

Motion put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 17 put and passed.

### *Progress*

Progress reported and leave given to sit again, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development).

*House adjourned at 10.4 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 12th October, 1967

The **SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

### STATE OF THE HOUSE

#### *Absence of Opposition Members*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman) [2.16 p.m.]: I ask the Premier, in view of the state of the House, will we proceed with business?

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Premier) [2.17 p.m.]: Unless you, Mr. Speaker, have advice as to the reason for the state of the House, I see no reason why we should not proceed.

The **SPEAKER**: Very well, we shall proceed.

### JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

#### *Vacancy*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr. Hearman) [2.17 p.m.]: I have to announce that the member for Collie has resigned from the House Committee. I would like to thank the member for Collie for the very good work he has put in during the time he has been a member of the House Committee. He has been an assiduous worker and I think I would be expressing the views of other members, as well as my own, if I took this opportunity to record my appreciation.

**MR. BRAND** (Greenough—Premier) [2.19 p.m.]: I support your remarks, Mr. Speaker, about the service given by the member for Collie (Mr. May). I know he has served the House Committee well and faithfully.

Having said that I now move, without notice—

That the vacancy on the Committee be filled by Mr. A. W. Bickerton.

Question put and passed.

### QUESTIONS (15): ON NOTICE HOSPITAL AT BEVERLEY

#### *Tenders*

1. **Mr. GAYFER** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health: Referring to my question of Tuesday, the 22nd August, 1967, concerning the proposed new Beverley hospital, have tenders as yet been called for this construction?

**Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON** replied:

No, but the architects are arranging for tenders to be called on the 18th November, 1967.

### PASTORAL LEASE 395/1014

#### *Result of Appeal*

2. **Mr. TOMS** asked the Minister for Lands:

Further to question 17 of the 7th September, 1967, in regard to pastoral lease 395/1014, has the appeal mentioned in the answer been decided; if so, what was the decision?

**Mr. BOVELL** replied:

The appeal against the cancellation of pastoral lease 395/1014 was dismissed by the Governor in Executive Council on the 13th September, 1967.

### ESPERANCE PLAINS (AUSTRALIA) PTY. LTD.

#### *Neridup Location 12: Allocation and Subdivision*

3. **Mr. TONKIN** asked the Minister for Lands:
  - (1) On what date was the first Crown grant issued to Esperance Plains (Australia) Pty. Ltd. in respect of Neridup Location 12 comprising 61,536 acres?
  - (2) Was the company relieved of its obligations with regard to the development of this parcel of land?
  - (3) If "Yes," when and by whose authority?
  - (4) How was it possible for the company, or the assignee company, to subdivide the parcel of land in Neridup Location 12 into holdings exceeding 2,000 acres in view of the express provisions of section 5(b) of the agreement?
  - (5) On what date did the Surveyor-General approve the proposed subdivision?
  - (6) On what date was the way first open for Esperance Plains (Australia) Pty. Ltd., or the assignee company, to sell any of the subdivided holdings?
  - (7) Which company actually was the vendor in the sales of holdings from the subdivision of Neridup Location 12?
  - (8) Has any transfer or assignment of any permit to occupy been effected by the Esperance Land and Development Company?
  - (9) If "Yes," what are the particulars and did he give his authority in each case?

Mr. BOVELL replied:

- (1) The 18th October, 1957.
- (2) No.
- (3) Answered by (2).
- (4) The variations in farm sizes were apparently found necessary by the Labor Government (of which the honourable member was a Minister) because of the poorer nature of the country, and relying on the power of variation conferred by clause 24 of the agreement then in force. Since 1960, the Minister has power under clause 5 (b) to consent to such variations.
- (5) The 3rd July, 1957.
- (6) Sales could be made at any time subject to necessary consent, performance of obligations and the granting of title by the State.
- (7) Esperance Plains (Australia) Pty. Ltd. was the original grantee company, and appears from records to have been the vendor.
- (8) Not so far as is known.
- (9) Answered by (8).

4. *This question was postponed.*

### TRAFFIC

#### *Overwidth Trucks*

5. Mr. BURT asked the Minister for Police:

- (1) Is a vehicle carrying an oversize load under permit allowed to travel after dark on Western Australian roads?
- (2) Is an interstate vehicle carrying an oversize load exempted from local regulations when operating in Western Australia?
- (3) Is he aware that recently an interstate truck carrying an overwidth load after dark was involved in a collision on the Great Northern Highway resulting in two persons being killed?
- (4) What action is being taken to see that interstate trucks conform with all relevant traffic regulations when operating in Western Australia?

Mr. CRAIG replied:

- (1) Generally, no.
- (2) No.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Local authorities are being requested to pay close attention to this aspect. The attention of Eastern States' authorities is also being drawn to this State's requirements as to this type of movement.

### WALLACE ENGINEERING COMPANY

#### *Government Subsidy*

6. Mr. HALL asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

- (1) (a) Is the Wallace Engineering Co. of Albany in receipt of Government subsidy?
- (b) If not, has it been in the past?
- (c) If so, during what years?
- (d) What is the total amount of subsidy paid to date?
- (2) Who are the shareholders of the company?

Mr. COURT replied:

- (1) (a) Wallace Engineering Co. Pty. Ltd. of Albany is not in receipt of a subsidy from the Government.
- (b) No subsidy has been paid in the past.
- (c) Answered by (b) above.
- (d) Nil.
- (2) The shareholders of the company are—

Wallace James-Wallace.  
James Jack Frost.

Mr. Speaker, in case the honourable member has used the word "subsidy" with a different meaning from the way I understand the word, I would like to make a further explanation. I do not want to mislead him, because the company has, in fact, had some financial assistance through guarantee from the Government but not through subsidy. I think the honourable member is well aware of the assistance this company has had from the Government.

7 to 9. *These questions were postponed.*

### RENTAL HOMES

#### *Maintenance*

10. Mr. GRAHAM asked the Minister for Housing:

- (1) What is the total lying to the credit of the fund for maintenance of Commonwealth-State rental housing?
- (2) What sum was paid into this fund during the last financial year?
- (3) What amount was spent on maintenance during that period?
- (4) Is there a policy of regular maintenance—  
(a) interior;  
(b) exterior?
- (5) If so, what are the respective time intervals?
- (6) If not, what is the basis of determination?

- (7) How many rental dwellings erected for more than five years have not had general external maintenance during the last five years; and what is the period in years in each case since either completion or last maintenance, whichever is the longer?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. O'Neil) replied:

- (1) Nil. Maintenance factors included in rents since inception of the agreement total \$8,638,000 and expenditure totals \$9,085,000. Provisions for future long term maintenance have been set aside from profits on sales of houses and other factors.
- (2) Maintenance factors on the rents for 1966-67 totalled \$950,000.
- (3) Maintenance expenditure for 1966-1967 totalled \$1,115,830.
- (4) (a) and (b) Yes.
- (5) (a) Lounge rooms .... 12 years  
Bedrooms .... 10 years  
Kitchens and Bath-rooms .... 6-7 years  
(b) 6-7 years.

These periods are guides only and are varied as required by circumstances.

- (6) Answered by (5).
- (7) 5,573, of which 2,100 are programmed for painting and general maintenance during 1967-68.

183 erected in and not painted since 1958  
645 erected in and not painted since 1959  
1,635 erected in and not painted since 1960  
1,903 erected in and not painted since 1961  
1,207 erected in and not painted since 1962

5,573

## CEMETERIES

### Control

11. Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

- (1) What department or organisation is responsible for looking after cemeteries in the country districts and metropolitan area?
- (2) Are there any obligations on the department or organisation to properly attend to such cemeteries?
- (3) Are cemeteries not now in use under the control of the shire council or some other Government department?

Mr. NALDER replied:

- (1) The trustees of each particular cemetery, who are appointed under the provisions of the Cemeteries Act. . .

- (2) No.

- (3) Disused burial grounds may be vested in trustees under the provisions of section 41A and 41B of the Cemeteries Act.

## LAND AT GOSNELLS

### Acquisition by Public Works Department

12. Mr. MOIR asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

- (1) How many properties adjacent to lot 1711 Ranford Road, Gosnells, have been purchased or are in the course of purchase by the Public Works Department on behalf of the Metropolitan Water Board?
- (2) What area is involved?
- (3) What is the price per acre which has been paid for the properties already purchased?
- (4) What is the area required for the proposed sewage treatment site?

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON replied:

- (1) No land adjacent to Lot 1711 Ranford Road, Gosnells, has been purchased or is in course of purchase by the Public Works Department on behalf of the Metropolitan Water Board.

It is thought that the question refers to a proposed sewage treatment works which would include all the land bounded by Southern River Road, Furley Road, Evelyn Street, and Ranford Road.

One property has been purchased (Lots 1769, 1770, 1772); negotiations for the remaining Lot 1771 are in course.

- (2) 76 acres purchased; 27 acres 2 roods 10 perches being negotiated.
- (3) Price varies over the property but averages \$500 per acre.
- (4) 103 acres 2 roods 10 perches.

## VAPECH HOUSE

### Tenants and Rents

13. Mr. FLETCHER asked the Premier:

- (1) What Government, semi-Government, or instrumentalities occupy accommodation in Vapech House, 638 Murray Street, Perth?
- (2) Who owns this property?
- (3) What is the total rent paid by tenants mentioned in (1)?

Mr. BRAND replied:

- (1) (a) Department of Native Welfare.  
(b) Department of Labour.  
Weights and Measures Branch.  
Industrial Commission.

- (c) Crown Law Department: Probation and Parole Office.
- (d) Workers' Compensation Board.
- (e) Parents and Citizens' Federation.
- (f) The National Trust of Australia (Western Australia).

The above tenants occupy the whole building, which has a total floor area of 25,800 square feet.

- (2) Snowden and Willson Pty. Ltd., of 1123 Hay Street, West Perth.
- (3) \$7,394.85 per calendar month.

14. *This question was postponed.*

### INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS

#### *Inquiry by Department of Labour*

15. Mr. DAVIES asked the Minister for Labour:

- (1) Under what conditions does the Department of Labour inquire into industrial accidents?
- (2) Which of the department's officers make such inquiries?
- (3) What is the purpose of such inquiries?
- (4) What action is taken on such reports?
- (5) To whom are they made available?

