

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 3rd May, 1979

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

EVAPORITES (LAKE MacLEOD) AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. V. J. Ferry (on behalf of the Attorney General), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. V. J. FERRY (South-West) [2.39 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to ratify an agreement between the State and Texada Mines Pty. Limited which, by a recent change of name, is now known as Dampier Salt (Operations) Pty. Limited. I shall, however, refer to the former name in which the agreement was executed.

Under the original agreement, Texada was required to produce potash. This requirement was amended in 1972 to include the production of langbeinite. This was achieved by including langbeinite in the definition of potash. Clause 9(1)(a) was amended to provide for the establishment of the required plant and the expenditure thereon of not less than \$18 million.

By 1976 Texada established a langbeinite plant to the capacity required. However, the levels of production envisaged were not reached because of serious technical difficulties in the production of that product. In addition, the company was not able to market the langbeinite it produced and, as it was also in serious financial difficulties, liquidation seemed inevitable.

To rescue the operation, the major shareholder, C. Itoh, offered BHP a 76 per cent equity in Texada. BHP accepted the offer, following an assurance by the State that, if the production of langbeinite proved not to be viable, consideration would be given to amending the agreement in 1979. This assurance was subject to conditions which included the expenditure of \$4 million by Texada on upgrading the salt installations. The

sum of \$2.3 million was spent on this work by March, 1978.

As was required, Texada carried out further research into and development of processing and marketing of langbeinite and submitted its report. The report indicated that langbeinite could be produced. However, the economic viability of producing it could not be gauged, as reasonably accessible markets did not exist. It was also found that production of potash—potassium sulphate—would not result in a reasonable return on investment.

Following the submission of Texada's report, BHP transferred its interests to Dampier Salt (Operations) Pty. Ltd. CRA has 64.9 per cent shareholding in this company. Other shareholders are Marubeni Corporation 20.4 per cent, Nissho-iwai 10.2 per cent and C. Itoh 4.5 per cent.

In general terms, the amendments made to the principal agreement by virtue of this Bill are as follows: The only obligation imposed on the State is to ratify this agreement and to endeavour to secure its passage as an Act prior to the 30th June, 1979.

The amending agreement requires Texada to upgrade the Lake MacLeod salt installations to improve both their efficiency and security against the elements. Reference was made earlier to Texada's obligation to expend \$4 million on the upgrading of the salt installations. The amount of \$2.5 million now expressed is for the completion of this work.

The company is also required to produce not less than 700 000 tonnes of common salt per annum over the first three years and thereafter at a rate of not less than 500 000 tonnes.

In reaching this agreement with Texada, recognition has been given to the uncertainties inherent in the future marketing of salt. It is the intention of both parties that production of salt at Lake MacLeod will continue. However, a provision was considered necessary should a serious fall in the demand for salt occur. It was agreed that if total annual sales of salt from the Dampier and Texada operations fall below 2.6 million tonnes, the company would have the option to place the Texada operation on care and maintenance. Confidence has been expressed that sales will not fall below the specified figure.

As a result of Texada's report on the production of langbeinite, mentioned earlier, Texada will be relieved of its obligation to produce potash—which term, under the principal agreement, includes langbeinite. This relief is conditional upon the company continuing to investigate the full utilisation of the resource and

reporting thereon at three-yearly intervals to the Minister.

The amendment further provides that the State may introduce a third party to utilise the Lake MacLeod resource for purposes other than the production of common salt.

Members are aware of the havoc brought by cyclone "Hazel" and of its effect on Texada's shiploading facility in particular. This catastrophic event may put back the time-scale of the company's commitment to produce common salt from Lake MacLeod. In spite of this, there is confidence that, by the amendment to the agreement, Texada will be a significant salt producer and continue to be a major employer and factor in the future of Carnarvon.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the Opposition).

COLLIE COAL (WESTERN COLLIERIES) AGREEMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. W. M. Piesse (on behalf of the Attorney General), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. W. M. PIESSE (Lower Central)
[2.46 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to ratify an agreement between the Government and Western Collieries Ltd., which was formally signed by officials of the company and the Premier on the 17th January this year.

The agreement contains five major provisions—

- (1) An obligation on the company to reserve at all times 50 per cent of its extractable reserves of coal to satisfy the needs of the State Energy Commission.
- (2) A requirement for the company and the State Energy Commission to enter into coal supply arrangements commercially acceptable to both parties for the tenure of the agreement.
- (3) An undertaking by the company to prepare an overall scheme for the exploration and development of the coal resource over a 42-year period, together with provision of detailed proposals for specific developments at nominated intervals within that period.

- (4) Requirements for protection and management of the environment and for appropriate rehabilitation of mined areas.
- (5) Procedures whereby the company may secure title to substantial additional coal reserves.

Before commenting further on the specific provisions of the agreement, it may be profitable for me to provide an overview of the coal reserves situation in the State, together with an indication of future State Energy Commission coal requirements. As a result of these comments, members will be in a position more fully to appreciate the significance of this agreement and of other actions which the Government has taken in relation to this vital State resource.

Any assessment of recoverable coal reserves must have due regard for the anticipated sale price of the coal and the proposed methods of mining, as well as the geological appraisal necessary to establish the quantity and quality of coal in any location.

Having regard for those criteria, the currently assessed estimate of extractable reserves in the Collie field are approximately 350-400 million tonnes.

Occurrences of coal have been reported from other areas of the State, particularly at Eneabba, but to date no significant reserves of commercially extractable coal have been established other than at Collie.

At the present time production of coal at Collie is approximately 2.5 million tonnes per annum, most of which is consumed by the State Energy Commission. The balance is used by one large and a number of small industrial consumers.

Conversion to coal firing of the second generating unit at Kwinana has now been completed. Construction of the two new 200 megawatt generating units at Muja will be completed by 1981 and 1982 respectively. As a consequence, SEC coal consumption will increase by one million tonnes per annum by the early 1980s.

Long-term forecasts of coal consumption indicate an annual requirement for some six million tonnes of coal per annum by the SEC alone around the turn of the century. After allowing for the consumption of coal by existing and yet to be built coal-fired power stations over their full economic life, the aggregate SEC consumption of coal would probably exceed 50 per cent of the presently known commercially recoverable resources of Collie coal.

This leaves less than half of the reserves for industrial use and Government's policy is to achieve a reasonable balance between consumers.

Against this background, the State and the two coal producers, Western Collieries Limited and Griffin Coal Mining Company Limited, have recently entered into long-term arrangements which are designed to be of benefit to the producers and to the State Energy Commission.

In addition to the agreement now before the House, members may be aware of a long-term coal supply contract signed on the 29th March, 1979, which provides for the Griffin Coal Mining Company to supply the SEC with about 50 million tonnes of Muja open-cut coal over 25 years.

As a result of the long-term security provided by the contract, Griffin is proposing to enter into a major development plan for bigger and more sophisticated equipment to be employed in its mining operations.

Negotiations have also commenced with Griffin for that company to enter into an agreement similar to that in the schedule to this Bill.

The other company holding coalmining leases at Collie, Western Collieries and Dampier Pty. Ltd., has also signified its intention to finalise a similar agreement during this year.

With the significance to the State of the Collie coal resource now established, I return to my initial comments on the purpose of this Bill and propose to explain in some detail the implications of the agreement provisions.

Reservation to the State Energy Commission of 50 per cent of the extractable reserves of coal available to the company is provided under clause 5. Provision is also made for coal to be supplied from both open cut and deep mining methods, as required under "mutually acceptable commercial arrangements" or, in more specific words, long-term coal supply contracts.

