

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 17 October 1984

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage, during which the President advised members that this would be the last time this session that oral answers would be given to questions on notice.

BILLS (3): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Machinery Safety Amendment Bill.
2. Construction Safety Amendment Bill.
Bills introduced, on motions by Hon. D. K. Dans (Minister for Industrial Relations), and read a first time.
3. Lotteries (Control) Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Minister for Administrative Services), and read a first time.

ACTS AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS) BILL (No. 2)

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. D. K. Dans (Minister for Industrial Relations), and transmitted to the Assembly.

ACTS AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (DISQUALIFICATION FOR PARLIAMENT) BILL

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) in the Chair; Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1: Short title—

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I take this opportunity to indicate to the Chamber that when the Bill is promulgated after it has passed through the Parliament, as I believe it will, I should like the Government to provide a booklet to prospective members and present members of Parliament so that they might have a ready reference which will indicate the disabilities or protections provided by this legislation. The position has been clouded in the past, but will now be clarified in many respects thanks to this measure. It would be most helpful if such a booklet were available.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I am happy to take that suggestion on board. It is attractive and I will

refer it for the attention of the Minister for Parliamentary and Electoral Reform.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 7 amended—

Hon. V. J. FERRY: Here again I take the opportunity to highlight the nature of the legislation before the Chamber. Section 7(1) of the Act provides that the Auditor-General is incapable of being a member of Parliament. This is now to be deleted. I think this is a worthwhile and monumental piece of legislation to clearly define a number of areas relating to the Parliament and to those officers of Government, or of the Public Service, who would qualify or otherwise, for a position in Parliament.

I re-emphasise the worthy content of this legislation.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5 put and passed.

Clause 6: Sections 16 and 17 repealed—

Hon. V. J. FERRY: This clause repeals sections 16 and 17 of the Constitution Act and a little later on the legislation spells out the conditions by which members of Parliament may nominate for a seat in either Parliament.

Here again, a qualification will follow later in the Bill, setting out that one member of a Chamber cannot be a member of the other Chamber and a member of Parliament in one Parliament in Australia cannot be a member of another Parliament in the same country.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 put and passed.

Clause 10: Existing section 32 repealed; sections 33 to 37 substituted—

Hon. V. J. FERRY: During my contribution at the second reading debate, I referred to the fact that it was my belief that justices of the peace should not be permitted to preside in a court. I take the view that maybe there needs to be some explicit provision in this Bill to ensure that that privilege should not continue.

I do not believe that the judiciary can be mixed with parliamentary work and with that in mind I placed an amendment on the Notice Paper, hoping to achieve that aim.

I have subsequently had some legal advice, which I appreciate, and which indicated that perhaps my amendment does not really do what I thought. I am further advised that perhaps the Bill does already contain sufficient safeguards and provisions to disbar members of Parliament, who are JPs, from sitting on the bench. If that is the

case, I will not proceed with my amendment. However, I would appreciate some comment from the Attorney General.

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: A couple of weeks ago I did provide some advice to Mr Ferry, based on information from Parliamentary Counsel. I do not know whether that is the only legal advice that Mr Ferry has had, but if it is, I think it only fair to say that he appears to have read more into what Parliamentary Counsel was saying than was actually said.

As I understand the position, there is nothing in the Bill, as presented to this Chamber, which would prevent a justice of the peace who was also a member of Parliament from sitting on the bench. I believe that there is a lot to be said against the amendment that Mr Ferry foreshadowed, but I do not debate that now as this amendment is not before the Chamber. In fairness though, I think it is important to indicate to the member that he may have read too much into the comments of Parliamentary Counsel.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I appreciate the advice given to me through the Attorney General. I have discussed this matter in other quarters as well. It is my understanding that there is some doubt in this regard, but the doubt seemed to linger on the side of perhaps preventing a member of Parliament sitting on the bench. That may be found to be wanting when the case is to be decided in the future.

I will be content at this stage to register my concern and belief that justices of the peace, who happen to be members of Parliament, should not engage in bench work at any stage. I think that would be quite undesirable in a community where a justice of the peace, who is a member of Parliament, has to carry out duties other than witnessing obligations in regard to declarations, affidavits, or whatever. I believe that is contrary to my belief as to the duties of a member of Parliament.

I do hold strong views that members of Parliament who are justices of the peace should not sit in a court.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11 to 15 put and passed.