Mr. O'CONNOR (for Mr. O'Neil) replied:

Under the Factories and Shops Act, 1963-65, the following is the position:—

- (1) When an accident occurs in a factory which is caused otherwise than by a boiler or machinery subject to the Inspection of Machinery Act, 1921, and which incapacitates an employee for not less than one day, or causes death.
- (2) The Chief Inspector of Factories or an inspector appointed by him to make the inquiries.
- (3) To ascertain the cause of the accident and report accordingly.
- (4) Action is initiated to rectify any matters which may appear to have caused or contributed to the cause with the aim of preventing a recurrence of the accident.
- (5) If an inquiry is held in accordance with section 65 of the Factories and Shops Act, to the Board of Inquiry, or to

the coroner's inquiry into the death of an employee in a factory.

Under the provisions of the Scaffolding Act—

- (1) All accidents concerned with scaffolding or gear which necessitates an absence from work for three days or more must be reported under the Act to the department.
  - (2) The area inspector for the district.
  - (3) To ascertain the cause so that action can be taken to endeavour to obviate a recurrence.
  - (4) Answered by (3), but in the case of a fatal accident an inquiry by the coroner is held.
  - (5) To the coroner, if fatal.
- General.—Inquiries and research into causes of industrial accidents, generally, are made continuously by the Industrial Safety Liaison Officer of the Department of Labour.

### CHILD WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Mr. Crommelin, and read a first time.

### JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Third Reading*

Bill read a third time, on motion by Mr. Court (Minister for Industrial Development), and returned to the Council with an amendment.

### DOG ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Third Reading*

MR. NALDER (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.32 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. JAMIESON (Beeloo) [2.33 p.m.]: I regret I was unable to be present during the second reading stage of the Bill. The measure represents only a small amendment and the Minister explained it was to overcome a problem existing at the moment whereby a by-law had become *ultra vires*. The comment I wish to make is that the Bill seeks to give local authorities additional powers to control dogs, but the authority they already have under the relevant section in the Act has not yet been used to the full. In fact, in some cases it has been completely ignored.

Surely it is of little use Parliament deliberating and placing laws on the Statute book unless somebody is to be responsible for administering them. Some of the local

authorities, especially in the metropolitan area, are certainly not doing much about policing the provisions of this section, and I want to make my protest at this stage to point out that these authorities should show greater interest and take more action in the matter.

It appears to me that the responsibility for administering the legislation does not lie only with the local authorities. The police are empowered to take action against dogs, but I have never known any police officer to take action to prevent a dog committing a nuisance, or to act in the dog's welfare, but perhaps they should. If they did, dog owners might take more care to ensure that their pets do not make a nuisance of themselves.

Section 21A gives local authorities a number of powers to prevent dogs straying on beaches, recreation reserves, and so on, and this is the section which the Bill seeks to amend. In the Peppermint Grove area I have often noticed how large dogs have despoiled the beach front, where numbers of people congregate, by urinating and leaving their excreta in various places, sometimes even damaging the belongings of those people who are sitting on the foreshore. Apparently these animals are left to wander at will, completely uncontrolled by their owners or the local authority responsible. The adjoining local authority has at least taken the trouble to proclaim by-laws in the Mosman area, and to erect notices warning owners of dogs that the animals must be kept off the beach and other places.

However, there are vast numbers of local authorities throughout this State which allow dogs to roam in various places used by people for relaxation, and it is about time they recognised their responsibility by taking action to protect people from dogs. I therefore doubt whether we should continue to grant extra powers to local authorities, to the police, or to anyone else if some action is not taken against offending dogs.

The Peppermint Grove area, to which I have referred, is very popular with people who have young families, and I suggest to the Minister that on any Sunday he can go to that portion of the river front and see people who own large dogs letting them roam without any restraint whatsoever. It would appear that as people become more affluent they have a tendency to own bigger dogs. They can probably afford more meat for such animals which wander around and make a nuisance of themselves without anybody bothering about them.

I suggest that some action be taken to overcome this problem by pointing out to local authorities, and to the police, that an Act of Parliament which is on the Statute book should be implemented in the same way as any other Act of Parliament is implemented. It seems to me that it is a complete waste of time if we are prepared to pass Acts of Parliament and

bring down amendments to them only to find that no action is taken to have them administered. Perhaps the local government health inspectors could take some action but they have limited scope in regard to policing the activities of dogs. In my opinion there should be a clear understanding that when any member of the Police Force sees a dog making a nuisance of itself he should take action immediately to ensure the dog is impounded and its owner prosecuted.

The existing situation is most unsatisfactory. Whilst I agree that this additional power to be granted to local authorities is most necessary to prevent dogs entering food establishments, and so on, I consider it is unfair to the dogs themselves, because, in the first place, they should not be brought into such surroundings by their owners. I protest that insufficient notice is given to the local authorities pointing out that a close watch on offending dogs should be kept by their officers. Following my protest I hope that in the future local authorities will recognise their responsibilities under this legislation to a greater extent than they have done in the past.

**MR. NAUDER** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [2.38 p.m.]: I have listened with interest to the comments made by the member for Beeloo. Generally speaking the members of this House and the public are well aware of the situation relating to the control of animals under this legislation, especially in built-up areas, and in other places where there are shopping facilities. I think everyone will agree that dogs should not be allowed to wander at large in these places.

I have very strong views about people owning dogs in the metropolitan area without exercising proper control over them.

**Mr. W. Hezney**: And also not taking steps to keep them off the streets.

**Mr. NAUDER**: Yes, I was about to mention that point. Not only is the presence of dogs objectionable in shops that are dealing in food, but they are a danger when they are allowed to wander on the streets, because quite often they are the cause of accidents. Only this week I read a Press report of a young man who was injured when he fell off his bike after trying to avoid a dog. One does not have to travel very far to see such happenings every day. One finds that dogs are allowed to roam at will practically everywhere one goes.

I think the time will come when the House will need to pass more stringent measures to ensure that people who keep animals and pets keep them under greater control.

**Mr. Kelly**: Treat them as we did the Alsations.

Mr. NALDER: I might be inclined to agree with the suggestion made by the honourable member. I feel that some provision should be made for action to be taken in the event of people not looking after their pets, but I do think they should first be given the opportunity to control them. Nobody is opposed to the keeping of pets provided they are looked after and are kept under control; but I do not think any of us appreciates dogs being allowed to wander around without any control at all being exercised.

I might say that in the street in which I live there are numbers of dogs that wander up and down; in fact, one particular dog seems to emerge at six o'clock every morning, so much so that it would seem he was trained to do just that. He walks up the street—

Mr. W. Hegney: Sniffing at all the posts and trees.

Mr. NALDER: —sniffing at all the posts and trees, and so on.

Mr. Hawke: He is probably on his way home.

Mr. NALDER: It would seem that the member for Northam has some very real experience of animals. His suggestion, however, could be the right one. The solicitors acting on behalf of the South Perth City Council indicated that there was some weakness in the legislation, and it is because of this that the provisions in the Bill have been introduced.

I hope the situation will improve. I will pass on to the Minister for Local Government the information that has been given by members, with the request, perhaps, that local authorities be informed of the position. I hope some action will be taken as a result of this.

I know that quite a number of people are in the habit of taking their dogs into food shops, but if they were spoken to about it they would plead ignorance and say they did not know such a law existed. I do think the time has come for some stricter action to be taken. We are not trying to be difficult in this matter, but if we are to enforce the health laws then we should restrict animals wandering around the shops.

If they wander around without any control being exercised over them, some action will be necessary. The amending legislation before us is designed to allow local authorities to take any action that might be necessary, and it tightens up a weakness in the Act. As I have said, I will pass on the opinions expressed by members to the Minister for Local Government, in the hope that this information will be conveyed to local authorities.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 10th October.

MR. EVANS (Kalgoorlie) [2.45 p.m.]: This Bill seeks to amend the Evidence Act of 1906. The Act was amended as recently as 1960. The measure before us aims to add a new section to the Act. It will be seen that the provisions of this amending Bill have been included in the Evidence Act of Victoria in identical form. I believe a separate Act was passed in that State embodying these provisions in an Act entitled Evidence (Foreign Tribunals) Act.

It would seem that the Commonwealth Government, as a result of a meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, has requested the various States to implement legislation of this nature. The principle behind the scheme is a fairly simple one. In essence it is this: Where an authority, as termed by this Bill, desires to take or receive evidence from someone within the State of Western Australia for use in a foreign country, the authority concerned may, by an instrument in writing, appoint a person so to take or receive evidence, and for this purpose such a person would have authority to administer an oath for the purpose of taking or receiving evidence.

The term "authority" is defined to mean a court, a judge, a body, or a person of a foreign country—by the law of that foreign country—entitled to take or receive evidence. The terms "court" and "judge" are defined by the Evidence Act of Western Australia; and "judge" means—

A Justice of the High Court of Australia and a Judge of the Supreme Court of Western Australia, and includes the Chairman of General Sessions of the Peace, a Police or Resident Magistrate, and also any Justice or Justices of the Peace sitting in Court.

The expression "judge," when used within the meaning of this Bill does not necessarily have this meaning at all; it relates to a judge of a foreign country. There is no guarantee given in the Bill as to what the qualifications shall be for such a person who is entitled to take or receive evidence in Western Australia, other than that he could be a judge of a foreign country; but he need not necessarily be a judge.

I would like the Minister to comment on this aspect, because I have some fear that when this provision becomes law, a citizen of Western Australia could be brought under the jurisdiction of a foreign authority and required to give certain evidence without the protection of the privileges that attach under Western Australian law—in some cases—necessarily being applied.

For instance, under the general law the spouse of a person who has been charged is, in some cases, not competent—and in

all cases not compellable—to give evidence. There are also other qualifications. That may not be the best example that could be given, but I feel that certain safeguards are missing from this legislation and, as a result, a citizen of Western Australia could, by force of this law, be directed against his will to give evidence to a person of foreign allegiance, without the sanction and protection afforded to such person by the atmosphere of an ordinary court of law where he can be represented by counsel, and so on.

However, I do not desire to oppose the legislation. I can see advantages flowing from having machinery of this nature on the Statute book. I would ask the Minister whether he is aware of any reciprocal arrangement having been entered into whereby an Australian authority is given the opportunity to take and to receive evidence in some foreign countries. We are extending this privilege to certain foreign countries, and one would hope that similar privileges would be extended to appropriate Australian authorities in foreign countries. With those comments I support the second reading.