Clause 6 places an obligation on the company to prepare an overall scheme for the exploration, development and rehabilitation of the coal resource contained in areas under application or now held as coalmining leases.

The scheme will encompass developments over a 42-year time span and, for the latter part of the period, will, of course, be general in nature. The merit of the provision is that it establishes for the first time in the history of the Collie coalfield a general development framework which will be of value to both the company and all Government departments and instrumentalities serving the Collie community.

Detailed proposals for the conduct of operations for an initial 15 years are required, pursuant to clause 7, on or before the 1st July, 1980.

In formulating its proposals, the company must provide details of measures to be taken to achieve a balance between open cut and deep mined coal production. It must provide evidence that the coal needs of the SEC have been met for that period. It must also specify the total annual tonnage of coal which the company proposes to mine, indicate if any processing of coal is envisaged, and provide details of measures to be taken for the protection and management of the environment, including rehabilitation.

Requirements for consideration and implementation of proposals, similar to those contained in other agreements ratified by the Parliament are set down in clause 8. Further proposals are required in respect of the 15 years from year 16 to the end of year 30, and for the 12 years from year 31 to the end of year 42.

If during the continuance of the agreement, the company desires significantly to modify, expand or vary its activities beyond those specified in any approved proposals, then it is required by clause 10 to submit additional proposals in respect thereof.

The environmental protection and management proposal required under clause 7(1)(m) is to be the subject of ongoing investigation, research and monitoring in respect of which a report must be submitted to the Minister yearly with a more detailed report required three yearly.

Arising from the detailed report the Minister may, under clause 11(3) call upon the company to submit additional detailed proposals for the management of the environment. The agreement does not, of itself, require the company to submit further details of its operations, although clause 14 requires the company to forward to the Minister a copy of any mining plan which the company submits to the SEC. It is envisaged that proviso will result in the Minister receiving a detailed five-year mine development plan which will be updated annually.

The normal provision for use of local professional services, labour and materials is included at clause 15. Specific provisions relating to roads (clause 16), rail (clause 17), electricity (clause 18), water (clause 19) and forests (clause 20) are incorporated to achieve clear understandings between the company and the State with respect to those aspects of the ongoing coalmining operation.

Provision is made in clause 21 for the company to apply for and be granted a coalmining lease.

The lease may encompass so much of the 29 existing Mining Act coalmining leases now held by the company and so much of the company's 41 approved applications for coalmining leases, as the company may determine.

A plan, a copy of which I will table, shows in red the existing coalmining leases registered in the corporation's name. The yellow areas delineate approved lease applications.

I have already indicated that the company would be granted access to additional coal reserves. The additional reserves are within the yellow areas. The company is presently conducting a \$750 000 drilling programme to determine more clearly the size of the additional resources.

In view of the importance of Collie coal to the future energy requirements of local industry, as well as the State Energy Commission, the Government has, by clause 25(1), prohibited export sales of coal without the consent of the Minister.

It has also been mentioned earlier that the company would provide details of the annual tonnage of coal proposed to be mined. Should the company desire to sell in excess of the approved tonnage, it is required under clause 25(2) to secure the approval of the Minister.

The remaining provisions of the agreement are standard to agreements of this nature.

Reference is made in clause 38 to seven specific coalmining lease applications which form part of the yellow area on the tabled plan.

The company has had to have access to coal reserves which can be mined in the period prior to approval of the proposal required under clause 7. Consequently, provision was made for the seven applications to be granted under the Mining Act. Clause 38 provides for those leases to be relinquished by the company in the event of the agreement being determined.

This agreement is one of several major initiatives which the Government has in train to ensure that maximum long-term benefit flows to the State from the coal resource at Collie.

I commend the Bill to the House.

The plan was tabled (see paper No. 164).

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. W. Cooley.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [3.00 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has two primary purposes. Firstly, it makes provision for the appointment of a commissioner as chief executive officer and member of the Metropolitan Water Board as a replacement for the presently named general manager. This position is currently vacant, the management of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Board being in the hands of the acting general manager (Laurie Coonan).

Secondly, it deletes from the principal Act the prescription of certain fees relating to the board's registers of debentures and stock.

In the first instance the Bill proposes to amend the principal Act by replacing reference to a general manager as chief executive officer and member of the board by reference to a commissioner in these two roles.

Such action has been considered desirable to implement recommendations arising out of a review of the board organisation undertaken on the board's behalf late last year.

The review identified a need to create a new chief position to co-ordinate the authority's administrative and engineering activities and recognises the growth of the Metropolitan Water Board's operations in recent years.

In respect of the second proposal in the Bill, it is intended to remove from the Act particulars of fees payable for inspecting the board's registers of debentures and stock which show details of loan subscriptions and for copies and extracts of entries in these registers. The prescription of such fees more appropriately belongs in the province of subordinate legislation in the form of the board's bearer debenture and inscribed stock by-laws recently tabled in this House.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. W. Cooley.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: TENTH DAY*Motion*

Debate resumed, from the 2nd May, on the following motion of the Hon. N. F. Moore—

That the following address be presented to His Excellency—

May it please Your Excellency: We the Members of the Legislative Council of the Parliament of Western Australia in Parliament assembled, beg to express our loyalty to our Most Gracious Sovereign and to thank Your Excellency for the Speech you have been pleased to deliver to Parliament.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [3.02 p.m.]: Firstly, I would like to congratulate the Hon. Norman Moore, as other members have done, for his contribution in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. Unfortunately, he is not in the Chamber at the present time.

In this regard I want to make some comments. It is fairly traditional that members rising to perform this duty at the opening of Parliament become slightly nervous due to the occasion. Many of the guests present in the Chamber have their eyes on the member moving the motion, and on such occasions that member is really in the limelight. I think it was very clear that on the opening day of this session the Hon. Norman Moore had no need to be nervous. I wish to congratulate him on the content and presentation of his speech. It shows quite clearly that the honourable member has much to offer in this House, and I am sure we can look forward to very good contributions from him in debates in the future.

I had intended to speak on many matters, but I shall leave some of them over for discussion in the next session of Parliament when we debate the money Bills at Budget time. However, I shall raise certain matters now, although I shall not make the suggestion that Mr Cloughton made at the commencement of his speech in this debate yesterday when he said, "It is not my intention to make a long speech today."

I did intend to spend quite a lot of time in dealing with a matter concerning the State Housing Commission. However, I am very pleased to find that this problem has been resolved, and that it is not necessary for me to raise the matter in this debate. I wish to thank the Minister for Housing (Mr Ridge) for the assistance he gave me in resolving the problem.

I have been very concerned by the way in which a member of this House, to my knowledge on two occasions, made use of part of a pledge of an organisation which is committed to help to develop people so as to render service to the community. The organisation to which I refer is the Rostrum organisation which assists men to improve their speaking ability and to improve their knowledge of procedures at meetings. In doing that they improve their service to the community.

There are ex-Rostrum or practising Rostrum members in almost every area of community activity, who have equipped themselves better because they belonged to this organisation. Many members of Parliament, shire councillors, members of sporting organisations, and members of parents and citizens' associations have used this organisation to better equip themselves, and have then used this training in their services to the community.

One of the good features of Rostrum is that it is not a political organisation; it is an organisation which helps a person to help everyone else. It is not uncommon to find members of this organisation from opposite sides of the political arena assisting one another. One very outstanding example of this—I shall not mention the name of the gentleman involved—was the case of a Rostrum member, now a freeman of Rostrum who is a committed member of the Australian Labor Party and who took under his wing an endorsed Liberal candidate in a Federal election.