Clause 16: Section 67 amended—

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I move an amendment—

Page 28—Delete paragraph (c) and substitute the following—

(c) in subsection (4)—

(i) by deleting 'and' at the end of paragraph (a) and substituting a colon;

(ii) by deleting paragraph (b);

(iii) by inserting after 'Provided that' the following—

" , subject to section 39(4) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act 1899, "; and

(iv) by deleting 'or appointment published'.

As members will have noted from the explanatory memorandum, clause 16 is complementary to the proposed amendment to section 39(4) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act. The opportunity is taken by this amendment to get rid of one of those redundant and anachronistic provisions which have remained in the parent Act for some time.

I refer members, in this respect, to the fact that section 67(4)(b) of the Electoral Act of 1907 purports to deal with the occurrence of a vacancy in the seat of a member of Parliament arising by reason of the appointment of that member as a Minister of the Crown. That provision is a relic of the period prior to 1947 during which a person who was appointed to the position of Minister had to vacate his seat and stand for re-election. That has not been the case now for something over 30 years.

The opportunity has simply been taken to delete that old provision from the parent Act.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 17 to 20 put and passed.

Clause 21: Section 6 amended—

Hon. J. M. BERINSON: I move an amendment—

Page 31, lines 7 to 27—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute the following—

(b) by inserting after subsection (6) the following subsections—

(7) Where a member of Parliament (not being a Minister of the Crown, the holder of an office with the designation "Honorary Minister", or the Parliamentary Secretary of the Cabinet) travels in this State or elsewhere in order to perform any duty or function as a representative of the Government or of a Minister of the Crown—

(a) he is not entitled to have his fares for that travel paid by the State, or to receive reimbursement from the State in respect of those fares, unless that pay-

ment or reimbursement is made—

- (i) with the written approval of the Treasurer; or
- (ii) under arrangements made under section 11A (1);
- (b) he is not entitled to receive any remuneration from the State in respect of accommodation or other expenses incurred in the course of or in connection with that travel other than an allowance payable in accordance with a determination made by the Tribunal.

(8) Where a payment or reimbursement in respect of the fares of a member of Parliament is made with the approval of the Treasurer as referred to in subsection (7)(a)(i), no payment or reimbursement shall be made in respect of those fares under arrangements made under section 11A(1), but that payment or reimbursement shall not be regarded as being in satisfaction of any part of the entitlements of the member under those arrangements.

There has been such a tortuous procedure involved in reaching the stage of actually presenting this Bill to the Parliament that now we are at the point where it pays to take a little more care and, even at the cost of excessive caution, try to make sure that we get it right in all respects.

Clause 21, as originally submitted to the Chamber, posed two questions. The first related to proposed section 6(7)(b) of the Salaries and Allowances Act which requires that, if a member is to perform a service as representative of the Government or a Minister, he can receive remuneration only if authorised by the Governor. On second thoughts, that was seen to be rather too restrictive. Usually, a Minister or the Government looked to a backbencher for representation at some function, when it is found, at short notice, that the Minister or another Minister is unable to attend. It then becomes a matter, not simply of inconvenience, but of impracticability for a Minister to have to go to the Governor in order to ensure that the members' expenses will be eventually met.

The second question which arose related to the meaning of the word "remuneration". Surprisingly, there is very little authority on what remuneration amounts to. Questions were raised in some quarters, for example, as to whether it includes fares or the cost of accommodation. It was also asked whether the question of remuneration

arose where there was not a reimbursement of fares, but a direct payment of fares on behalf of a person travelling in that representative capacity. In an effort to overcome all those problems, this expanded form of clause 21 is proposed.

Fares are dealt with separately. Questions of accommodation costs are also dealt with separately. The amount available for reimbursement for accommodation is restricted to that amount provided by the Salaries and Allowances Tribunal. The provision is also made more flexible to the extent that it requires the Treasurer's approval rather than the Governor's. That is the purpose of this amendment. I believe that the amendment meets all of the intentions of the various bodies which looked at the provision in earlier days.

Hon. V. J. FERRY: I have examined the amendment proposed by the Attorney General. I have compared it carefully with the previous provision in the Bill and have found, quite frankly, that the amendment is far clearer than the original amendment. As the Attorney mentioned, there have been difficult areas in defining just what expenses should be paid and how. I believe that the amendment certainly tidies up some of the problems which members might have in their minds. The amendment is certainly clear in my mind and I support it.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 22 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

EXPLOSIVES AND DANGEROUS GOODS AMENDMENT BILL

Report

Report of Committee adopted.