**MR. COURT** (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [2.51 p.m.]: In answer to the query raised by the member for Kalgoorlie, I would like to say that off-hand I do not know the reciprocal arrangements which have been made with the many countries with which Australians have dealings. However, I will make some inquiries to ascertain whether it is intended in the interpretation of this legislation, that the Attorney-General will, for this and for other reasons, make or attempt to make it a condition that some reciprocity be given before he grants this approval.

So far as local citizens are concerned, I would point out that the great strength in this legislation is that a person who is not a judge or a court cannot take evidence unless he has received the consent in writing of the Attorney-General. This stipulation is included in the provision for a very good reason; it is to prevent any Tom, Dick, or Harry nominated by another country—and it might not be a very responsible country at the time—from taking evidence. The Attorney-General will have the right to consider—and I am sure he will do so with a sense of responsibility—whether the person nominated is the type of person who should be authorised to take evidence from citizens of this country.

In considering this legislation we also have to look at another point of view. In certain circumstances the giving of this authority could be in the interests of Australian citizens, and this could occur quite often. I invite the attention of the member for Kalgoorlie to a case which arose in recent times. Although it is not altogether comparable it does indicate

how the provision under discussion can act in favour of Australian citizens. This was the case in which the American Government, through one of its agencies, constituted a court in Sydney. On several occasions in recent months it was able to take evidence in Australia in relation to a matter which normally would have been dealt with under the jurisdiction of the U.S.A., and would thereby have involved the representatives of the Australian companies in travelling to America at a fantastic cost to put forward their case. On this occasion the American Government brought the court to Sydney, where the case was handled to the great satisfaction and to the great benefit of the Australian companies which were most directly concerned. Goodness only knows what that action by the American Government saved the Australian companies in costs, but it must be a tremendous figure.

Very good reasons exist for allowing the nominees of other countries to take evidence in Australia. As long as this matter is controlled properly by Statute, I can see nothing but good coming out of it. The greatest safeguard is that the Attorney-General of the State concerned will have the authority to give the required approval, and I am sure he will not give it lightly.

I am not an authority on this matter, but I can imagine cases in which wives, who have been separated from their husbands, or who have in other ways been disadvantaged, could receive great benefit from this provision in the Bill. If there was a desire on the part of, say, the American authorities to try to assist a person who had been separated or who for some reason or other was living in Australia, and who would be greatly disadvantaged if he or she had to go to America to have the case heard, then this provision would be of great value. I thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

## LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 10th October.

**MR. KELLY** (Merredin-Yilgarn) [2.57 p.m.]: On this occasion it would be a very simple expedient just to agree to the Bill without any discussion. However, there are a few comments I would like to make. I draw attention to the differential between the parent Act and the amendment as outlined by the Minister several days ago.

The parent Act makes provision for the disposal of Crown land—town and suburban lots—by the system of public auction. In the arrangement of auctioning blocks of land through Government channels a great deal of time is lost between the time of application and the ultimate land sale which determines the ownership of the blocks to be auctioned. All such land is put up for public auction with upset prices, and they are the minimum prices which will be accepted. On some occasions when land is put up for auction, it so happens, that in the long interim between the application and the sale the intending purchaser who had asked for the land to be put up for auction has altered his outlook and at the time of the sale he is not interested in the purchase of the land. Therefore on occasions land is passed in without bids being made. The Act provides that where any other interested person makes application to the department within a period of six months, the land can be made over to him without any further loss of time.

The amendment the Minister has outlined will mean that negotiations can take place without that loss of time; and it goes a little further as it extends to 12 months the period of time in which the prospective buyer can make application and, without any further loss of time, at the Minister's discretion, the land can be sold to the person interested.

The Bill also deals with compensation, but covers only one aspect. Up to the present time, the term "*bona fide* improvements" has not contained a satisfactory reference to a dwelling house that happens to be on a pastoral property or lease. As leases have expired—or if for some reason the land comprising the property has been resumed, or the land has been selected under C.P. conditions—with the Act as it is at present worded, the owner of the properties have not been entitled to compensation. The department, through the Minister, has now put up the suggestion that a reinstatement of the conditions enabling compensation for a dwelling should be included. The amendment before us will make it possible for that to take place. I think it is only right and proper that that should be the case.

After all, the house is part and parcel of a property—an important part of it—and in many cases quite an amount of money has been spent in erecting a fine homestead on a pastoral property.

Mr. Bovell: The pastoralists' association asked for this.

Mr. KELLY: I did not know from where it emanated, and that does not make any difference. However, I think it strengthens the argument for this provision to be made.

There is a further amendment dealing with rental concessions to discharged members of the forces. I am pleased to

see that this amendment embraces members of the Merchant Marine. We all know that members of the Merchant Marine, particularly in the first and second world wars, were largely responsible for keeping open our sea lanes and they did a magnificent job without receiving the kudos they richly deserved.

In any case, this amendment will embrace the Merchant Marine, as well as the Navy, Army, and Air Force. According to some people it is right to put the Navy before the Army. Anyway, that was the order used by the Minister.

Mr. Bovell: That is the order of seniority within the services.

Mr. KELLY: I have often heard that argued. The amendment widens the scope of the Act and defines eligible members with a far greater degree of clarity than is now the case. Not only does it include the Merchant Marine, but it also includes personnel who are serving in zones of war that have been in the limelight over the last four or five years. The Act, as amended, will embrace these people and make it possible for rental concessions to be made available to them in the event of their being holders of C.P. land. This is quite reasonable and it should be of considerable help to many would-be settlers who, after their discharge, wish to continue their activities on the land.

I now wish to turn to the reference in the parent Act to ringbarking. I read through the relevant section and ringbarking is mentioned extensively. Of course, all members would realise that ringbarking was the vogue many years ago, but in recent times the bulldozer has replaced the axe in almost every instance. So the mention of ringbarking in that particular section becomes redundant for two reasons: Firstly, there is very little likelihood of any ringbarking being done at the present time, or in the future; and, secondly, it would definitely not be done for 2s. 6d. per acre.

I think there must have been some hardy people in those times, seeing they were prepared to ringbark trees for the magnificent return of 2s. 6d. per acre. Another portion of the Act will still make provision that should it become necessary once again to invoke the ringbarking method, this can be done. Reference to ringbarking will be taken out of the Act when we complete our deliberations on this Bill, and that will not cause any heartburning in any shape or form.

At the present time the Land Act empowers the Minister to transfer, sell, assign, or otherwise dispose of land held under lease or C.P. conditions. That, of course, is a wide definition and enables the Minister to proceed in an almost unlimited fashion to do those things. For some reason, known probably to the Minister and to his department, it is now desired that the conditions under the Act



be altered and the Minister, in future, will have not only that form of veto, but also the Act will make it necessary for any person wishing to dispose of a property to apply in the first instance to the department for permission to place the land on the auction market or to advertise its sale.

I am not quite sure what the Minister has in mind in this regard. He did not tell us in his introductory speech why he wanted to have this particular section altered. Apparently there is a good reason for it. Probably it will increase the control the department has in the matter of preventing land being transferred without its being sufficiently improved, and complying with the various other conditions provided for by the Act.

I think the Minister said that five sections were being amended, but, having looked through the Bill I think the figure should be six.

Mr. Bovell: One is a consequential amendment.

Mr. KELLY: It is an amendment, though.

Mr. Bovell: Yes, that is true. There are actually six amendments, but two are consequential.

Mr. KELLY: The only other reference I would like to make concerns an amendment which I think will give teeth to the legislation passed in 1965. At that time the conditions of transfer were directed to the percentage development of an area instead of being based on the expenditure outlay. I think the new method will be better and more satisfactory from the point of view of the person holding a C.P. lease, or a lease of any kind. In all, it should have a beneficial effect and make easier the task of those charged with the responsibility of keeping a close eye on property improvement. It will be possible for them to know the improvements that have been carried out.

I have nothing further to say except that I support the Bill.

**MR. I. W. MANNING** (Wellington) [3.11 p.m.]: I desire to offer my support to this measure. As the member for Merredin-Yilgarn indicated, it proposes five amendments to the principal Act; and the first, of course, concerns the sale of town or suburban lots. The second deals with compensation payable for dwellings on pastoral properties; but it is the third amendment in which I am particularly interested and I would like to commend the Government for introducing it at this time. It widens the field in regard to those ex-servicemen who will receive land rental concessions, to include those who served in the merchant service.

Although this will not involve any great sum of money, it does extend recognition

to those people who, during the war, played a very important part. Although the sea is their natural calling, during times of war they are subjected to many dangers, and particularly was this the case during the last war. It is very good to realise that even at this late stage they will be recognised and the concession extended to them.

I want to commend the Government also for amending the definition in order to include those servicemen who have served in Malaya, Korea, or Vietnam. This amendment will indicate to those servicemen that their service has been recognised as has been the case with those who served in the two great wars, and this concession is something which the State can offer to them.

I wanted briefly to offer my support to this amendment and to commend the Government for introducing it at this time. I also offer my support to the other two amendments touched on by the Minister and the member for Merredin-Yilgarn.

**MR. NORTON** (Gascoyne) [3.15 p.m.]: Like the previous two speakers I wish to add my support to the amendments in this Bill. The first one gives the person concerned extra time in which to purchase land offered at auction. At the moment the period involved is six months. If any land is passed in and a person is interested, but was not able to attend the sale, he can within six months apply for it at the upset price. This has been done on a number of occasions. However, it has not always worked.

I am involved at the moment with a case on these lines. Some land was offered for sale recently, but since the sale it has been found that water cannot be connected to the area by the country water supply department, and the land has been withdrawn from sale despite the fact that applications have been made for it. Therefore it is not mandatory that the applicant shall be able to get the land, because it can be withdrawn.

I feel that before land is offered for sale under the auction system, the availability or otherwise of water should be ascertained. This should not be done after half the land has been sold and the other half passed in.

The extension of the six months to 12 months is good because it gives people an opportunity to decide whether or not they need the land. Under the present provision it has been too late sometimes before people have decided they need the land and then it has been necessary to have it revalued, readvertised, and so on, and this involves a great deal of time. Under the amendment it will be possible for the land to be taken up almost immediately.

The next two amendments deal with the valuation of pastoral homesteads. In the past this has not been necessary because such valuation has not been included in improvements made towards the productive capacity of the pastoral lease. Now, however, it is found that at times a pastoral homestead may have to be resumed and therefore a valuation is necessary for compensation purposes. The lease might be surrendered, and again the valuation would be required before another person took up the lease.