THE PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. I would ask members to refrain.

THE HON. I. G. PRATT: This gentleman, being a member of Rostrum, took under his wing an endorsed Liberal candidate in a Federal election and brought him into the Rostrum organisation in order to help him.

While this candidate had thoughts of entering Parliament and had ambitions to serve the people he had difficulty in expressing himself, because he was nervous of standing in front of people.

That member of Rostrum did a wonderful job, because he brought into the organisation—of which I was a member—an endorsed Liberal candidate, who has now become an established member in the Federal Parliament and is carrying out his duties very ably, thanks to the training and understanding of members of Rostrum from both sides of the political arena.

I have very good friends in Rostrum who are ALP members, and we get on extremely well, because we have been members of this

organisation and have felt for one another. I am sure those people will be disgusted, as I was on two occasions, to find that part of the actual pledge used when joining the Rostrum organisation was used in an endeavour to goad people in a political situation. I shall say no more other than to indicate that part of the Rostrum pledge was used.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: You are talking about this Chamber?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: Yes. I am referring to the part of the pledge which says, "I promise not to be silent when I ought to speak." I remember the occasions when the member to whom I am referring chose to use that part of the pledge for political goading of members on this side of the House. There is much more in Rostrum than those last few lines suggest. I suggest to the honourable member that he should read the rest of the Rostrum pledge and digest it.

The Hon. Lyla Elliott: Who are you talking about?

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: The honourable member concerned is aware of whom I am speaking.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: It looks as though he has a thick skin.

The Hon. I. G. PRATT: I have pride in that organisation; and I hope that others in it also share my pride. It appears that is not the case, and I am sorry to see that happen. I am aware that people who have reached the high position of Premier of this State—from both sides of the House—have publicly involved themselves, shown their commitment, and spoken of their commitment to Rostrum and their pride in the involvement that they have had.

Having heard such people speaking about this matter, I find that they made the same point that I have in mind: it should not be used for political purposes. That is the reason I am making these comments. I hope the pledge of Rostrum is not used again in that manner in this House.

The next matter on which I wish to speak fills me with considerable sadness. I refer to the recent passing of the town planner of the former Armadale Shire Council, now the Town of Armadale—the late Mr Tony Brant. I pay a tribute to the work he did for the community of Armadale. He was a man of vision and a man who looked well outside the immediate job in front of him.

I became involved with Tony Brant when I was a councillor with the then shire and we worked very closely together. I was the town planning

chairman and he was the town planner. Through this association I am well aware of the contributions he has made to the future of the district.

The area of the shire which soon will be rezoned is in the south-east corridor extensions has been a matter of public discussion recently and is of significance to the community. For years, Tony Brant was laying down the background which would be required for the eventual development of the area once it was zoned urban. It is presently zoned rural, but some time ago he was able to see that it would eventually become an urban area.

Tony Brant did a great deal of work as a paid officer and as a private citizen in his own time. In the relatively near future when the land is rezoned there will be in front of the owners and possible developers a plan which will make the development of the area a far more simple proposition than would otherwise have been the case.

One of his earlier projects was to make a population projection which would tend to overcome the problem we experience in a lot of areas with the provision of educational facilities. As long ago as five years back he pinpointed the areas in the shire which would be requiring primary or high schools when rezoned. As far back as that time he had discussions with planning officers of the Education Department and had agreed on the general areas which would require the provision of schools. One such school will come into fruition in the near future and that is the West Armadale High School. The school will be sited in an area that will become part of a massive urban development when the rezoning has been completed.

Tony Brant was a man who paid a tremendous amount of attention to the provision of recreation facilities and at all times he bore in mind the different groups in the community who would use them. The work he did was of paramount importance to the future of the people living in the shire—to the young and to the old. He was a man who never considered anything to be too much for him to do. My last contact with Tony was symbolic of the way he treated others. I rang him asking for certain information and he informed me that he had the information there. I said that I would be over in a few minutes to pick it up, but Tony said, "No, I am going past your office shortly and I will drop the information in to you." He would do anything for ratepayers in the area. He was prepared to help me and not because I was a member of Parliament but just because he believed in his work. I felt I could not let this

opportunity pass without publicly paying tribute to Tony Brant and expressing my sorrow at his passing.

I was very pleased late last year to hear that the Army was to supply an armour-plated bulldozer to prepare land for extensions to what will become a part of Mandurah Road. The bulldozer is to be used to clear scrub and make it possible to detect any unexploded ammunition in the Warnboro-Safety Bay area. There has been some confusion about its role, which is limited; it is to be used purely and simply to clear the scrub. The land is to be cleared so that magnetometers can be used to check for unexploded shells. The northern section of the road between Rockingham and Mandurah has caused considerable concern for some time. The bulldozer will now enable the work to go ahead so that a better road can be provided.

I am glad to know that this is about to happen and that the Commonwealth Government has co-operated with the State Government in this way. However, the rest of the area is a different kettle of fish. Although the Premier has been pressing the Prime Minister to make a commitment, a compromise between the two Governments is not easy to arrange. I will be very pleased when a solution has been found, but unfortunately it seems a long way off.

Another matter which has pleased me is that in the last couple of weeks a report has been made on the proposed development at Long Point. This area has caused considerable concern to the Rockingham Shire for some time, particularly with respect to the holiday camp—if one could call it a holiday camp. The area consists of squatters' shacks and there is a very serious health problem. Septic tanks consist of 44-gallon drums buried in the ground only 20 or 30 feet away from bores used to obtain drinking water.

The shire wanted to get rid of the camp and the Hon. Neil McNeill and myself took the then Minister for Lands (Mrs Craig) to see the area to establish what could be done to have it cleaned up. There had been conflict between the Lands Department and the shire as to whose responsibility it was to tidy up the area. No doubt Mrs Craig has been pleased to make the announcement that the development is to go ahead and the area is to become a major recreational area.

One of the more humane aspects of the problem is the attitude taken by the Government with respect to the people who are presently squatting in the area. The Minister has said she intends that some of the leasehold area will be made available to these people; they will be given

the chance to apply for some of the leasehold land to rebuild their accommodation—something reasonably priced.

About the same time, we were greeted with the good news that the quarantine station was being made available by the Federal Government for a very reasonable sum of money, thus giving us more recreational space at Cockburn Sound. This shows very clearly that the State Government is committed to providing adequate coastal recreational areas. I know the Government has been criticised on occasions—unfairly—for its lack of action in this respect, but these two announcements coming within a week or two of each other give the lie to that criticism.

Other matters of concern to me will be better dealt with if left till the next session of Parliament. I support the motion.

THE HON. GRACE VAUGHAN (South-East Metropolitan) [3.19 p.m.]: I would like to make a contribution to the debate on the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech. I hope my contribution will contain matters of more importance than those contained in the speech we have just heard, which I think exceeded all others I have heard in this House for pettiness and petulance. To bring in a matter of personal endeavour in the community—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are getting very hard to hear.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Leader of the House is getting hard of hearing; it is a sign of old age. Perhaps it is because I am saying things he does not want to hear.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are mumbling to yourself.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not keen to have this House known in the community for petulant speeches such as the one just made. I refer to the initial part of Mr Pratt's speech and not the part concerning town planning at Armadale.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: I was talking about one of your members.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Yes, I am aware of that but as usual Mr Pratt did not mention any names.