ORD RIVER DAM CATCHMENT AREA (STRAYING CATTLE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 25 September.

HON. C. J. BELL (Lower West) [5.12 p.m.]: The Opposition supports this Bill. It seeks to amend the Act to ensure that certain deficiencies are overcome, and to allow the Government to take action with regard to stock straying in the regeneration areas and in the immediate vicinity of Lake Argyle.

On a recent trip to the area I saw a number of very large bullocks wandering out of the scrub into the area referred to. The amendments make good sense, not only for the preservation of the

environment around Lake Argyle, but also good economical sense.

If these animals are not wild they can be rounded up and returned to their owners. If they are wild, the Government can receive some remuneration by selling them to the meatworks. A couple of those bullocks I saw would have weighed in excess of one tonne, and, therefore, they have a substantial commercial value.

Some concern was expressed in another place that the bearings detailed in the Bill may have, in fact, altered the area previously encompassed in the regeneration region. Subsequent investigation has proved that not to be true.

We are happy to support 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.

Third Reading

Bill read a third time, on motion by Hon. Peter Dowding (Minister for Planning), and passed.

APPROPRIATION (CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND) BILL

Consideration of Tabled Paper

Debate resumed from 9 October.

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [5.18 p.m.]: I wish to speak in favour of the motion that the House take notice of the tabled papers relating to the 1984-85 Budget. I want to use the occasion to canvass at some length some matters specifically related to the Budget and others which are not financial in their context, but which relate to my electorate.

The Government deserves some congratulations for its decision to aim for a balanced Budget this financial year. It is not always an easy decision for Governments to make, and in many western economies in the past decade or so, far too many Governments have opted for deficit budgeting. Only now are they beginning to pay the appalling price for these actions.

I have said before in debates of this kind that while the concept of a balanced Budget may, in fact, be regarded as somewhat old-fashioned and, to some, financial fuddy-duddyism, it is nothing other than good sound financial sense. In that context it is a great pity that successive Federal Governments in Australia have not sought to take a leaf out of Western Australia's book in the past

decade where balanced Budgets have not only been sought, but also have, in the main, been achieved.

Having given some praise to the Government I nonetheless want to express concern over the way in which the Government seems to be hell-bent on spending, at what I would suggest, is a fairly reckless rate, and indeed raising revenue at a rate that is even more greedy. Much has been said about the Government's accomplishments in financial management.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Well justified.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: All of it has been said by the Government itself, and it is not surprising that most of that—

Hon. J. M. Berinson: It is not what the Confederation of WA Industry says.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: We will come to the Confederation of WA Industry in a minute. As time goes by, as one of the senior economic Ministers of this Government, the Minister for Budget Management may have cause to regret the framing of this Budget. I repeat that much has been said about the Government's alleged accomplishments in financial management, and its stated desire to reduce taxes. I suggest that when taxation has in fact risen by an average of 13.3 per cent, then one can hardly claim that as a restraint in an economic climate where inflation is currently running at about four per cent.

It is worth noting that the *per capita* level of State taxation in Western Australia has gone from a fairly meagre \$130 per head for every man, woman, and child to a quite staggering \$345, in the space of about 13 years. I would like to examine those figures in some depth in the next few minutes in relation to a chart to which I will refer. In the last year of the Brand Government the *per capita* levy of State taxation was, as I mentioned earlier, a little over \$130. Three years later—that is at the time Mr John Tonkin left office, that figure had risen to well over \$260. Effectively, therefore, it doubled in the period of the Tonkin Labor Government. I repeat again that we are talking about the *per capita* levy of State taxation.