The next amendment is also a good one and deals with a section which has been a bone of contention for some time. Why should only those in the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, be entitled to rental reductions? Many persons other than those have served our country under wartime conditions, and have given up their civilian livelihood to work in, for instance, the Allied Works Council, the Civil Construction Corps, or the Merchant Navy. All the people in those organisations worked for their country and risked their lives, and they are entitled to the same concession. This amendment seeks to correct the position; but I do not think that those who worked in the Allied Works Council or the Civil Construction Corps with the Army in forward areas, are included under this amendment.

Mr. Kelly: I don't think they are mentioned.

Mr. NORTON: If they are not included I think they should be. The other amendments, as mentioned by the previous speakers, are more or less tidying up clauses, particularly the one concerning ringbarking, which does not apply now. As the member for Merredin-Yilgarn said, it would not be profitable to do that work for 2s.6d. per acre. It would be necessary to spend a lot of time for practically no value. The last amendment gives the Act the power it should have in the long run. I support the Bill.

MR. BOVELL (Vasse—Minister for Lands) [3.19 p.m.]: I thank the members for Merredin-Yilgarn, Wellington, and Gascoyne for their comments, and I appreciate their cordial acceptance of this measure. It is rather encouraging to know that at least sometimes we are unanimous in our views.

I think the one point raised by the member for Merredin-Yilgarn was that I had not disclosed my reason for wanting notice of any proposal to sell. The position is that a person who is negotiating to buy a property might sell some of his assets so that he could proceed with the transaction. However, when notice is submitted to the Minister it might not be correct for the Minister to approve. As I have said, the person who wanted to purchase the land might have sold some assets, or done something to prejudice his previous position, and the Minister is

faced, more or less, with a *fait accompli*, and he has to take those circumstances into consideration.

If we tighten up the Act to stop trafficking in leases to protect *bona fide* purchasers, I think prospective purchasers will be placed in a better position if their intention has to be brought to the notice of the Minister before entering into any negotiation. That is the reason for the amendment. There are no specific cases, but the legal advice I have had is that purchasers can proceed to a certain point in good faith and enter into an arrangement for the purchase of land thinking that it would conclude successfully. Then, for some reason or other, the Minister of the day could refuse to allow the sale.

In regard to the extension of concessions to ex-servicemen, the member for Gascoyne has raised another point which will be examined. I was not aware that merchant seamen have never been recognised for concessions, and I think this has only been an oversight. It is right that they should receive concessions, because they contributed in war zones to our success. I want to thank the member for Wellington for bringing this matter to my attention; I had no previous knowledge of it. The Government considers it is proper to extend the concessions to merchant seamen who served in the 1939-46 war and also to merchant seamen who served during the 1914-18 war.

I again thank members for their reception of this Bill, and I commend the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

## STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### *Second Reading*

Debate resumed from the 10th October.

MR. KELLY (Merredin-Yilgarn) [3.27 p.m.]: This is a short Bill, but one which deals with a very important subject as far as this State is concerned. The Bill confines itself almost entirely to the cattle disease of bovine pleuro-pneumonia. I think we have reached the position where, because of the stringent controls and the action taken in Western Australia in the period following the enactment of this legislation, we can be reasonably proud. When the legislation was enacted this State was in very bad shape because of the incidence of pleuro-pneumonia. This disease was very evident on many properties in the north-west, but by close attention and vigilance we were able to get on top of it and it has practically been eradicated.

Of course, some Australian States can claim to be entirely free of pleuro-pneumonia. I think those States must be

very satisfied with that achievement. The Commonwealth Government control over this disease in the various States, and the control through the various State Acts, can be defined, more or less, in three different categories. Some States are still suffering partially from the effects of this disease, and some, unfortunately, are more seriously affected. Consequently, it is the desire to bring the future activities in regard to pleuro-pneumonia within these three categories.

The action we are taking at the present time has been taken already in some areas in other States and in the Northern Territory. By adopting the area idea by which the degree of the incidence of the disease can be designated, we will, I think be able to deal with all the difficulties associated with pleuro-pneumonia in a very much better way.

The Bill seeks to amend regulations mainly made under the Western Australian Stock Diseases Act. I understand that before this can be done, it will be necessary to amend the Stock Diseases Act as distinct from the Western Australia Stock Diseases Act. This appears to be somewhat of an anomaly, but it may not be so. The Minister probably will be able to tell us just what it really means. However, that is the aim of the measure which is now before the House.

I consider one of the principal aims is to ensure that a greater amount of care is taken in regard to the possibility of stock going from one State to another. This has happened under some circumstances in past years. The Bill does endeavour to lessen the amount of traffic that could take place; and, at the same time, I consider that in its new state, the legislation will more adequately protect the position in regard to the transference of stock from one affected area to another. If it does only that, it will of course achieve quite a lot in an overall sense.

The definition of "areas" is quite clear and certainly indicates the exact legal position that accrues through the amendments as outlined by the Minister. Opportunity, too, is being taken to remove existing anomalies that appear in the West Australian regulations. They are only of a minor nature and it is not worth while dealing with them in detail. As a matter of fact, the Minister mentioned these anomalies when he introduced the measure. These amendments, again, will bring about an improvement to the Act. Overall, I feel certain that the disease of pleuro-pneumonia will be well taken care of by the enactment of the legislation. I support the second reading.

**MR. NALDER** (Katanning—Minister for Agriculture) [3.33 p.m.]: I thank the member for Merredin-Yilgarn for the comments he has made in reply to my introductory speech on this Bill. We fully

appreciate the importance of eradicating disease, not only in this field but in every field where stock is concerned. This could cover a wide range and, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will appreciate that I could talk about the importance of veterinary surgeons and the importance of advisers in every section of the farming community. Anything which can be done should be done in order to get rid of disease in this country. It is a loss whatever way it is looked at. If the cattle go to slaughter, of course they are condemned; and if they do not make that grade they pass the disease on to other animals. Therefore, the amount of money in total that is lost through stock disease, not only in the north of Australia, but in every part of Australia, would be considerable.

As I indicated when I introduced the Bill, a committee was formed on an Australia-wide basis to discuss the matter. The member for Merredin-Yilgarn would appreciate this from the Australian Agricultural Council aspect, because this is one of the problems which is discussed at almost every meeting; that is, the problem of disease and its control.

We have quite a good record in Western Australia. We have tackled the problem of tuberculosis and, I would say, we are well on the way to overcoming this disease.

**Mr. Kelly:** This Bill, though, only deals with pleuro-pneumonia.

**Mr. NALDER:** Yes, but I am trying to outline the importance of covering all diseases and to stress that, in this instance, we are making a move in the right direction to control the incidence of the disease by removing areas from the list and animals from the areas where they are likely to pass this disease on.

The idea of having three areas, which include a totally free area, is very good. The movement of cattle between any parts of Australia which are in free areas is unrestricted, provided they are tested under the various immunity tests. We will be able to improve the situation which has developed over the years in regard to drought conditions. In some parts, the movement of cattle to other areas is desirable so that there is not a total loss. This happens almost every year in different parts of Australia. Therefore, the idea is one that is very worth while. I consider we have made quite a lot of progress and I am happy the House is prepared to accept the amendment as a move towards still greater control over this much-dreaded disease in cattle.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

**LOAN ESTIMATES, 1967-68***In Committee*

Resumed from the 10th October, the Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Crommelin) in the Chair.

**Vote: Railways, \$10,884,000—**

**MR. GRAHAM** (Balcatta — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.40 p.m.]: Whilst the subject is not directly impinging on the activities of the State, I feel obliged to make some reference to Australia's unfortunate involvement in the South Vietnam war. In my opinion the United States of America and its satellites—among which, unfortunately, is included Australia by the action of the present Commonwealth Government—have no right to be in that country. I think it is obvious to all of us that world-wide opinion is growing that the troops of the various countries that are there have no right to be in South Vietnam, and that a most dangerous situation is being created because of their presence in that country.

Following my return from abroad last year, I think I indicated to the members of this Chamber that in not one of the 12 or 15 countries I visited did I encounter any person who agreed with the presence of the United States of America in Vietnam, and any references made to Australia were expressed in a slighting vein which naturally did not fall very happily on my ears.

**Mr. Court:** Did you agree with the Americans being in Europe at the time of the Berlin airlift? It is the same principle.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I am speaking of Vietnam.

**Mr. Court:** It is the same principle.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** If the Minister for Industrial Development will contain himself for a moment I will continue. Some 30 years ago I well recall speaking at public meetings at various places—including the Town Hall, when it was possible to fill that hall for a political meeting—against steps that were being taken by Nazi Germany to enter countries such as Spain on exactly the same pretext as the United States of America is using now; namely, that Nazi Germany wished to save Spain, Europe, or some other portion of the world from the domination of communists and communism.

I maintain it is totally wrong to justify any immoral act on the plea—which is principally a spurious one—that the action taken is to protect certain people from communism; that if troops of a certain country were not present then communism would spread throughout that country.

**Mr. Brand:** Don't you think there is evidence it is spreading and, without that force, it will continue to spread?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Evidence has been brought to my notice that in over 100

countries in the world there is not the threat of communism, because countries with right-wing tendencies; countries which are civilised; countries which have experience of extreme Governments, will not have a bar of this business. Yet we find the United States present in South Vietnam and, as I said before, it is fighting alongside many of its satellites, including Australia. However, in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, and many other countries the evidence is that none of them wish to become involved in this unhappy affair.

**Mr. Craig:** You are a long way from it.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Distance has nothing to do with it, because we know that when there is a world war, or the ingredients of it in evidence, it can spread to other places within a few hours.

**Mr. I. W. Manning:** What would happen if the United States pulled out of South Vietnam?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I have already indicated that in my opinion the United States of America has no business whatsoever to be there. In addition to the evergrowing world opinion to which I have referred, I wish to repeat there is scarcely any country which will have a bar of direct intervention in the South Vietnam war, and I am sorry that our country is being dragged into it at the heels of the United States of America.

There is growing evidence that bit by bit there will be greater and still greater involvement and goodness knows what the fate of this country will be. I wish to make special reference to the false facade that has been presented. Recently an election was held in South Vietnam.