The Hon. I. G. Pratt: Did not Mr Cooley name them?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Mr Pratt did not name them. I hope to get onto something a little more important and something which affects the Government and the people of Western Australia, rather than speak about petty little personal interests.

One of my pet interests, and one which I probably acquired at a very early age, is a great interest in the force of peace in this world. I am concerned that Australia, having been one of the proponents of the Indian Ocean Conference for a zone of peace has done very little to help advance that cause of peace by being so lyrical in its welcome—through the Federal and State Governments and through *The West Australian* newspaper—to the United States submarine *Tunny* when it arrived in this State. It was a nuclear-powered submarine, and its arrival brought into focus the whole matter of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, which was first proposed in 1971 in the United Nations Assembly. By an overwhelming majority, usually around the 100 mark to an opposition of nil, with some abstentions, it has been reaffirmed each year since 1971.

One of the proposals was that an *ad hoc* committee be set up in 1971, and Australia was a member of that committee which comprised 15 of the countries bordering the Indian Ocean. That committee reported each year to the United Nations Assembly as to the progress of its deliberations, and its proposals with regard to how the zone of peace could be effected eventually.

One proposal was that there would be a conference of all those nations, including the great powers, which could, in fact, bring into effect a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. The proposal which I intend to put forward, and in which I hope the Government will take some interest, is that the conference which has not yet been held despite the fact that the committee was set up in 1971 should be held in Perth.

Although the *ad hoc* committee has repeatedly reported to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and it has always been congratulated on its progress and exhorted to go further with its goal of effecting a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, the conference has never been held. It would seem to me that Western Australia's isolation which is one of our greatest worries—whether it comes to the matter of academics taking study leave because of our remoteness or isolation—calls for some action on the part of the Western Australian Government despite the fact that defence, of course, is a matter of Federal interest. I believe we should make some effort, with regard to the *ad hoc* committee proposal to the United Nations General Assembly for a conference, to have that conference held in Perth. That would be a great way to mark our 150th anniversary and it would show we were taking some positive steps towards

bringing to a reality the goal of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The only words I was able to hear were, "Indian Ocean". You do not happen to be talking about the Indian Ocean Study Conference, do you? As I said earlier, we can hardly hear you over here. We will be able to read your speech later, but if you are talking about the Indian Ocean Study Conference, one is due.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is probable the Leader of the House feels he has greater powers than most in being able to talk to others and listen to me at the same time, otherwise he would have heard what I was saying.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No, ask those members sitting behind me.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The Leader of the House was talking, so it is probable that the other members could not hear me over the top of his voice.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is one way out.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Anyone who claims he cannot hear me—

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You are better now; we can hear you.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: There is nothing wrong with my voice; I have a loud voice. Normally it is far too loud and I try to tone it down in case I offend the delicate ears of those listening.

However, if an important person like the Leader of the House has not heard I will repeat it. I said an *ad hoc* committee was set up in 1971 by the United Nations General Assembly to look into the matter of effecting a peace zone in the Indian Ocean.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: We are talking about different matters; there is no need to go on. An Indian Ocean Study Conference is due in Western Australia later this year. I thought you referred to that.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is not a United Nations conference?

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: No.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Well, this is a matter of peace in the Indian Ocean. The *ad hoc* committee proposed a conference, but the conference has been postponed for many years. Really, it has not been mooted except that each year the United Nations General Assembly has voted for the proposition that there should be such a conference organised by the *ad hoc* committee.

If the Western Australian Government could, in fact, hasten the convening of such a conference that would be a step towards peace in our 150th anniversary year.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The Indian Ocean as a peace zone was discussed in Delhi with representatives of this State and the other States, and it was attended by all Commonwealth countries. That was the theme of the conference.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That is very good. The conference about which I am speaking has been discussed each year. In the same way, the special session of the United Nations last year on disarmament again discussed a peace zone in the Indian Ocean. This is a matter of getting all the great powers, as well as those countries which border the Indian Ocean, to get together to propose a plan for peace in the future.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Yes, I attended that meeting. As a matter of fact, I was surprised to observe our great significance; our many miles of coastline along the Indian Ocean compared with the other countries that border the ocean.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Again, the isolation of Western Australia and its lack of population are very important factors.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The other countries did not seem to think we existed, except as a place to obtain cheap wheat and cheap products.

The Hon. D. W. Cooley: The Japanese knew we existed.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: What I want to speak about in regard to this zone of peace is a matter of urgency because of the imminent advent of the Trident class submarine of the United States Navy. The Trident submarine will carry two types of missiles. The first type will be capable of a range of 4 000 miles, and the second type will be capable of a range of 6 000 miles. Those distances are exactly the distance from east to west and from north to south of the Indian Ocean. The suggestion is that Cockburn Sound should be used as a United States base for these nuclear submarines, which are capable of long range firing, and are equipped with a sufficient number of warheads to enable each submarine to eliminate 408 cities. As the Editor of the *Saturday Review* has said, next to the President of the United States of America and the Secretary of the USSR, the commander of a Trident submarine will be the third most powerful man in the world.

A Trident submarine commander is the third most powerful man in the world because of the number of missiles that each submarine can carry, the number of warheads on board, and

each warhead being capable of being sent to a different target, each within a 300-foot margin of error, and in fact 17 of them will be absolutely zero error because they will have manoeuvring warhead vehicles attached.

This means, that if the Trident submarine were introduced into Western Australia as a first strike weapon, Cockburn Sound and Perth would become a prime target for any power opposed to the United States.

There appears to be, as with nuclear reactors and nuclear power, an attitude—expressed so well by Professor George Wald, a Nobel prize winner, when speaking at Hiroshima on how the men who run our lives think—that the bigger the contract the better. Of course, the Trident is a very big contract indeed.

The first missile is due to be operational at the end of this year or early 1980, and the second missile is due to be operational in 1985. So there is a great need for urgency to show that Australia—and perhaps Western Australia could promote this to the Federal Government—is concerned and wants to do all it can to promote a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

We find that the Premier and others can, in fact, face up to members of the Federal Cabinet when it comes to matters of trade. Surely, when it comes to a matter of our very survival, the leaders of the Government in Western Australia should be making some representation to the Federal Government to ensure that the Cockburn Sound base is not put into a position where it will be a first strike target.

I would like to refer people to some of the publications put out by the United Nations General Assembly on the zones of peace around the world. One paper was published on the 6th October, 1977, and it shows the history of the peace zones. Another publication is the result of the proceedings at the special session of the United Nations on disarmament last year. This matter always comes up late in the year, around December, and if by that time our United Nations representatives could have prevailed upon the *ad hoc* committee and upon the United Nations Secretary General to hold a conference in Perth relating to peace in the Indian Ocean that would, indeed, be a great achievement for this Government.

This leads me to a matter of concern to us, and one which was the subject of an amendment moved by the Hon. Lyla Elliott, an amendment which, predictably, was defeated. On the anti-nuclear proposition that the Opposition reiterates time and time again, the argument put up by the

Leader of the House is that the nuclear industry will produce jobs, and it would be awful if we did not export uranium to the third world countries so that all the people there could have power.

This is a nonsensical argument, because our State Government would be much more likely to applaud the colonial attitude of exploitation taken to the third world since imperialism commenced in the 17th century. So, surely we should not swallow that argument without a pound of salt. If we are so sorry for the people living in the third world countries that we feel we have to mine our uranium, why the hell do we not give it to them? That is what we should do if we are to countenance the story put forward by the Government. Perhaps the people putting forward this argument would like to have a daily dose of the fallout that could occur!