It may come as a surprise to some members to know that it was only with the election of the Court Liberal-National Country Party Coalition Government and its successor, the Government led by Ray O'Connor, that those taxes, inflated by the Tonkin Labor Government, were contained and given the chance to level out. For example, under the Court Government the figure rose from Mr Tonkin's \$265 per head to something like \$275 per head. The highest point that that figure reached under Sir Charles Court was in the order of \$294

per head. Subsequently, in Mr O'Connor's one year as the Treasurer of Western Australia, that figure dipped to about \$288.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: It also led to a projection of a deficit in excess of \$20 million.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The Minister for Budget Management knows quite well that the nonsense surrounding the alleged deficit of the Treasury was cleared up many months ago. Indeed, if he wants to suggest that it is \$20 million, he is \$6 million out in comparison with the figures of his Lower House counterpart as of last night.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I am talking about projection—not the final result.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: In any case there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the deficit was anything more than a few dollars. It has been said before in this House that it would not make sense for a Government to go for and to achieve a balanced Budget for its first eight years in office and then, by some odd reckoning want to put the State in hock in its ninth year in office to the extent to which the Labor Government now suggests.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Whether it wanted it or not it was the result of what it did.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Whether the Minister for Budget Management likes it or not, the fact is that when the Brand Government left office in this State a little over 13 years ago, every man, woman, and child was being levied the equivalent of \$130 per head in State taxation and yet three years down the track, under Mr Tonkin, that figure of \$130 had grown dramatically, in a staggering proportion, to the extent that it had doubled and become something like \$265. And it was only in the following nine years, including those years under the stewardship of Mr O'Connor, that the \$265 became a stable figure.

Hon. Neil Oliver: Even in times of inflation?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Indeed, in times of high inflation, particularly that brought about by the actions of the Whitlam Government from 1972 onwards.

The figures speak for themselves because in 1983, upon the election of the Burke Labor Government, and after an absence from the Treasury benches of nine years, the first Burke Budget which was brought down a little more than a year ago saw that figure again rise quite dramatically from the \$288-odd that Mr O'Connor had imposed and at which it had levelled, to something over \$320 per head. Now that figure is well over \$340, in fact close to \$355.

The graphs are there for anyone who wishes to see them, and I am going to take the opportunity at the end of my speech to ask that the graph be incorporated in *Hansard* because in the simplest and plainest possible terms, it shows that in the last 13 months the Governments which have been capable of spending at the highest possible level have been the Labor Governments, and that is the five Labor Budgets that have been introduced in the past 13 years.

Before I move off that subject, the figures only tend to underline that financial bushranging that has gone on under this and previous Labor Governments. Put another way it means that in the three years of the Tonkin Government, State taxation rose at an average of 33 per cent a year. In the nine years that followed under Sir Charles Court and Mr O'Connor, the annual rate of increase of State taxation was not 33 per cent, not 20 per cent, or 10 per cent but on an annual basis, it was one per cent. Therefore, over that nine-year period, State taxation rose—I gave the raw figures earlier—by something in the order of nine per cent or one per cent a year.

In the two Budgets for which Mr Burke has now been responsible, there has not been an increase of nine per cent as occurred during Sir Charles Court's nine years as Treasurer, but rather there has been a 19 per cent increase. In the two years it has been in office, this Government has achieved a growth rate in taxes and charges double that achieved by previous Liberal Governments over their nine years. To give an example on a per annum basis, it means that State taxation—I am not talking about charges—has risen, under the two Budgets brought in by Mr Burke, by 9.6 per cent. If anyone can suggest to me that that represents a model of restraint—that it is some method by which the Labor Party has been able to operate the finances of this State in a responsible way—I would be very surprised indeed.

Hon. Mark Nevill: What is your analysis of Government charges?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am quite happy to bring on debate about Government charges as well.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Before you do that, could I ask you to indicate the components of the figures with which you are dealing now?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The components of the figures to which I have referred are contained in the first part of the Budget where we talk about State taxation. I have my copy of the Government's Budget and we are talking about revenue from State taxation as distinct from revenue from

Commonwealth sources, departmental, territorial, law courts, and other sources.

Therefore, the answer to the Minister for Budget Management is that we are talking specifically and only about State taxation which, as I recall, embraces payroll tax, land tax, tobacco tax, financial institutions duty, liquor licences, and other taxes which come under the general heading of State taxation.

I repeat that the gravity of what we are facing here is simply this: The Government is in no position to claim to the people of this State that it has exercised restraint either in its spending or in its revenue raising, because on both counts it has been shown to be quite adrift in its thinking.

I shall refer to some of the increases which I regard as appalling. I know that members like Hon. Sam Piantadosi would have taken particular notice of them in the Budget documents which were tabled. At page 33 of the Estimates of Expenditure, reference is made to the Department of Premier and Cabinet and all the departments and agencies which come under the Premier's own personal control. Members should bear in mind that we are talking about the Premier who has the audacity and temerity to sit in front of the television cameras of this State trying to convince the electorate that he has been a sound and prudent financial manager. What do we find?