*Sitting suspended from 3.46 to 4.7 p.m.*

**Mr. GRAHAM:** That election has been represented to us as being a portion of the democratic system in operation; the people have spoken and by this process have elected a popular government. Of course, I was not there, but there were supposed to be official observers present. I do not know what they observed, but if any member will be fair and frank with himself, and have regard for the fact of the situation, he will accept the election in South Vietnam as just so much humbug; and I give my reasons for that assertion.

Prior to 1936 the elections for this Parliament in Western Australia were on a volunteer basis; in other words, there was no compulsory voting. The last five general elections prior to that date, for which I was able to obtain figures, show that in the elections held in 1917, 1921, 1924, 1927, and 1930 an average of 67½ per cent. of those enrolled voted.

We read in the Press that last Saturday week a referendum was held in New Zea-

land on the question of amending that country's licensing laws, and we find that 69 per cent. of the people voted at that referendum. The elections of which I now speak have been held in civilised countries, where the people are educated, where they are accustomed to voting, and where they know the process of elections; they are able to read newspapers and at least, to some extent, are able to understand the problems and issues of the day.

It will be seen that this is a reasonable pattern—somewhere between 60 per cent. and some 70 per cent. is the usual percentage of people who will vote when such voting is optional. Yet we are asked to believe that 83 per cent. of the people voted at the poll in South Vietnam, where we have these primitive people; these illiterate people; these people who are constantly in fear of murder and death; and who are completely ignorant of the system of voting. It is just too ludicrous; it is a fairy story.

Mr. I. W. Manning: You would have to prove they did not.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the member for Wellington is prepared to believe a proposition such as that, then he will believe anything at all.

Mr. Court: There have been 80 per cent. and 90 per cent. polls in Britain and America where the voting was voluntary.

Mr. Jamieson: In those countries the elections are held under different circumstances.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have already pointed out the circumstances of the people of, and the conditions in, the country of South Vietnam as against the circumstances in countries such as Australia and New Zealand; yet we hear the ridiculous figure of 83 per cent. being suggested as having cast votes at the election in South Vietnam.

Mr. Durack: What percentage of the people vote at the elections in India?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not know, but I hazard a guess it would be around 50 per cent. In any event, in that country the people have voted at elections on a number of occasions, but this is the first instalment in South Vietnam.

Not only has it been indicated that there is lack of sympathy and lack of support throughout the world—as shown by the attitude of the overwhelming number of countries in the world—for the war in Vietnam, but the people of many countries, including the people of the United States as well as the people of Australia, have, in ever-increasing numbers, expressed their lack of support for and their bitter opposition to the intervention of the United States in Vietnam and to Australia being dragged into it at the heels of the United States. I need go no further into this matter than to quote this news

item which appeared in *The West Australian* of the 9th October, 1967—

New York, Sun: A newspaper survey published here today indicates a marked decline in the American public's support for the government's handling of the Vietnam war in recent weeks.

The New York Times made the survey, in which 245 Governors, senators and congressmen measured opinion trends among constituents. The survey also showed an increased public sentiment for less military action and more negotiation.

The newspaper said: "More than two-thirds of the public officials replying to the questions reported rising criticism of the war as it is now being prosecuted."

The word that appeared most often in explanations of declining Vietnam support was frustration. This was a combination of shame that American military might was unavailing, a feeling of helplessness to affect events and a growing conviction that the President had not been entirely frank about the war.

In Washington, Mr Arthur Schlesinger, the historian and former presidential assistant, said that the nation should vote Mr Johnson out of office unless he stopped stepping up the war.

That report came from the United States. As everyone is aware, from every corner of the globe—whether there be conservative Governments and people, or whether there be more radical Governments and people—there is a growing crescendo of opposition to the ruthless slaughter of the people in Vietnam, because of the presence of the troops and the forces which are foreign to that soil.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: The same sort of thing as that which occurred at Munich with "Peace in our Time."

Mr. GRAHAM: I have already pointed out that this intervention by strong powers in the affairs of another country is embarked on for political considerations.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): I would point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that during the afternoon tea suspension I read through the Loan Estimates. I cannot see how he is relating his remarks to the Loan Estimates in any way whatsoever. I would suggest that he refer no more to the war in Vietnam, unless he can actually relate his remarks to the expenditure of loan funds.

Mr. GRAHAM: With all due respect, I must point out that Western Australia, as well as all States of the Commonwealth, are short of loan moneys which they require for the development of the respective States, because the Com-

monwealth Government is spending countless millions of dollars in prosecuting the war in Vietnam. I repeat it has no business to be doing that, and it is prosecuting the war in the face of overwhelming opposition from many countries of the world.

Mr. Court: The Commonwealth Government had an overwhelming mandate from the people of Australia at the last election.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is impossible to say what particular issues or factors are responsible for the election of Governments or for the defeat of Governments. There could be a whole host of circumstances and reasons.

Mr. Court: This was the issue on which the last election was fought, and yet that Government was returned with the biggest majority ever.

Dr. Henn: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has no right to stand up and talk like that.

Mr. Brady: When was war declared?

Mr. Court: You are flying in the face of the people of Australia.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am reminded of the results of the by-elections which were held in recent weeks. I do not think the Federal Government, and members opposite who support that Government, can gather much comfort from those results.

Mr. Court: In neither case was the Vietnam war an issue.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is obvious that members opposite are running contrary to the growing trend of world opinion. What I am saying is not an expression of an opinion of mine, but of those in all ranks and from all quarters in virtually every country of the world. In ever-increasing numbers they are expressing opposition to the war, and they include people in the United States itself.

I am speaking on this question because I am fearful of what will ultimately develop from this unwarranted action in Vietnam. In the mid and late 1930s I, amongst others, was scorned and ridiculed, because we went on the public platform and pointed out what was happening in some parts of Europe. At that time we found that the Conservatives—the equivalent of members opposite in this House—were on the side of intervention, because in their view that would stop the onward march of the Reds, the communists, the extremists, or something of that nature; but ultimately the situation got out of hand and a world war developed. I can see a parallel in the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: You are referring to the Nazis.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. It was a case of a strong military power interfering in the politics of a weaker country. That is the same position in which the U.S.A. is placed at the present time. Nearly all other democratic countries in the world will

have nothing to do with sending their troops to interfere in the affairs of Vietnam. I deplore the fact that not only the U.S.A., but more importantly our own country, is involved in that tragedy.

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: It was Chamberlain who brought back "Peace in our Time" after his meeting at Munich.

Mr. GRAHAM: There we find a tragedy brought about by backward and conservative thinking. There seems to be a school of thought abroad which considers that as long as one is shooting down the Reds or condemning the communists, one is embarking on a divine mission, and that everything one does—however immoral or wrong—in that direction is justified. My principles always have been, and still are, opposed to that line of thinking; but that has always been the view of conservative thinkers.

Mr. Dunn: It is about time you did things instead of talk.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the honourable member wants to satisfy his conscience that the mere fact of doing something is a worth-while mission, then I suggest there are a thousand and one useful and constructive things which could be done without having to bomb and blast the people who live in another country. There are jobs galore which could be done in a constructive sense.

Enough of that subject for this afternoon. I read in the Press recently an abbreviated report of an address given by the Mayor of Subiaco at a local government seminar, under the heading, "Bastion Of Democracy, Says Mayor." It reads as follows:—

Local government was about the last stronghold of true democracy, Subiaco mayor J. H. Abrahams told a seminar on "Local Government and the Community" yesterday.

Then he went on to elaborate. This is just about as nonsensical as our being asked to believe in the poll that was held in South Vietnam. We know democracy made some progress in this State in 1907 when every adult was given the right to vote at parliamentary elections for the Legislative Assembly. Unfortunately we had to wait until the year 1965 before every adult citizen in the State became eligible to vote for members to sit in the Legislative Council. But in this year of grace—1967—we still have not attained what should be the objective of every democratic party and democratic institution; namely, that every adult should be entitled to vote for local government elections. This, of course, occurs in many countries in the world; and I deplore the fact that Australia in so many things is falling further and further behind, whereas previously it was in the vanguard of public affairs. It was progressive and it was leading the world in social reform; but it is now trailing.

This is indicated by the difficulty being experienced in obtaining migrants for Australia in sufficient quantities. Previously people from countries regarded as being backward came here because of the sudden lift in affluence they would get in Australia on account of working conditions, social services, and amenities, generally, that applied. However, the conditions in many of those countries have reached the same standard as ours in Australia, and in others they have exceeded them. So, in comparison with the rest of the world, Australia is slipping back.

If I might revert to the matter of local government, surely if one were surveying the whole situation, one would conclude there are three arms of government: the Commonwealth Parliament dealing with national questions and international affairs, the State Parliament dealing with matters coming within its sphere—and we all know the activities of State Governments—and local government dealing with district matters. In each of these arms of government the people should have an opportunity of expressing themselves. We are aware that the Perth City Council, which has been so much in the news of late, is having the utmost difficulty in getting candidates to nominate for elections.

Very many people have not the necessary qualifications and, as a consequence, many of these local authorities become virtually the monopoly of a certain section of the community—that is to say, those who are either retired or are semi-independent businessmen. But anyone who is a public servant, a school teacher, a bank employee, a worker in an office, a clerk in a solicitor's office, or anything of that nature, is debarred because he is unable to attend the meetings which are held in the daytime. Then, when there are nominations requiring an election, only a fraction of the community is entitled to vote. By and large the ordinary little citizen is outvoted by the interests of property and business. I am speaking so far as the city is concerned.

Therefore I suggest it is completely laughable that the mayor of a local authority should have the effrontery to refer to local government as being the last stronghold of true democracy. The franchise for local government is a complete negation of democracy. I hope the time is not far distant when every citizen resident within the borders of a local authority will be able to vote at the elections or referenda, as the case may be, when such are held.

Mr. Elliott: Would you make it compulsory?

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot see anything wrong with that. I would be agreeable to that because I think that is how it should be. If we do not agree with compulsory voting for that arm of govern-

ment, surely we are not in a position to have compulsory voting for the other forms!

It is impossible to have compulsory voting at the present moment, because if I lived at Bamboo Creek or somewhere else I would still be entitled to vote for the Perth City Council if I were the owner of a property in the city and would be, indeed, even if I lived out of the country. Because of this it becomes an impossible proposition to enforce any system of voting. Therefore it must be left to the individual to make up his own mind.