Surely the accidents occurring in the United States at the present time ought to convince people of the dangers of the nuclear industry. It is not just a matter of back-up and safety systems. It is a matter of a combination of weaknesses. We can have weaknesses in human behaviour, in metal, and in design, and of course we know that making a quick quid is the important thing in America. It has been reliably reported that the Three Mile Island station at Harrisburg was completed very quickly in order to return, as it were, a tax yield.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: That is a great old cover-up that, "reliably reported". In the capitalist Press, I suppose, the *Tribune*.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Not in the *Tribune*, but in *Time* and *The Australian Financial Review*. That is the true capitalistic, free-enterprise oriented Press.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It has probably been unreliably reported.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Unlike the Leader of the House, occasionally I give credit where it is due.

It was amusing, but rather sad, to hear the Hon. Neil Oliver the other day give us a classic example of a Freudian slip when he said, in this House, that he was disturbed about a growth of democracy in this country. Unfortunately *Hansard* did not pick it up, or permitted him to retreat gracefully.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: Oh, fair go, Grace, you know that was a slip of the tongue!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I immediately interjected and told him that was one thing I thought he would be concerned about. He went on

to say he was disturbed about a growth of bureaucracy.

These Freudian slips are made quite often by people who are putting up a pretence of conforming with society's expectations. They have a repressed desire to renounce such expectations. That was what Mr Oliver was doing with his Freudian slip.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: It is clear from your remarks that you associate yourself with the undergraduates who are now running the Labor Party.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I was rather amazed to notice in *The West Australian* the following morning a rather amusing headline which was not exactly a Freudian slip, but it was something similar, in which the Minister for Conservation and the Environment (Mr O'Connor) was answering Dr Peter Brotherton of the Environmental Centre who had complained about the lack of facility for public participation in the Cockburn Sound investigation. The headline in *The West Australian* was "O'Connor Rejects Sound Criticism". I thought that was very amusing, because that was what he was doing all the time.

I refer to a matter about which I am concerned. I am not concerned with the growth of bureaucracy, because bureaucracy is a modern way of dealing with organisations and it is evident that such organisations—whether they be in the public sector or the private sector—are necessary for carrying out societal needs and they meet the exigencies of a modern, complex society. So, we cannot complain about the growth of bureaucracy. Perhaps we can complain about the people who are put into wrong holes, slots, and jobs in a democracy. That is what goes to produce it; not bureaucracy itself.

We must remember that bureaucracy is a style of organised living, rather than a group of people who are out to annoy us—which many people interpret the meaning of "bureaucracy" to be. I am not concerned with that; neither am I concerned, as Mr Oliver said in his Freudian slip, with the growth of democracy. However, I am extremely concerned with the decline in participatory democracy. This decline in participatory democracy, which can be more widely interpreted as declining democracy, has probably been brought about by what in itself is a good thing; that is, the emergence of the two-party Westminster system, or rather the exaggeration of the two-party system within the Westminster system.

This has led to too much reliance on representative democracy in which the people feel themselves as being powerless, and simply cast a vote every three or five years, depending on the type of Parliament, in order that they will be represented. They lose touch. Quite often they see this as being democracy; that is, simply by putting a ballot paper into the ballot box. It is not good enough to regard that as democracy.

In the first place, there is a weakness in the predominantly two-party system in the type of people we choose as representatives. We may not all agree with Professor. Oliphant's statement concerning mediocrity and low standards of the people who represent Australians in Parliament, or that academics would make better Ministers.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.05 p.m.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Prior to the suspension of the sitting for afternoon tea, I was expressing my concern at the decline in democracy, and how circumstances had led to a feeling of powerlessness among the electorate, and saying that it may be necessary artificially to bring about a resurgence of interest by the people in the governing of their country in order that they may truly be called democrats.

I was saying that this decline in democracy perhaps has arisen because the electorate has relinquished its democratic right of rule by the people, by relying too heavily upon its representatives in a time when Cabinet Government is in full swing.

By "Cabinet Government" I mean that phenomenon which has been introduced in this century and which has increased as the century has progressed, where governing is done by Ministers who have become cabinets under Prime Ministers or Premiers who have demonstrated their ability to form Governments.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you think democracy has failed? Is there a better alternative, or does democracy need patching up? What is your theme here?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: My theme is that democracy does not need patching up but perhaps needs to be revived.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Would it still be the best system in the world after it was revived?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Yes, I think it would. When I say "revived" I mean democracy itself needs reviving, not necessarily that it should be a version of the democracy we have seen in the past. Perhaps we need something new in the way of participatory democracy, in which the people have vehicles by which they can truly be said to

be taking part in the decision-making processes in our society.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I thought that was our basic idea.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is our idea and our ideal, but it is not happening.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: The complaint is that it is not happening.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We hear more of our representatives in Parliament saying, "Do not stir the people up" or, "Fancy them demonstrating on the streets" or, "What a pain in the neck it is that they have sent so many deputations or requested us to ask so many questions in Parliament" than we hear of those same people rejoicing in the fact that people are actually taking part in the decision-making process.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: When did this actually happen? When do you think we left democracy behind?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I think, probably, it has been a matter of the "privatisation" of the individuals or individual families within our society, where once there was much more reliance on one another, whether it was in the work place, in community organisations or in the neighbourhood; people had to rely more on one another in order to get tasks performed and things done.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: But there was less communication in those days. How could it be better?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That is right; Mr Gayfer has touched on a very important point. He has often reiterated in this House, and personally to me, the camaraderie, self-help and mutual help which exist in country areas, where communications are not as good as they are in the metropolitan area, and where the proximity of one family to another is not as close. So, it is not a matter of physical distance from one another but of one's philosophic attitude to life.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: Does not the ballot box have anything to do with this process?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Certainly it does.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: But not much, apparently.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: What I am saying is that people are inclined to regard the ballot box as their excuse for saying they are democrats, rather than participating in the decision-making process in between elections and

participating through both community organisations and their own personal efforts.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: And we should use street marches as an instrument of Government?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That is just one of the examples I quoted, simply because we more often hear people in a tirade against demonstrators and in a criticism of those who are questioning established ways of doing things, and who perhaps are prodding their representatives to do the things which they think ought to be done to make a better society, than we hear them encouraging others to take part in making decisions.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: What you mean is that we need more individuals, and individual will, rather than a grouping of society.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: No, I think it would be truer to say that individualism has helped to create the idea that each person must stand on his feet—or must fall on his feet, which happens more often than standing. Perhaps "collectivism" is a better way of describing what I see happening. It is very difficult to grasp the concept of the individual in society. I do not expect Mr Oliver will grasp it immediately but I will give him some private tuition if he so desires.

The idea of the individual in society is that without a society there would be no individuals, and without the individuals there would be no society. We must understand that man is human only because he is in society and joins with his fellow men in performing tasks.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Then is it not incredible to find the number of achievements in our lifetime by individuals in solitude? Some of the great scientific discoveries have been made in this way.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Nobody has ever done anything in solitude, except to go off his rocker.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: You must have been alone for a long time!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Many experiments have been conducted both in controlled circumstances and in real life to test the ability of man to live in solitude. The memoirs of Sir Francis Chichester are a good example. He revealed how close he came to losing his reason due to the lack of stimulation of other people. He hallucinated and despaired and became despondent. This phenomenon has been demonstrated frequently both in naturally-occurring pieces of research and in experiments conducted to establish just how much human

beings can prosper or even survive without the stimulation of other people.