Hon. Kay Hallahan: Just that.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I shall refer here to the documents which obviously Hon. Kay Hallahan has not read, because there is no way she can say the Premier has been a prudent manager of the finances of the State when we find the following details in respect of the Premier's own department. In 1983-84 in the Department of Premier and Cabinet—

Hon. Graham Edwards: You obviously do not understand the nature of the Department of Premier and Cabinet. You have plucked figures out of the air.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am not plucking figures out of the air; I am plucking them out of the Government's own Budget.

Hon. Graham Edwards: And you obviously don't understand them.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The Budget papers indicate that for 1983-84 the vote for the Department of Premier and Cabinet was \$4.683 million. The estimate for this year—that is one year down the track—is \$7.551 million; that is an increase in the Premier's own area of 61 per cent.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Costs have increased though.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Of course they have increased and that is part of the point we are trying to make. If members look at some of the increases in the estimates for the Department of Premier and Cabinet, they will see that is precisely the point we are making. We have a 61 per cent increase in the vote for the Department of Premier and Cabinet. I shall move on to other areas.

We cannot complain about the Executive Council which receives \$10 a year. It has been receiving that sum for a long time and perhaps there is a lesson there for other bodies.

I turn now to the London agency. Many people, I think I would be one, take the view that there is certainly no reason to increase dramatically the spending on the Agent General's office in London unless some financial or commercial interests is to be gained by the State. However, this Government—I ask members to remember it is this Government—has said it will upgrade its representation in South-East Asia, because the days are past when our representation in London should be the principal overseas agency.

Hon. Graham Edwards: Do you disagree with that?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I do not disagree at all.

Hon. Graham Edwards: So you don't disagree with that?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: It is this Premier who has said that the time has come for us to stabilise any spending on the London agency and to look at areas in South-East Asia where our markets and natural increases in our markets are likely to be found. Through you, Sir, to answer Hon. Graham Edwards, I agree with that entirely.

If we are all agreed on that issue, why would the following have occurred? Expenditure on the London agency has increased from \$1.157 million to \$1.246 million. In itself, that is a rather modest increase, and, on the face of it, does no more than take into account the factor of inflation. So far then there is no quarrel with the Government's own stated intention. However, why would there be a mere one per cent increase in the figure allocated by the Government to the next major commercial agency for the whole of Western Australia? I refer here to the agency in Tokyo, Japan. Why did we spend there last year a meagre \$314 990 and why do we see an allocation this year of only \$319 990, which is a \$5 000 increase? That increase would not even cover the cost of postage stamps. It represents a one per cent increase in expenditure on the agency which is the most significant for this State.

I hope the point has not been lost on Government members that, by their Premier's own ad-

mission, the South-East Asian ports, including Tokyo, are the ones where the future of Western Australia lies, and yet the Tokyo agency has been given a one per cent increase which compares unfavourably with the increase in the Premier's department in St. George's Terrace of 61 per cent.

I go further: In 1983-84 the Public Service Board was allocated a total of \$3.857 million. This year that allocation has increased to \$5.218 million; that is an increase of 36 per cent. Again I repeat that it is this Premier who has appealed to the rest of Western Australia, and to many other Government departments to exercise restraint in their expenditure, and yet he is prepared to give one of his own agencies an increase of 36 per cent.

However, that is not all. We see the position in respect of the Treasury, the body which has the task to plot and plan sound financial management in this State, is that in 1983-84 it was allocated \$6.7 million to perform its duties. In this Budget the allocation has been increased to \$8.972 million; that is an increase of 41 per cent over and above the amount allocated one year ago.

Is anyone trying to suggest that that is restrained spending? I suggest that is no more than symptomatic of what is wrong with much of this Budget. It is a little like the iceberg; on the surface it appears to be harmless enough, but once one looks beneath the surface, the situation is different. Once we look beneath the surface and analyse some of the Government's own figures, the Budget becomes quite an indictment on the Government of a sort of spending spree—just like a drunken sailor—that this Government has been on during its 18 to 20 months in office.

Have a look at page 42 of the Estimates. Under the heading of "Treasury" we find a total of 262 staff members will now be employed by Treasury. Last year's figures are not listed, but it is a relatively simple matter to check them. They reveal that, at this time 12 months ago, Treasury employed, not 262 people as is now envisaged, but 177. That is a 48 per cent increase in the staffing levels of the major Government department which is in charge of the finances of this State—48 per cent in one year!