A great deal has been said this session with regard to housing and the deplorably tragic situation which has developed. I have stated before, in the long period of years I have been a member of Parliament, that I have never known the situation ever to approach that existing at the present time. I care not for the figures which are trotted out, which are almost invariably the number of structures commenced; and almost invariably when headlines are quoted—as were those quoted by the Minister—they make reference to building activity generally but fail to get down to the important point of housing for the ordinary people of the community.

It is true that as the activities of the Housing Commission are tapering off, some of the slack is being taken up by private building, not of houses, but of flats. Of course, flats as we know them here are not suitable for families, because they have not been built for that purpose. It is a different matter entirely if they are built for families. So the position of the family man is getting worse and worse as every week passes. Members are aware of the fact that in respect of a three-bedroomed house in the metropolitan area, the State Housing Commission is making allocations to people who applied in January, 1965. There has been no movement from applications made at that date for more than six months. No progress whatsoever has been made. So for every month that passes, instead of the commission keeping up with the situation, it means every person on the books is being compelled to wait for a month longer. But, if the Government was doing its job, the period would be getting less.

I am staggered that the Government does not take the situation more seriously and do something about it. This Government has tremendous sums of money made available to it as compared with its predecessor. In the financial year in which we are operating at the present moment the Government has a total of more than \$57,000,000 of loan funds available to it. The Hawke Labor Government had slightly over \$33,000,000 average per annum. This Government I repeat, has more than \$57,000,000; but what is the Government doing with it? It is not building houses

for which there is such a crying need, not only in respect of our own native born citizens, but also the poor unfortunates who come from overseas and who are virtually getting kicked from pillar to post as they are not accepted as being eligible to apply for a home until they have been here for more than 12 months, irrespective of whether they are evicted or not. Even if local families are evicted, no consideration whatsoever is given to them.

The policy in respect of evictions, which was in existence for a period of some 12 to 15 years, has now been completely abandoned by this Government because of the impossibility of its meeting the demands of the people. It has had to economise somewhere, and as these poor, luckless devils who are evicted have nowhere to turn they become the victims of certain unscrupulous people.

What I want to point out is that from its average of \$33,000,000, the Hawke Government allocated 8.4 per cent. to housing: the average amount being \$2,842,000 under the State Housing Act. Yet this Government, in 1967-68, with approximately \$24,000,000 more available to it, is spending a lesser figure. It is spending \$2,640,000, representing only 4.6 per cent. of the money available to it. That is 4.6 per cent. as against an average of 8.4 per cent. when the Hawke Government was in office.

One would think there is no problem at present; that there is no crisis. The way things are going it will be necessary for the House Committee to make extensions to my office in order to accommodate the vast volume of papers, ever accumulating, concerning people unable to obtain accommodation!

I have said that because of the situation these people are subjected to all sorts of pressures; and that is the word the Minister for Housing used. Here let me say that I am sorry to hear he is ill at present and I hope and trust he will be back with us before long.

I think I have already indicated, to some members anyhow, the pressure which is used, and I quote the case of a family occupying accommodation for which it has been paying \$14 a week. I suppose that, as things go, \$14 is not a terrifically high sum to be paying for rent; but, of course, for an ordinary working man it is a pretty fair slice of his weekly pay packet. However, he felt he was extremely lucky because he was occupying a reasonable house. Recently, he received a notice from his landlord telling him that, as from a certain date, a fortnight ahead, the rental of the property would be \$30 a week, payable in advance, and that continuance of possession after that date would be taken as acceptance of the new terms of tenancy.

If ever there was blackmail, that was it! What can this poor unfortunate family do? Where can it turn? At present I have families with 10 and seven children, to mention two of them, with no idea what-

ever of what to do because they are facing eviction. I have been around to land agents galore, but the story is almost invariably the same—either the rentals are far in excess of what can be paid, or else the number of children in the family is a sufficient disqualification. Such being the case—and these are not isolated instances—surely there devolves upon the Government a responsibility for it to step up its building programme in order to meet the situation. But, unfortunately, the trend is in the other direction.

Mr. Norton: What about key money?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not only key money, but all sorts of devices are used. The other day I was talking to a gentleman known, I think, to the great majority of members of this Parliament. He had a lease of a house at a rental of \$20 a week with the right of renewal for a further 12 months on terms to be mutually agreed. This gentleman and his family were quite happy to sign the documents believing that this was an arrangement between gentlemen, in the broadest classification, anyhow, and that possibly at the expiration of the two-year period there could be some minor upward adjustment of the rental to meet increased charges, such as rates and other factors.

However, at the expiration of the two-year term, which has just occurred, the landlord demanded an extra \$10 a week, making \$30 a week. Because of the particular circumstances, this unfortunate person has no alternative whatever but to pay the extra \$10 a week which is being demanded of him.

Until the Government bestirs itself and creates a sufficiency of housing, not only by its own activities, but by greater encouragement to private builders as well, these things which are instanced will be allowed to continue and it will be impossible to stop them. Only at the weekend I had the case of a migrant family with a number of children and it became necessary for it, as a condition of tenancy, to pay \$44 as a deposit, and then \$44 in advance for a fortnight's rent. This is an ordinary working man with a large family and he is paying \$22 a week, a fortnight in advance. That man has been paying his rent in advance since he has been in that accommodation.

However, he has found it possible to keep only one week in advance instead of two, and accordingly he has been given a notice to quit. Therefore on his behalf I am calling on friends who are land and estate agents in the hope that something can be done for him and his family. The Housing Commission has wiped its hands of him because he has been in the country only since April, 1967. The commission will not register an application until the applicant has been here for a period of at least 12 months. That sort of policy might be all right if there were a reasonable sufficiency of houses, and if these



unfortunate people were given an opportunity to find houses for themselves; but, as we know, that is virtually impossible.

I have another policy about which I wish to complain. Quite a number of migrants—and I am referring to British migrants—appear to have reasonably large families, and because of the confined nature of accommodation at the migrant hostels something like this is arranged: The parents come to Australia with their half-dozen children, and one of the children is allowed to take residence in the hostel with the parents, and the other five are sent to the Fairbridge Farm School.

The parents agree to this proposition, but, of course, being parents and being human, after they have been in Western Australia for a period naturally they want their children with them. I suppose that feeling would start to become intense after a couple of weeks' separation from the children. So they battle around and by good fortune, perhaps, are able to obtain some sort of accommodation, and they leave the hostel and take the children out of Fairbridge Farm School.

Once again the family is united, but because of circumstances such as those I have outlined, and the attitude of landlords, they are given notice to quit. On occasions they have nowhere to turn. Incidentally, they miss work sometimes in order to battle around trying to find the almost impossible private accommodation on a second occasion. But still the Housing Commission will not recognise their plight because they have not been in the country for the minimum period of 12 months.

Any Government—Commonwealth or State—which brings people into this country in those circumstances, compelling them for a period of at least a year, and perhaps more, to live separately from their children because of the inability of this country to provide accommodation, must realise that this policy is a reflection on it.

There ought to be a steadying of the inflow of migrants to allow housing to be stepped up in order to cater reasonably for those who do arrive. I am aware that there is, unfortunately, a great deal of ill-feeling generated in the community because of the respective claims of migrants as against those of local people. Whilst the shortage continues that state of affairs is inevitable. If an Australian who has been waiting for two or three years learns of a person who came from another country a few months ago being able to get accommodation from the State Housing Commission, naturally he will be hostile.

The Government should not allow this position to continue. It should do something about it; and that something is, of course, to build more houses. But for some unaccountable reason the Government shows no disposition whatsoever to play the role which it should be playing in connection with its considerably increased

responsibilities, as indicated from the figures I supplied earlier.

I am sorry that the Minister for Electricity is not in his place. I have had occasion previously to complain of the attitude of the State Electricity Commission, with particular reference to the ridiculous procedure which had been laid down in connection with the positioning of meter boxes. This procedure required people, in many cases, to spoil the facade of their homes in order to meet the whim of a not particularly resilient bureaucrat. That is about as politely as I can put it.

Fortunately, the Minister was good enough to accompany the member for Victoria Park and myself on a tour of inspection and he wholeheartedly agreed with my submissions. After a lot of painstaking effort, extending over a period of some 12 months, the Minister was able to get a few lines of the regulations altered which improved the situation. This indicates to me that there is something radically wrong with the State Electricity Commission. Are we creating too many boards, trusts, and authorities? Might it not be better if the Ministers took the direct responsibility for the work and the activities of the instrumentalities under their control? If it is desired that certain instrumentalities should be separated from direct ministerial interference, then a different type of officer with a different outlook should be appointed to cater for the situation.

I feel that the State Electricity Commission is suffering from ingrown toenails; it is looking inwards and is not moving with the times. I was astounded to learn from an authoritative source that the State Electricity Commission would not allow cables—that is, electricity mains—to be placed underground even if the subdivider or the developer was prepared to pay the cost of the lines being placed underground. I know that members, not only from this side of the House, but from the other side of the House, too, have been appalled by the stodgy approach to the question by the State Electricity Commission. I implore the Minister to exercise his authority—and surely he has some. If he has no authority he has merely to come to Parliament and ask for it and I am sure it would be granted.

What right, I ask, has the State Electricity Commission to say that in a certain township, or a certain area, the people shall not have the amenity or the improvement of the absence of a whole forest of poles and electricity wires necessitating the trimming of trees and creating hazards for the ever-present schoolboys with their footballs and cricket balls? What right has the State Electricity Commission to say that a suburb shall not be clean and neat, and be built in conformity with modern trends the world over? Why is it necessary for this authority to interfere?

The reply to my question was that the consumer would, in the long run, have to

meet this added cost. However, I know the Government, and several Ministers, are very proud of the suburb known as Lynwood. In that suburb the developers have tried to make the area a little bit better than the ordinary suburb and, accordingly, have provided certain amenities, including a kindergarten. Why did not the Government step in and say that no kindergarten was to be provided by the developers because the consumers, or the occupiers of the houses in the district, would be paying for it?

If a suburb is improved because of some device or another, the average person would be prepared to pay a little more for a particular block. Such an improvement could make it possible for a ready sale to be made in an area which otherwise might not be particularly attractive. But because a developer wants to make an area attractive, and effect sales by placing the electricity cables underground, we find that the State Electricity Commission is adopting a role which definitely does not belong to it. It has no right whatsoever to interfere. The commission has a responsibility to provide electricity to certain areas.