The Hon. O. N. B. Oliver: Solitude did not affect Madam Curie, Einstein, Bach, or Brahms.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not talking about people working on their own. If Joan Sutherland gets up to sing, she does not need a choir standing around to help her. However, she did need to be taught how to sing, and she does need an audience; she needs some stimulation in order to sing. Einstein certainly had the history of all the people who had made some progress in his particular field before he was able to produce those marvellous theories and inventions which, obviously, Mr Oliver must have seen in the recent television advertisements, otherwise he would not have known about them.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer interjected.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Mr Oliver is stimulating me somewhat and I, like all other individuals in society, need stimulation.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Like gut in an oyster!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Worthy as the Westminster system is, there have been those who say we should combine it with the American system of having a hierarchy of executive separate from the representative legislature. Of course, the judicature is separate in the same way as in the Westminster system.

We saw today how the Government of a State operates—"the Government" not "a Government", because there is a fine distinction there—and how the Premier or Prime Minister finds he can form "a Government". But the Government of a State—and there is a telling distinction between them—must take into account the three arms of government. We saw that this morning in *The West Australian* where the President of the Queensland Industrial Court rebuked the Premier for his statement about the judicature. Whereas there is an inclination of the people now running the Government—

The Hon. Neil McNeill: Do you mean the Premier of Queensland?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am referring to the Premier of Queensland. I do not believe our Premier would be foolish enough to do that. The Cabinet Government has evolved as a result of the Westminster system. We do not see a Cabinet Government in the United States where there is a very different system of government, although it is similar to our own western style of democratic government. So, the Cabinet sees itself as governing in its own right. I believe it has

even been said in this State that the people, who are not Ministers but who belong to the party of the coalition which gave the strength to the Premier to form a Government, are not seen as Government members but rather as Government supporters. That has been admitted, or at least hinted at by the Premier of Western Australia.

It is not a phenomenon peculiar to the Premier of this State. It is something which has happened as a result of elitism or confidence, if members like, which a Cabinet now has. It has the numbers and, therefore, the decisions made in Cabinet will prevail.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: So far your argument is inconclusive. It does not illustrate the part played by the party and the members of both Houses; but you may be getting to that point.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We have seen this operating in this House. We tease one another and chide one another about slavishly following party policies. However, this in fact is what we do and the two-and-a-bit party system would not work if we did not do this. I extend my apologies to Mr Gayfer.

By divorcing the cabinet from the rest of Parliament we have achieved a situation where the pressures that people outside Parliament can bring to bear on their parliamentary representatives are not as telling as they would have been in 19th century Westminster systems, or are at the moment in the American system—where each member of the Congress sees himself or herself as an individual representative capable of voting without adhering strictly to party lines.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You are proposing the same system favoured by Edmund Burke.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not proposing that now. I am saying this happened in the 19th century. Edmund Burke's theoretical system was a practical one and it worked; but in this century and in the future there is less and less likelihood of the individual representative having a great deal of influence in the House. This is not to say that that influence cannot be exerted in the party room; but if one wants to have an influence it must be exerted before a decision is made in the party room. In fact, on matters of great importance it may be that the decision has to be made at the party conference in order that it can be interpreted in the party room in a way that does not compete with party policy.

People who still wish to influence the Government are finding they have to go either to the Cabinet or to the parties themselves. On occasions the influence has to be exerted when the

policy is decided at conference level. The reasons for this are, firstly, as I have outlined, that parliamentary representatives have lost their power to speak up in the House. Secondly, there has been a continued lowering of the prestige of the occupation of a politician or parliamentarian as a result of which, as mentioned by Sir Mark Oliphant, we are seeing a lower standard of person coming into Parliament. This is not to say that everybody in this House is not marvellous. I am not pointing my finger at any particular person in this House.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I did not agree with Sir Mark Oliphant. I take the view that the essence of quality is that it comes from a broad sweep of the community. You do not have to be an academic to be a member of Parliament.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I did not agree with that point made by Sir Mark Oliphant either. I am saying, however, that we are not drawing the candidates from a big enough pool to ensure that we obtain in Parliament a normal distribution of the different types of people in the community. That is, if we do not take members of Parliament from all strata of society, we do not obtain a representative group.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: We have departed from your WASPS of some years ago, have we not?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: There are not as many WASPS now, but we certainly do not have a representative system. We have far too many school teachers and too few women as members of Parliament. The range of ages of members of Parliament is not too bad, but it still is not good enough. Of course, we do not have adequate representation of the large number of people who were born overseas. One-third of the members of our population here were born overseas or their parents live overseas.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: There are a lot of English people in Parliament.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Perhaps there are too many. We do not have proper representation of the various types of people in the community.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: We have a female Minister.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We do have a female Minister, and that is very good.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: The first in Australia?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: But we do not have adequate representation of non-English speaking migrants.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: We have in local government.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: We do in local government and that is correct; but local government is not as influential as I personally would like to see it. It does not have as much power as I would like it to have. I know we will not get rid of State Governments now, because they are so well established; but I believe it was a mistake to set up State Governments in the first place. We should have had regional Governments.

The Hon. J. C. Tozer: State Governments were there in the first place.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: State Governments were founded in capital cities, but we formed States only by drawing straight lines. The only two States in Australia with natural boundaries are Victoria and Tasmania. It was really only a cartographer who extended out from the capital cities in each of the colonies and said, "This will be the State."

I am, however, deviating from my main point which relates to democracy and how we can restore democracy in our State so that we can show the rest of Australia what to do. The powerlessness of the electorate is very debilitating. It does not allow new ideas to come up from the grass roots. It does not allow the parliamentary representatives to be prodded frequently enough. Many times the prodding levelled at parliamentarians comes from people who are sophisticated in this sort of behaviour. Therefore, we are more likely to have that small section of the community continually having an influence on the parliamentary representatives, rather than all the people feeling they have the power to influence the decision-making and the way in which they are governed.

I believe the choice of candidates is an extremely important matter to be considered. It is a factor which can lead to the raising or lowering of the standard about which Sir Mark Oliphant spoke. I did not agree with everything he said and I did not read the whole text of his speech. I did, however, read the report in *The West Australian* yesterday morning where he said that just because a person was a businessman it did not necessarily follow that he would make a good Minister. That is a very true statement.

Just because a person is a geologist, it does not mean he will make a good Minister for Mines. Sir Mark's argument could have been countered very easily by saying that just because a person is a businessman it does not necessarily follow that he will not make a good Minister, or that just because a person is a geologist it does not necessarily mean he will not make a good Minister for Community Welfare, perhaps.

We should give the electorate a feeling of power. First of all, we must restore the confidence of the people in their elected representatives. Although there are some variations in the way candidates for Parliament are endorsed, they are roughly similar.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: I did not hear that.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: There are variations in the endorsements—in the way politicians are endorsed—but, nevertheless, there are enough similarities to say that all parties could begin to look at the type of people they are attracting. This, of course, has a great deal to do with salaries. In some cases one can say parliamentarians are well and truly overpaid and that a number of them could not earn outside Parliament the amount of money they earn as members. On the other hand, many people are discouraged from entering Parliament, because they would suffer a great drop in salary or income. It is not just a question of money. It is a question of prestige, because despite the trends in our materialistic society I do not believe the majority of people, who are privileged to choose the type of work they will undertake, do so on the grounds of the size of the pay packet or the amount of income they will receive if privately employed.