Many other aspects of the Budget are similar, and one could spend many hours on them. I expect other members will want to draw attention to those matters. I repeat that I do not intend to spend much more time on them other than to say again that they are symptomatic—that sort of extravagance is symptomatic of what really is in this Budget.

At the bottom of the page we find, without too much explanation, under the heading

"Contingencies" an item for services and contracts. Whereas last year the amount spent under that heading was \$838 000, this year it has increased to \$1.9 million, representing an increase of 132 per cent. That is a 132 per cent increase in that item alone under the Treasury vote. That situation, I might say, is reflected throughout every department under the heading of "Services and Contracts" where the amount allocated has increased enormously.

If we look at part 13 relating to the Minister for Minerals and Energy, there appears to be an enormous increase. I conducted a check with some departments and, as far as I can ascertain, a fair degree of the increase under the heading "Services and Contracts" represents the computerisation programme that is being implemented in the Government services.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Do you know when it was commenced?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Yes, I do.

Hon. Peter Dowding: When?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Within the time of our Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Thank you.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: That is correct.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is a pity you didn't put that fact up front.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: We planned it, and that is precisely my point. I suggest the Minister for Planning should keep out of these things if he does not understand them. My point is that surely, in a family or a business, one spends only at the rate that one can afford.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: We have a balanced Budget.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Of course the Government has a balanced Budget, but only because of the enormous increases in the taxes I have just outlined. The Government cannot have it both ways.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Have a look at State charges.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am not saying that the computerisation programme should not proceed; I suggest that if it is necessary to increase the estimate by 132 per cent in one year in order to proceed with it, the Government must start to slow down, especially at a time when the Government itself is asking the rest of the community to use restraint. I repeat, the increases are symptomatic of the jingoism that this Government is attracting to its budgetary planning; on the surface everything seems fine, but once one gets below the

surface and has a look at a few items in detail, things start to look horribly amiss.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Particularly if you take it completely out of context, as you are doing.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: On the contrary. A Government member asked a few minutes ago whether I had plucked the figures out of the air, and I repeat that I did not pluck them out of the air, but out of the Government's own documents which have been placed before us by the Government's own officers

Hon. Peter Dowding: But, Mr Pendal, you take them out of context.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I now want to turn to non-financial matters in the Budget, some of which affect the Minister for Planning who has been interjecting. I hope he will be a little more receptive to some of the other things I want to put before him because at least two of the matters that I want to refer to have specific reference to his portfolios.

The first question is that of youth unemployment or, to look at it more positively, the question of youth employment. I will not suggest that this Government or this Opposition has a greater or lesser compassionate attitude towards youth unemployment than had previous Governments or, for that matter, previous Oppositions. I submit that most members of this House, once the rhetoric is put aside, would acknowledge that youth unemployment is one of the great scourges of our time, particularly when it means it is possible nowadays apparently for people to reach the age of 25 and still not have had any experience in the workplace.

That means, of course, that Governments and Oppositions will be required to work harder at addressing themselves to serious ways of finding work and career opportunities for people who have simply never experienced them. Many of us, I think, have heard the lament in the past that we allow people to qualify for unemployment benefits and having done so, we do not, as a community demand anything in return for those benefits. It has been suggested to me—and I have read of this on occasions in the past—that it is quite impossible to have a situation where a person can be obligated to work for the unemployment benefit which he or she might receive. Coupled with that problem and alongside it, and something which we never seem to link in with it, is that rather peculiar situation that many worthy community projects might be undertaken at great benefit to the community by unemployed people in such a way as not to interfere with the normal commercial or public works which go on and which need to go on in

order to support those who are in employment and to ensure that they remain in employment.

It seems to me that the time has come when surely the Government—and I put it as a serious proposition—should be looking to marry those two ideas together whereby many community projects which cannot proceed simply because there is no Government or local government money—as at the same time as, we have a large pool of unemployed people who would be willing, I suggest, to work on a voluntary basis—could proceed. Perhaps thousands of young people would be willing to work in a voluntary capacity while receiving unemployment benefits, under some arrangement with the Commonwealth whereby they can receive some sort of recoupment of their expenses incurred in travelling to and from some of those community programmes. An idea of that kind might have some relevance to two areas in my electorate.