If it is more costly for the underground main—as undoubtedly it is—and somebody is prepared to pay for it, then the State Electricity Commission should go ahead with the project. It should be instructed by the Minister and by the Government of the day to carry out the work.

I received a personal letter from one who has had something to do with this sort of thing and he complains bitterly. This person, incidentally, has political views entirely opposed to my own. I will read his letter, dated the 13th September, 1967, which is as follows:—

With regard to the S.E.C. and their antipathy to put any electrical reticulation cables underground, we of the Institute of Architects have been trying for many years to get somewhere with the S.E.C. in this respect. We agree it is more expensive, perhaps to the tune of \$200 to \$300 per house, but there is no doubt that eventually it will come. It has happened in the City and it has happened in other parts of the world. New Zealand has a very large part of its new residential reticulation underground. Having this in mind people spending large amounts for blocks of land, which they do these days, are not going to quibble at the additional cost of underground reticulation if they can see that it going to up-grade their property.

A benefit of underground reticulation which the S.E.C. are not prepared to admit, is the saving in cost of annual trimming of road side trees. Trimming is a kind word, in most cases the trees are murdered. I know the following proposals have been put to the S.E.C. and the people concerned have offered to pay the additional cost.

1. Perth City Council in its latest City Beach development.
2. R.D.C. with its Lynwood development.
3. Landalls at Bungaree.
4. A select little group that live at the "Coomb" Peppermint Grove.
5. The Games Housing Project, and
6. A number of Local Authorities have for many years been anxious to co-operate with the S.E.C. to achieve a breakthrough, without success.

To see and appreciate the difficulties, I would like you to consider Koolyanobbing a town that was built by B.H.P. who are not renowned for throwing their money away and who put underground reticulation throughout this town very successfully.

I have done quite a lot of research with an Electrical Engineer Consultant and I can assure you that apart from the cost there is nothing but advantage in this form of supplying electricity to residential areas.

Surely that letter speaks for itself. This would not impose another penny of cost upon the S.E.C. Indeed, in the fullness of time it would result in a saving to the State Electricity Commission, because whenever the time was right for all of the wires to be put underground, there would be considerable portions of the metropolitan area already so treated. They would be a gift to the S.E.C. because they would be provided at a cost no greater than the cost of overhead mains at the present time; and, of course, there would not be all the disadvantages which accrue from overhead lines.

I cannot understand a Government which prates of private enterprise and the freedom to do this, that, and the next thing, but does not allow this to be done. The Government would finish up in front financially and the areas would look more attractive. Also, this unnecessarily frustrating business would be terminated.

Fancy the State Electricity Commission going into the pros and cons of what certain developments in areas and subdivisions are going to cost the people! Let the S.E.C. get on with its job of supplying electricity to certain points, and leave the subdividers to do their job with the support of the S.E.C., which will find its costs are no more.

I was interested to read in the north-suburban supplement of *The West Australian* this morning that the Wanneroo Shire Council is experiencing the same sort of difficulties. It will be seen that the chorus is ever-growing in connection with this matter. The article is as follows:—

The State Electricity Commission has told the Wanneroo Shire Council

there is little hope of new urban subdivisions being provided with underground instead of overhead electricity mains.

The council had asked the S.E.C. if underground cables could be laid in new subdivisions in the shire if developers paid the increased cost.

The Commission said that few communities could afford the increased cost of an underground cable system and few consumers would wish to pay more for electricity.

Again I say that is damned impertinence on the part of the S.E.C. Next thing it will be complaining that the Wanneroo Shire Council is spending too much on a sportsground or a proposed swimming pool, or something of that nature. I repeat: This is to cost the Government and the S.E.C. not one penny. It can have no other result than to make certain portions of the city and the outer areas more attractive than would otherwise be the case. Why then is not the Government doing some straight talking to the General Manager of the State Electricity Commission, or to the Chairman of the State Electricity Commission, or to someone else of that nature?

I am unaware of the exact powers of the Minister, but I have had ministerial experience myself and I am certain that even if he has not the powers, if he attended a meeting of the commission and strongly made the point on behalf of the Government that, provided there were no additional costs incurred, approval should be given for this sort of thing to be done, the S.E.C. would heed the request.

I wonder how many more examples there will be of people protesting and of people—ranging from members of Parliament, to local authorities, to subdividers, to architects, and the rest of it—being frustrated, before the Government will make some move in this matter. Surely the Government does not believe in this mass of overhead wires forever and a day. If not, when does it propose to make the change? I repeat that so much of what is required to be done with the rapid expansion of suburbs could be done without cost to the Government if it saw the State Electricity Commission was doing its job.

I carry no personal vendetta against Mr. Jukes, but I am afraid he is falling down badly on the job. I fear I do not have a great deal of confidence in the commission itself, because surely the commission can override the general manager, who is only one of the number that comprises the commission. Surely these Government-promoted instrumentalities are at least required to pay some attention to the wishes and the desires of a properly elected Government. If the members of the commission run counter to the wishes of the Government in a matter of public interest which will impose no direct burden

whatsoever on that instrumentality, then surely there is a case for somebody to get on with the job and that somebody is, of course, fairly and squarely the Government.

Mr. Williams: Have you made any further inquiries into fault-findings in underground mains?

Mr. GRAHAM: No I have not. If there are some complications, no doubt this could be part of the agreement or the arrangement with the developer of a particular project. I would point out that mains up top are subject to motor vehicles running off the road, to storms, to the activities of boys in innocent sport, to larrikins, to misadventure, and to all sorts of other considerations. Anyhow, enough of that.

I was going to say I hope this will not be construed as an attack upon Mr. Jukes and the S.E.C. I am complaining, and complaining bitterly, at the lack of responsibility to approaches made by other people, not by myself. I have not made any requests in connection with this, but so many responsible people and authorities, both public and private, have made these approaches, and in each case the answer has been a flat rejection.

Finally I want to say I was most disappointed—indeed, I was disgusted—with the replies, which no doubt were prepared for him by officers in his department, which were given to me by the Minister for Electricity when I asked questions last month in respect of this matter. The first of my questions reads as follows:—

(1) Is it a fact that the State Electricity Commission refuses to agree to electricity mains being placed underground in an area, even if the developer is prepared to meet the entire cost of underground cables, or the difference in cost between underground and overhead mains?

(2) If so, why?

The reply is—

(1) Yes.

That is, it is the policy of the State Electricity Commission; or, rather, it refuses to agree to this proposition. The reasons given are as follows:—

(2) Because—

The commission, in line with other major electricity authorities in Australia is undergrounding where this is economically justified, and simplifying its overhead system where undergrounding is not justified.

The expression "economically justified" ought to refer to the State Electricity Commission itself. It has no business to interfere with the economics of Graham as a consumer or the R.D.C., or any other developing authority which desires, and is

willing, to pay the amount necessary for this improvement. The commission goes on with its impertinence to say—

Whoever finds the large amount of capital required for undergrounding, the consumer eventually pays.

If that is the order of the day, then other developers must be told that they cannot provide any facilities such as footpaths, concrete kerbings, or more than the minimum amount of open space—certainly not the kindergarten at Lynwood—because the S.E.C. has spoken and said, “The consumer eventually pays.” I wonder whether this is becoming a super-Government.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has two more minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The answer went on to say—

Poles are necessary for street lighting, and if poles and underground street light mains were charged to street lighting, the cost to local authorities would increase.

Of course it would, but is anybody suggesting this ought to be done? Members should notice that the State Electricity Commission puts in the word “if.” I could think of a lot of things to put in on a supposititious basis, but they are quite irrelevant to this matter. The local authority will pay for the street lighting. If the change is made, there is no suggestion that there will be no imposition whatever on the S.E.C., or that it will be completely relieved of having to meet the cost of the overhead mains where a developer is agreeable to meet the difference in cost between the installation of an underground main as against an overhead main.

The answer goes on with more delightful impertinence and the commission, through the Minister, says—

Any available capital can be better utilised in overcoming the shortage of housing and other essential community requirements.

I think that is lovely! A developer seeks to do certain things on his estate to make it more attractive and to provide more amenities for the people for good and sufficient reasons, and the State Electricity Commission says that the capital resources of that developer should not be spent in that way because, in its opinion, the money would be better used in overcoming the shortage of housing and other essential community requirements. This certainly necessitates examination and action on the part of the Government. I sincerely hope it will be stirred into action and that something concrete will result.

MR. COURT (Nedlands—Minister for Industrial Development) [5.1 p.m.]: I do not want to let this opportunity pass with-

out expressing some views on the comments that have been made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because I presume he is expressing the official views of the State Parliamentary Labor Party on the situation in Vietnam. Some of the remarks made were very extravagant and, to say the least, express the views held by the extreme left wing. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to espouse such views, that is entirely his own affair.

Mr. Graham: Here are some more of the tarbrush tactics you use!

Mr. COURT: However I do not want to let this opportunity pass because if I do there is a possibility that those who read *Hansard* will note the remarks made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and, if they are not answered or commented upon, will form the opinion that the views he has expressed in this Parliament have been accepted. I would like to think that at least the majority of members in this Chamber would dissociate themselves from such views very strongly if a vote were to be taken on them.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has endeavoured to blacken the name of the United States of America. He has, without any basis whatsoever, likened that country to Nazi Germany. No matter how the honourable member tries to evade what he has said, it is clear that he said the participation of the United States in Vietnam is akin to the Nazi activities.

Mr. Graham: I said it was akin to the activities in Spain.

Mr. COURT: Australia is an ally of the United States, and there was a time when a Labor Prime Minister was very pleased to issue an invitation to the Americans; in fact, he pleaded with them to come and help this country of ours, and help us they did.

Mr. Graham: I have noticed that the Minister's attitude towards the Japanese of late is entirely different from what it was 20 years ago.

Mr. COURT: We will deal with that too, if the honourable member so desires. Let us deal with this situation in its proper worldly perspective. Some of the European countries in particular, which may have refused to send troops to Vietnam, raised no protest when the might of America went to their aid in the post-war period during the Berlin airlift. Not one of those countries put up any protest! America offered the power that it had to Berlin to stave off what could have been an invasion by the communists.

Mr. Graham: That does not justify its intervention in Vietnam.

Mr. COURT: If the honourable member is consistent, he would say the United States of America had no right to be in Europe; but it had every right to be there,

because its troops were wanted there just as they are desperately needed in Vietnam today. I would like to feel I had some conscience in this matter which involves our future security. I think I can discuss matters of war with a clearer conscience than that of the honourable member.