I believe people want to feel they are making a contribution to society, and that they are doing the job they can perform best. If all political parties looked at the ways in which they could encourage the very best people to come into Parliament, I believe we would have a much more satisfactory system.

I do not mean by that the very best businessmen or academically educated people, or even the most highly motivated people or those who are regarded as being the best organisers. Rather, I am referring to the best people we can get who come into the pool from which they are chosen. In that case we would have the opportunity of obtaining the cream of society, whether we get the very best trade unionists, the very best businessmen, the very best doctors, the very best Anglicans, the very best mothers, or anything else.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you think that is what Parliament was designed for—to be the forum of the very best brains in the country?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: That is right.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: A constitution was worked out to do that. It is known as "fascism". I am being serious. The fascist constitution aims at that.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: I think you are over-simplifying it.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: My soft line has been attacked immediately by the Leader of the House who says what I am advocating could be interpreted as fascism. I referred earlier to Freudian slips. This is a very good example of a psychological defence mechanism called "reaction formation". It is very interesting.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: The sort of horizontal structure you talk about finished up leading to Mussolini accidentally.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is interesting that the Leader of the House is so sensitive about anything that may be construed as criticism. Because I am beginning to say that we should have better people in Parliament—I do not mean they must be technocrats—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: But they would be elitists.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: No. That is a different thing.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It is not.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Elitism is a situation where a group of people entrench themselves into an organisation and do not allow any others to come in unless the organisation is threatened either by its own incompetence or by outside influences in which case the elitists have to allow others to come in.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You have proposed something from which you cannot escape. You had better read *Hansard* again later.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I have been saying I am not seeking to get the very best Pommie migrant here. I am satisfied with the one we have, because he represents very well those in his own province and those outside it. I will flatter him now, because I have often thrown him a few insults by way of interjection. However, he is typical of the energetic, community-involved young man—he is younger than I am, so I can say he is a young man—who brought a new dimension into the Australian scene community-wise and politically.

The Hon. G. E. Masters: We will have a little chat afterwards.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not arguing whether or not Mr Gayfer is a good representative of farming. Probably we could find a representative, perhaps not more handsome, but wiser and—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: But under your system Chifley and Curtin would never have got a berth.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Absolute nonsense!

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They would not have. They would not have had the ability to be members.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: What I am saying is that we should have a large pool from which to draw. I have been to Shark Bay to do some fishing. When I am at Rottnest I am very satisfied when I catch a herring which is about 10 inches long, but when at Shark Bay it is necessary for a fisherman to throw back a mackerel if it is under 45 lbs., and if a fisherman catches a snapper which is under 2 lbs. he must watch out for the fishing inspector. It made me mad to have to throw back fish which were longer than 10 inches or weighed more than 2 lbs. However the situation is relative to the waters in which one is fishing.

Therefore, if we have only a few people offering for endorsement as members of Parliament then we will get only the small fish. We might be lucky enough to get one stray like Mr Lewis, for instance. We could fish all over the world and we would not get another fish like him!

My point is that to obtain the very best people we must have a bigger pool from which to draw.

The Hon. A. A. Lewis: You are back on that subject again, are you?

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you think we must be a brains trust?

Several members interjected.

THE PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Even the President would not be here.

The Hon. D. K. Dans: We would have only the *Hansard* reporters and the Clerks!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If we could encourage candidates to realise that the electorate behind them is concerned about the decisions they make we may begin to return to some sort of real democracy—

The Hon. R. G. Pike: You are a female chauvinist.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: —instead of having the Cabinet Government under which we exist and which is deleterious to the democratic concept. I believe we can do this. We make our own systems, and we can unmake them and remake them. The systems under which we operate do not just occur. They exist because of deliberate attempts on the part of people. I am

not suggesting it is a conspiracy. I am saying that a certain section of society does its best to create systems which will work but those systems can conflict with what someone in some other section is doing. The systems join together to make the whole social and political system and this can often turn out to be deleterious to the motives of all people who are working in the separate systems.

We must look at the overall situation and change the fragmentation which exists at present.

Cabinet Government, combined with the Westminster system, is responsible for the creation of a system in which people feel powerless and so we do not have as many people as we should have offering for parliamentary pre-selection. Unless we can get people at the one time to offer themselves as candidates—

The Hon. R. G. Pike: There were plenty for Fremantle last time, weren't there?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Some were dummies! At the same time we must get people interested enough to realise politics does not just concern the governing of a State. Politics exists in the very smallest of our community organisations.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you think we should start in the schools and educate the children politically?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: No. We do not need to educate the children in politics when they are at school. We know that people can sort themselves out in a group and that people have influence; that is what politics is all about. It concerns the seeking of power to influence the allocation of resources. That is the situation throughout society even in a parents and citizens' association meeting when people are trying to decide how they are going to spend the money raised at the local fete. They must decide whether to use it to improve the canteen, buy uniforms for underprivileged children, organise a trip away to a sister school in some other city, or for some other purpose. The allocation of those resources according to power is a very real thing and this applies right throughout society. Politics is not a matter of which party one belongs to.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Don't be put off. Some parts of your speech are the best I have ever heard from you!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Particularly the part about the Pommie shop steward?

The Hon. G. E. Masters: Yes!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Our aim ought to be something a little more than the mediocre and rather slow approach we have to Parliament at the moment. There is a much more exciting way to carry out our occupation as parliamentarians. There is a much more ambitious way to motivate people in our community so that they become involved.

One of the greatest problems parliamentarians have is that of survival and, as members know, I am very conscious of this at the moment. To survive, quite often we must do those things which really bore us stiff. I refer to it as the baby-kissing syndrome. It is the humdrum procedure which must be followed despite the fact that we know that those involved are already politically aware—

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If you have ability and education behind you, why do they throw you out? If you are the best of your kind, and I believe you could be, why would they throw you out?

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If I had a reasonably small electorate, population-wise, I am sure I would be able to obtain enough personal following to make a great difference. That is something I should point out to Mr Gayfer, because in this regard he has a great advantage. It is possible for him to become acquainted with a great percentage of his electorate. I know all about his problems of distance and travel.

The Hon. R. G. Pike: But that is the very reverse of the argument submitted by those on your side.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The fact that we work under the Westminster system and that the two-party system has developed means that for the—

An Opposition member: Two and a half!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN:—most part people vote according to their political socialisation; that is, they vote Labor or Liberal, or maybe National Country Party.

The Hon. T. Knight: But does that not happen in your own electorate? You were elected and so was the Honourable Clive Griffiths.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The personal following the President was able to obtain was quite phenomenal.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It is what tipped the scales in the last few elections—not the last one—in which daylight was second.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: It would not have mattered last time had he changed from the benevolent gentleman he is into some sort of horrible tyrant, because he would still have been the winner as most people vote according to party and not according to person. A small percentage vote according to person. I hope that a large percentage will vote for the female candidates, because in that case I shall be all right.

The Hon. H. W. Gayfer: You say they should not do that.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: I am not making a value judgment about this.

Several members interjected.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If we can accept that the Westminster system has produced the 2½-party system—

The Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Two and three-quarters.

The Hon. R. Hetherington: Two and two bits.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: If we could just accept that as having occurred we could then make it our goal to ensure that people in the electorate are made more aware of the power they possess. At the moment they retreat to their own quarter-acre blocks—their own private world—where they have all the influences of television, radio, movies, and the Press, but they in turn do not communicate. They become very cut off, blocked, and rusty because of a lack of use.