One such area is Burswood Island, which everyone would acknowledge to be an eyesore and much in need of beautification in the same way that Heirisson Island was beautified seven or eight years ago.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Are you going to support a casino there?

Hon. Peter Dowding interjected.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: It is not necessary to build a casino there, as Mr Dowding knows. We should not be doing anything there other than to beautify the site.

Only a few miles around the river towards South Perth is another huge area of public land, the Sir James Mitchell Park, which adjoins the South Perth foreshore. That is a project the beautification of which has been shelved for three or four years because of a lack of Government funds. It is a project which is far too big for the South Perth City Council to carry out by itself.

I suggest the Minister, through the job creation unit within his department, might well look at the idea of creating a civil youth programme to cater for young unemployed people. Furthermore, it is surely possible for us to look at the idea of the training that is involved in some of the more basic work for unemployed people which could be provided at little cost to the community by retired tradesmen and other personnel.

The proposition I am putting forward would require the Minister to carefully select the projects so that such a scheme did not take work away from commercial companies which have to maintain their own work forces. Those projects which up to now had no prospect of going ahead ought to be the ones we zero in on.

Finally, if the programme were sponsored by the Minister's department, it would present an opportunity for the people taking part to receive some sort of certificate. This might point out their willingness to participate although they are on unemployment benefits, and outline the sort of experience they gained whether in tree planting, general labouring work, or assisting a skilled tradesman. A person leaving the voluntary programme would then be able to take some pride in his or her work and present the certificate to a prospective employer.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is like the Prime Minister's proposal.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: If it is like his proposal I would be delighted, because I have said before I would have thought everyone would agree that the issue of youth unemployment can transcend party-political debate. I have no knowledge that the Prime Minister has suggested any such thing, but if he has, in so far as it fits into the mould I am talking about, I would support it enthusiastically.

While it is often the case that suggestions made in the House during the Supply Bill or Budget debates go unanswered or receive a fairly cursory examination, I am specifically requesting the Minister and his department and specifically the job creation unit within his department at least to examine that which I have put forward, carefully and in detail.

Hon. Peter Dowding: A similar proposal is already under close examination and I will be making a statement about it in due course.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am delighted to hear that and I hope the Minister is able to consider the two projects south of the river to which I have referred. They could well do with an injection of Government funds even if it is by way of the voluntary efforts of unemployed people.

Another matter which has both a financial and a non-financial component centres on some questions I asked in this House not so long ago. In question 127 I sought some details which had been requested by one of my constituents on the number and nature of ministerial officers and advisers or any personnel appointed by the Government since it took office. The Leader of the House responded on that occasion by saying I would be advised in writing in due course. That gave some hope that the matter would be treated seriously and that I would get some sort of response to my question.

The long and short of it is that I received a letter from the Premier, in due course, on 10 September. It is under the Premier's signature and states—

There are currently 35 ministerial appointees performing work for the State Government in the categories of ministerial advisers, ministerial officers and personal assistants. You will be aware that information on ministerial staff was provided in a ministerial statement to the Legislative Assembly on 3 August 1983.

It goes on to a third paragraph which has no relevance to my complaint, and the fourth paragraph then says—

I am sure you will agree that no other persons or organisations employed by Government or private enterprise have been subject to such close public scrutiny.

I probably agree with that. These 35 people have been the subject of considerable personal scrutiny. Why not? After all, they are paid out of the public purse, and just as in a debate of this kind members are entitled to represent their constituents and demand answers and accountability from the Government, that is a good enough reason. I agree with the Premier they have been subject to such close public scrutiny.

The letter then goes on as follows—

I am concerned that information supplied in the past has been used as the basis for personal attacks on ministerial appointees, and that provision of further information will only be used as an excuse for further such attacks.

I take that as an insult to members of Parliament and to Parliament as a whole. It is not the Premier's business to wonder about, ponder on, or speculate about the use to which a member will put the information he is seeking.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Oh, rubbish!

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Not at all.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Of course it is, if it is going to be misused.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: In other words that would be justification for not answering any questions in Parliament for fear the Opposition would use the information against the interests of the Government.

Hon. Peter Dowding: No, it is not the interests of the Government but the interests of the people involved.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The basis of the Westminster system, permits questioning in the Parliament to submit the Government of the day to an accountability which otherwise would not be provided.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is accepted. Personal abuse and muck-raking is not to be tolerated.