Mr. Graham: In what way? I would like you to be more specific.

Mr. Bovell: Because he has had some experience of it.

Mr. Jamieson: What would you know about it?

Mr. Bovell: A lot more than you!

Mr. Graham: Let the Minister look after Esperance.

Mr. COURT: We on this side of the House have some conscience, because the day could come when we want the Americans to honour their part in the Anzus Pact.

Mr. Graham: You cannot talk about a conscience!

Mr. COURT: Does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition say that Australians are wrong in being a party to this and one or two other pacts which mean so much to our security, and as a result of which we can sleep easy at night? If he does disagree with that, and believes that the Americans should not be in Vietnam, and that we should not be in Vietnam with them, he is saying that we should break the Anzus Pact.

Mr. Graham: Who said anything of the sort?

Mr. Jamieson: Your style is that you are more likely to send your dog than to go yourself.

Mr. COURT: The interjections from the back benches only confirm my view—

Mr. Graham: Don't the people of the United Nations Organisation know what they are doing in handling this?

Mr. COURT: I can only assume from the violent reaction from the other side that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was, in fact, expressing the official view of the State Parliamentary Labor Party on this question.

Mr. Graham: He was expressing a view that is world-wide.

Mr. COURT: If he was not, it is up to his leader to deny it. The fact that the remarks made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber have been recorded leads me to say that I hope there is a majority of members who do not agree with the views he has expressed.

If again we put this matter in its proper perspective and consider the invasion of Malaysia by the terrorists, does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition say that Britain, Australia, New Zealand, the Ghurkas, and other troops should not have been there

to assist Malaysia to get rid of the terrorists who were trying to overrun that country? The same principle applies in Vietnam. U.S. and other troops are there in an endeavour to prevent the communists from overrunning Vietnam and other countries, and with the possibility of their eventually spreading to Australia. At the time Vietnam was tragically weak, both politically and in every other way.

In going to the aid of Malaysia, Australia at that time was assisting the British troops in trying to put down the terrorists. "Terrorists" were the same for all political purposes as "Viet Cong." The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has quoted Britain as being one of the countries opposed to participation in South Vietnam. My understanding of the position is that the British Government is supporting the policy of the United States of America—although I notice in recent days the British Government has had some trouble with some of its members. Officially, however, the Prime Minister of Britain is supporting the American stand in Vietnam. This does not imply he is not endeavouring to do his best to find a peaceful solution, but officially he is supporting the policy of America, because he knows in his heart that if the Americans do not stay there the country will be overrun by communists.

Then we come further down the list to Indonesia. Were Britain, Australia and, New Zealand wrong in sending their troops, together with the Ghurkas and others, to help Malaysians protect themselves from Indonesia? Were they wrong? Were we wrong? Were all the other countries wrong? If we had not stepped in then it would have been only a matter of a short time when a very weak country would have been overrun, and eventually Australia would have been endangered. There is a simple philosophy in this matter: the defence of Australia. It is not new, and it is not smart or clever. It is just good commonsense.

Mr. Bickerton: I think Harold will take you spearfishing with him.

Mr. COURT: I think the honourable member, in his own mind, strongly supports the views held by the Government.

Mr. Bickerton: Do you speak for yourself or on behalf of the coalition Government?

Mr. COURT: I would make so bold as to say that the majority of this Parliament would support what the Commonwealth Government is doing in honouring its word by trying to keep Australia safe, and also by doing what the great majority of Australians voted for at the last general election. What more democratic way is there to ascertain the views of Australians as a whole?

Mr. Graham: Why not send the members of the Young Liberal League over there if they are so keen? Why are they

not volunteering in their thousands? It is because they know what they are doing.

Mr. Jamieson: It seems you are capable of sending only your dog there; you will not go yourself.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): Order! I would ask the member for Beeloo to refrain from interjecting to such an extent.

Mr. COURT: Thank you for your intervention, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I thought the member for Beeloo had started to play the bagpipes, and had learned to play in on the draw, and play out on the blow.

Mr. Graham: I wonder whether the Deputy Chairman (Mr. Crommelin) is still interested in Vietnam's connection with the Loan Estimates.

Mr. COURT: I am answering the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on the same grounds as he put forward; and, if you will permit me, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I propose before I finish to tell you why the war in Vietnam has not affected our loan funds. I want to make one final point on this question of Vietnam.

We have had a policy of trying to keep Australia safe by meeting our commitments outside our shores; when the enemy gets to our shores it will be too late, owing to the peculiarity of this country's geography and the immensity of its size.

Mr. Fletcher: Which enemy?

Mr. COURT: It all depends on whom the honourable member calls an enemy. I regard the communists as a real enemy and a very real threat to our country; and if members opposite do not, then we have no threat.

Mr. Jamieson: Which enemy do you expect will come here? Which one? Tell us.

Mr. Graham: You are suffering from nightmares.

Mr. Jamieson: Go on; tell us.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crommelin): Order!

Mr. Jamieson: Oh, rubbish; it is complete rubbish!

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member implying that what I am saying is rubbish, when I ask him to keep order?

Mr. Jamieson: Ask the Minister to talk sense.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order! I will ask the member for Beeloo to keep order.

Mr. Jamieson: Make him talk sense, instead of rubbish.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Hawke: Listen to all the hawks on the Government side.

Mr. COURT: It is just as well that I rose to speak on this issue, because I really wanted to find out the views of

certain members on the other side of the House. We have certainly found out what they are.

Mr. Jamieson: We could have told you privately. We have nothing to hide; we have no shame.

Mr. COURT: Might I now come to the main point I wanted to make; namely, that because of its huge size, its small population, and its comparatively small development as compared with other countries, the only way that Australia can defend itself is to make sure that through alliances she will be able to call on her strong friends in times of need. In the meantime Australia tries to meet her commitments in respect of alliances and tries to keep the potential threat of the enemy away from her shores.

It is not very different from the basic precaution of trying to fight a fire three or four farms away in the hope that it never reaches one's own farm.

Mr. Jamieson: Who is this "we"? I suppose it is the poor devils whom you are sending to Vietnam. You are not doing very much about it. It does not cost you a penny.

Mr. COURT: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that our Loan Estimates were reduced because of the South Vietnam war. Might I remind him that the amount we are getting is higher than it has ever been.

Mr. Graham: Not as high as it should be.

Mr. COURT: I would also point out that the method of determining loan funds has not been altered one iota.

Mr. Graham: Because it cannot be.

Mr. COURT: I would also point out that most of the commitments of the war are being met by the Commonwealth out of revenue. Accordingly, so far as the State Parliament is concerned, that completely debunks the argument the Deputy Leader of the Opposition put forward—

Mr. Graham: Oh no, it does not.

Mr. COURT: —when he discussed this extraordinary subject, under the Loan Estimates. There is just one final word I would like to say. I want to take this opportunity to make sure that I am personally dissociated from the comments of the member for Fremantle—comments which were made while he was representing the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association abroad.

He gave us his report and, to his credit, he had it recorded in *Hansard* so that we may know what was said. By interjection, however, I tried to indicate that I, for one, was not in accord with his views, and I personally deplore the fact that the member for Fremantle should have used that occasion to put over this comment while implying that it came from Western Australia.

Mr. Fletcher: No; I did not. I made that clear.

Mr. COURT: That was certainly implied, and it was the inference that could be drawn from the Press article.

Mr. Jamieson: They also get some from you.

Mr. COURT: It is with regret that some of us on this side of the House—in fact I would say all of us on this side of the House—listened to what the honourable member had to say; and we certainly do not support the views put forward at the C.P.A. conference by the member for Fremantle.

Mr. Graham: You are just little "Yes" men for the U.S.A.

Vote put and passed.

Votes: State Electricity Commission, \$2,750,000; Public Works, \$24,548,814; North-West, \$3,662,186; Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage, \$6,500,000; Mines, \$178,000; Housing, \$2,640,000; Agriculture, \$625,000; Forests, \$400,000; Fisheries, \$66,000; Government Printing Office, \$80,000; Industrial Development, \$300,000; Other State Undertakings, \$3,587,000; Sundries, \$1,173,000—put and passed.

This concluded the Loan Estimates for the year.

#### *Report*

Resolutions reported and the report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

MR. BRAND (Greenough—Premier) [5.18 p.m.]: I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Jamieson: Have you had enough for one day?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must keep quiet while I am on my feet. The Speaker has not left the Chair until he has left the Chamber.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.19 p.m.

## Legislative Council

Tuesday, the 17th October, 1967

The PRESIDENT (The Hon. L. C. Diver) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

#### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

##### *Tabling*

THE PRESIDENT: I have received from the Auditor-General a copy of his report on the Treasurer's statement of the Public Accounts for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1967. It will be laid on the Table of the House.

#### TERTIARY EDUCATION COMMITTEE

##### *Tabling of Report*

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (North Metropolitan—Minister for Mines) [4.36 p.m.]: I have two copies of the report of the Tertiary Education Committee, headed by Sir Lawrence Jackson. Fifty copies have been printed, and the Government has arranged for the type to remain set. If any individual member would like a copy of the report for his own use, a copy will be despatched to him if he contacts the Under Secretary, Premier's Department.

*The reports were tabled.*

#### QUESTIONS (4): ON NOTICE

##### RESEARCH STATIONS

##### *Experimental Plots South of Johnston Lakes*

1. The Hon. R. H. C. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines:

In reference to the experimental plots south of Johnston Lakes to test the suitability of areas for agriculture—

- (a) how many plots will be used?
- (b) how many acres will comprise each plot?
- (c) what types of cereals and pastures will be subject to experimentation?
- (d) will they be the responsibility of the Salmon Gums Research Station?
- (e) is it intended to fence the area before experimentation commences?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH replied:

- (a) Two sites, one situated on heavy land and the other on sandplain, three miles apart, have been selected.
- (b) The heavy land site will be 30 acres while the area of the sandplain site will be 80 to 100 acres.
- (c) Several wheat, oats, and barley varieties will be tested. Pastures tested will include a range of subterranean clovers, annual medics, rose clovers, cupped clovers, seradellas, lupins, and various other annual clovers.
- (d) Responsibility for planning and executing the programme rests with plant research division officers, and advisers of the wheat and sheep division stationed in Esperance, South Perth, and Lake Grace. The assistance of Salmon Gums Research Station personnel will be required from time to time.
- (e) Yes.