The Hon. T. Knight: The point is that they see everything through all the media, but until it affects them individually they stay in their small environment.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: The very point I am making is the one just made by Mr Knight. He pointed out that, because of the information which is available to people, they are not prone to go looking for further information and exchanging knowledge. It is not until something hits them hard that they realise exchanges must be made. Then they find they are powerless to do anything, because they have not built up that network within the community on which they can rely in times of crisis or perplexity.

This brings me to how such a network can be effected within the community. I think the

Executive arm of government—that is, the Ministers controlling the Public Service—could make a great difference to the involvement of people and the feeling of power and influence in the community which they should have as members of a democracy. They should feel they have a say in government, even though as a matter of practicality they need to have a representative in here to speak for them. Nevertheless, they should still have the feeling that if they do not like the way they are being represented, or if the Government which was elected perhaps takes too much for granted or imagines it has a mandate, they can do something about it.

A very bad fault which has developed—and I am not saying it is peculiar to conservative Governments—is that, having said certain things in an election speech and having been voted into office, a Government then considers it has a mandate to go ahead and do all the things it spoke about in its election speech. If through the Executive arm of government we can assist the ordinary members of the public, we will be going a great way towards restoring their confidence in their power to change things and influence the decisions which are being made.

Perhaps the experience in regard to divorce in the Supreme Court before the Family Court was introduced gives a very good example. When people first went to the Supreme Court to conduct their own undefended divorces, the clerks simply told them, "You will have to see a lawyer. We can't do anything about this"; whereas the Act stated very clearly what could be done and the manner in which people could act as their own legal advocates in obtaining a divorce.

Just before divorce jurisdiction was handed over to the Family Court, the Supreme Court officers became very helpful, and that helpfulness has been transferred from the Supreme Court to the Family Court. The clerks of the court are actively helping people and being very considerate, whereas previously they, like others in the community, had been conditioned to think the lawyer or the Government did things for the people and they could not be involved. In many other instances we find that through persistence—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Again I ask members to refrain from constant audible conversation in the House while a member is speaking. It is out of order and rude. The Hon. Grace Vaughan.

The Hon. GRACE VAUGHAN: Thank you, Mr President. We should have a larger pool of candidates from which to choose, thus increasing

the possibility of having better candidates. We might end up with the same candidates but, unless plenty of candidates are offering so that people can have confidence that they have chosen a good candidate, we will not have a proper democracy in which people can participate. When the people have proper knowledge of their rights, through information supplied by the Press, the courts, and the Public Service, perhaps we will be able to say we have a true participatory democracy in our modern complex society.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. J. C. Tozer.

SUPPLY BILL

Receipt and First Reading

Bill received from the Assembly; and, on motion by the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon (Leader of the House), read a first time.

Second Reading

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West—Leader of the House) [4.51 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The reasons for a Supply Bill at this time of the session were explained last year when we broke with past practice to give effect to the legal advice we had received.

This measure seeks the grant of supply to Her Majesty of \$820 million for the works and services of the year ending the 30th June, 1980, pending the passage of Appropriation Bills in the next sitting of Parliament.

An issue of \$720 million is sought from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and \$75 million from moneys to the credit of the General Loan Fund. Provision is also made in the Bill for an issue of \$25 million to enable the Treasurer to make such temporary advances as may be necessary.

The amounts have been based on needs and estimated costs of maintaining the existing level of services and no provision has been made for new policy decisions which must await the introduction of the Budget.

As members are aware, the 1978-79 Budget was the fourth consecutive balanced Budget with both revenue and expenditure estimated at \$1 451 million.

Present indications are that revenue will not reach this level primarily because of a subdued level in some areas of economic activity during the year.

Fortunately, expenditure is also running at levels slightly less than forecast in the Budget. This is, in part, due to wage and salary increases being less than anticipated and the rigorous expenditure controls that have been applied throughout the year. In line with what the Treasurer said in his Budget speech, a strict surveillance is being kept on any application for expenditure to exceed allocations.

At this stage, the Government is hopeful that it will achieve its aim of keeping revenue and expenditure in balance.

At this time last year an undertaking was given to members to circulate a summary of the financial transactions as soon as possible after the close of the financial year in order that they may be kept fully informed.

A similar undertaking in respect of 1978-79 is now given.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Members are aware that the House agreed to a suspension of Standing Orders which allowed a Bill contained in a message to this House to be dealt with and passed in one sitting, and that procedure would have enabled the Bill before us to be completed today. I have conferred with the Leader of the Opposition and we have agreed we should leave this Bill over until Tuesday. I therefore expect a request for the adjournment of the debate until that time, and I would be agreeable to it.

Nevertheless, it is expected that further adjournment of debate on this Bill would not be requested on Tuesday, and that we could, in fact, pass the Supply Bill on Tuesday in accordance with the suspension of Standing Orders which was agreed to.

We have the situation that the Address-in-Reply debate is currently proceeding, in which traditionally members have the opportunity to make general comments. Members have the opportunity to make those comments almost side by side with their general comments on the Supply Bill. Therefore, it appears no hardship will be occasioned by the passage of this Bill through the House on Tuesday, and hopefully we will be able to achieve that.

Debate adjourned, on motion by the Hon. D. K. Duns (Leader of the Opposition).

House adjourned at 4.55 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

TRAFFIC: PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Crosswalk Attendants

75. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Police and Traffic:
- (1) What is the hourly rate of pay for persons employed on a casual basis as crosswalk attendants outside schools?
 - (2) From what industrial award is the rate taken, and what classification is used as the basis for payment?
 - (3) Does the casual rate include a loading for the non-payment of public holidays, annual and sick leave?
 - (4) If not, why not?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON replied:

- (1) \$3.55 per hour plus 60c per week laundry plus 11.9c per kilometre mileage allowance.
- (2) The rate is not taken from any industrial award. It is based on the minimum wage and periodically reviewed.
- (3) Yes.
- (4) Not applicable.

RECREATION: FOOTBALL

Anzac Day

76. The Hon. T. McNEIL, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Recreation:
- (1) Would the Minister advise the last occasion on which a league football match was played on Anzac Day?
 - (2) For what reason was the policy of playing a match on Anzac Day not followed this year?
 - (3) Does the Minister know if it is the intention of the Western Australian National Football League to arrange for matches to be played on Anzac Day in the future?
 - (4) If not, would he ascertain the intention of the League in this regard?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) Anzac Day Holiday, Monday, the 26th April, 1976.
- (2) Sporting activities may not commence before 1.00 p.m. which causes time-table problems; other football commitments such as NFL have to be considered.
- (3) and (4) The Western Australian National Football League has no policy on football matches being conducted on Anzac Day. Fixtures vary and are drawn up annually according to changing circumstances.

TRANSPORT: BUS

MTT: General Administration Expenditure

77. The Hon. F. E. McKENZIE, to the Minister for Lands representing the Minister for Transport:

Referring to question No. 55 on Tuesday, the 24th April, 1979, concerning General Administration Expenditure (Rail)—

- (1) (a) Has the 15 per cent loading always applied; or
(b) has the percentage been varied from time to time?
- (2) If there has been any variation from time to time, will he detail the variations and the dates on which they took place?

The Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH replied:

- (1) (a) No.
(b) Yes. In the first year only—1974-75—in which it was necessary to allocate suburban passenger train costs to the MTT, General Administration costs were apportioned between suburban and other services in proportion to their identified direct costs.
Since then the "15 per cent" allocation has applied.
- (2) Answered by (1) (b).