues as follows—

Leading German capacities, like Prof. Zenker and his successor Prof. Heberer, both surgeons in Munich, and another 40 professors, have given positive opinions for the oxygen-therapy, in order to induce the German Ministry of the Interior to declare the intra-arterial oxygen-therapy a modern scientific method entitled to subsidy, in accordance with the recommendation of the Germany Ministry for Youth, Family, and Health, under file No. D III 7-213 104-1/5 of last year. With this, the difficulties regarding the recognition of the therapy have been put aside for all times.

It has been officially recognised and the treatment is now subsidised by the German Government, similar, I imagine, to the manner in which our health insurance is subsidised here. Leading German professors have acknowledged the oxygen-therapy treatment and the German Ministry of the Interior has also said it recognises that the oxygen-therapy treatment is entitled to subsidy.

The SPEAKER: The member has seven minutes.

Mr DAVIES: Thank you, Sir. A cutting on the treatment which appeared in a newspaper there apparently went to a man in South Australia by the name of Mr F. J. Goggins, of 5 Jago Street, Salisbury. He has been on radio and television in that State in his efforts to get the treatment introduced to South Australia. He has suffered much of the same "run round" which I am beginning to accept is the norm in this State. Mr Goggins wrote a letter to the *Australian Nursing Journal* in May, 1974.

Incidentally, he told me in his first letter that he had reached the stage that, when he arrived at the Adelaide railway station on his way to work he had to take a taxi 200 yards to his office, because he was unable to walk that distance. Since then he has driven a car to Western Australia and travelled all over the south-west and other parts. In his letter he went on to state how well he felt, but he recognises that he will soon be ready for another course of treatment. Like most of the other 193 people who have had this treatment and who have enjoyed some benefit from it, he realises that after a period of from one to four years he will have to undergo the treatment again, but he and others are faced with the question of how they will return to Germany to obtain it.

Following some material that was published in the *Australian Nursing Journal* dealing with the Möller therapy for vascular diseases, Mr Goggins wrote a letter to the editor of that journal giving some answers to the criticisms that had been made of the treatment. In view of the fact that I will not be able to quote all the extracts from the letter he wrote to the editor, I will have to paraphrase them. Firstly, he says that the therapy is not a cure. Nobody has ever said it is a cure. As I have claimed, the therapy never will be a cure. I think other people have said it is a cure, but I am not convinced it is a cure.

Mr Watt: Dr Möller does not say it is a cure.

Mr DAVIES: No, he does not. In the first line of one letter I quoted from earlier, Dr Möller says, "My treatment is not a cure."

The second reply that Mr Goggins makes to the criticism that was made of the Möller treatment, and which is made in the letter he forwarded to the *Australian Nursing Journal* is shown in the quote I am about to make. It reads as follows—

Criticism: As Dr Möller employs orthodox treatment for his patients, at the same time as they are receiving the intra-arterial oxygen therapy, it is difficult to assess to which forms of treatment possible benefit can be attributed.

Reply: If Dr Möller is obtaining greater success with orthodox treatment than are his critics, then surely an investigation is justified to obtain information on his methods of applying the treatment, which makes it so much more effective than the results in Australia indicate.

That, of course, is self-evident, and Mr Goggins goes on to make further explanation. The third reply that he makes is in connection with the criticism that the treatment is not proven. I think I dealt with that aspect in the last quote I made from

Dr Möller's latest letter which, incidentally, is dated the 18th February, 1975. The fourth criticism that was levelled against the Möller treatment was that there was insufficient scientific basis and against this Mr Goggins, in part, made the following reply—

As the Möller therapy has been used successfully on many thousands of humans, the need for experiments on animals and a clinical test on humans has been eliminated.

I suppose medical men would argue against that reasoning, but the fact is that the oxygen-therapy treatment has been used to benefit. The fifth criticism that was set out in this letter to the editor was—

Dr Möller has not had his treatment accepted by the medical profession.

Since that letter to the editor of the *Australian Nursing Journal* was published I have been able to quote from Dr Möller's letter dated the 18th February, 1975.

The sixth point of criticism set out in the letter to the editor was—

The therapy has been tested by the Department of surgery at the University of Adelaide.

I do not know much about this, but I will read to the House what Mr Goggins said in reply to that criticism. It is as follows—

If the authors of these statements are referring, and I believe they are, to "A Trial of Intra-arterial Oxygen for the Treatment of Arterial Disease in the Legs", then I must reject these statements as being incorrect, as the above report does not describe the Möller method of oxygen therapy.

Having experienced the treatment and observed others being treated I am in a position to know the facts.

Mr Goggins then goes on to talk about the position in Adelaide. I will now mention a rather interesting aspect of this matter. In two letters from the Royal Adelaide Hospital, one dated the 18th September, 1972, it is mentioned that the equipment for this treatment is available in the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Part of this letter reads—

The equipment for this treatment is available at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, such treatment is given by a specialist in Vascular Surgery if he considers it necessary.

On the 4th April, 1974, Mr Goggins was advised by the Acting Assistant Medical Superintendent of the Royal Adelaide Hospital—

I have no knowledge of it being available in this hospital . . .

So there is conflicting evidence from the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

My time has almost expired, so I will be unable to quote to the House all the criticisms and the replies made by Mr Goggins set out in this letter to the editor of the *Australian Nursing Journal*. However, the fact remains that I have been given the run around in regard to this matter. The Government must now clearly state whether it believes there is value in the oxygen-therapy treatment, and if it does it must get it into operation in this State immediately. I do not know why the Government keeps on deferring it for another day. Every time I raise the question I am told about some new tactic, but I can only consider it to be a delaying tactic. If it were necessary to refer the matter to the Human Rights Committee at the university it should have been done immediately the machine arrived in Western Australia.

If those in authority wanted to make certain that patients were properly treated in accordance with their rights, it seems to me we will soon not be talking about humans, but about corpses, because the people concerned will be dead before they are able to get the benefit of the treatment. We have already indicated that 100 people will die this year from some form of arteriosclerosis for which this machine could provide some tremendous relief.

So I return to the statement I was about to make; that is, the Government has to make a clear statement on what it intends to do. If it does not intend to go on with the oxygen-therapy treatment or use the machine, it should say so.

If the people handling the machine are not happy about doing the work, but the Government still believes there is some interest in it—I believe there is—then it should look for some persons, preferably German-speaking doctors, to go to Kassel, to spend a period of time there, to come back to Western Australia, and put the treatment into effect immediately.

What the Government has done makes a farce of the reply given by the Minister representing the Minister for Health, which I have referred to. In speaking in the debate on the Appropriation Bill (Consolidated Reserve Fund) when I raised this question the Minister for Lands, who represents the Minister for Health in this House, had this to say—

I can assure the honourable member that arrangements are being made to expedite the developmental work which is needed to bring this about because, like the honourable member the Government is extremely anxious to have the machine put to use.

I doubt it.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-Reply thus adopted.

House adjourned at 11.21 p.m.