Hon. N. F. Moore: If anybody has been involved in that it is you.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You have raked it, Norman Moore.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order!

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: It is a pity the Minister did not listen to his own words and those of his Leader a few years ago when they abused so heartily W. W. Mitchell, the one person the previous Government was able to employ as a so-called ministerial adviser and public relations officer.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Part time!

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: That is right, and every time the man incurred \$10 expenses the previous Opposition just about suffered from apoplexy. Now, a couple of years down the track, the then Opposition is in Government and has appointed 35 advisers.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Before the dinner suspension I was referring to the Government's having now appointed no fewer than 35 advisers, many of whom I have no objection to. It is a great pity that this should come within a year or two of so much criticism being levelled at the previous Government which employed Bill Mitchell as an outside public relations consultant, albeit, as Mr Wordsworth pointed out, on a part-time basis. Much fuss was made about Mr Mitchell over many years.

While on this particular point, I stress that to my knowledge there has never been a blanket opposition or condemnation of the system of advisers *per se*. Rather, has it been a condemnation in many cases of the choice of personnel, and the qualification and competence of some of the people, but I repeat, not all of them.

Before I was diverted, my complaint was that I was one of the members of Parliament who asked questions in this House, quite legitimately, in order to obtain information from the Government as to the number, the nature, and the cost of the Government's system of advisers. The upshot of all that was that the Premier, in a very cavalier way, said "We are not going to reveal that to you; you are not going to be told", despite the fact that all those advisers are paid out of the public purse.

It was a supreme irony, I suggest, that there was a refusal by the Premier to name those advisers, to discuss the salaries they were being paid, and the

functions that they carried out on the Government's behalf.

This happened a couple of days before the much-vaunted Parliament Week commenced under the auspices of the Government. In other words, tens of thousands of dollars, perhaps even hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' funds, were used on the pretext of promoting Parliament as an institution and on showing how important a role Parliament played in the scheme of things. Yet at the very same time, members of Parliament were being denied access to information they were entitled to seek through the Parliament.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: Shame!

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: On 16 September I sent a brief note to the Premier, a note which I will read out to members. I think it indicates the sort of contempt with which the Government was, and still is, treating the Parliament, despite the front of Parliament Week. I said this to the Premier—

It is a matter of considerable irony and sadness to me that today, the start of Parliament Week in this State, I should learn from the public media information which you specifically declined to supply to me as a member of Parliament.

Let me interrupt here to say that insult was added to injury, because not only did the Premier refuse to give information in Parliament, not only did he state that in a letter to me some time in September, but he then had the temerity, on the same day that he denied the information to me, to send the very same information to a journalist in this town, Robert Bennett of *The Sunday Times*, who then proceeded to publish the details of those advisers, without necessarily publishing their names, at a time when a member of Parliament was told it was not appropriate that he should have access to that information.

I went on to say—

You will recall that I recently asked you in the House for full details of all ministerial advisers. You declined at that stage, but undertook to write to me on the matter, a position which I was happy to accept.

And that, Mr President, is the letter I wrote earlier, the letter of 10 September. My letter continues—

You subsequently wrote to me the attached letter which clearly showed you were not prepared to give me the details sought. Worse than that, I now find that you have—in the last few days—supplied the names of the 35 advisers to Robert Bennett, of *The Sunday Times*.

I regret that this clear case of treating Parliament with contempt should be uncovered on the very day that your Government is piously proclaiming the Labor Party's alleged belief in the Parliamentary system.

This serious breach of Parliamentary custom aside, it also must be of concern to people in this State that the Adviser system is now, for the first time, costing the taxpayer in excess of \$1 million annually.

Let me interrupt that quotation by referring to an earlier comment by Hon. Kay Hallahan, who took considerable pride in the fact that the Government had been able to balance its Budget. It has been able to balance its Budget because of the excessive increases in State taxation to which I referred earlier.

I finished my letter on this note—

I regret having to write to you in this way but I have no alternative when it is you and your Government who are building up such a public facade over the role of Parliament. Your failure to answer the legitimate question of MPs is an eloquent, if unintended, indication of how you view Parliament despite all the trappings the Government has brought out for Parliament Week.

That is the end of the letter.

I finish this part of my Budget speech on the note that I started the letter. It is a matter of sadness that a Government spends so much time propagandising its views about Parliament to the people of this State, while at the same time deliberately, as a matter of policy, it denies members of Parliament access to information which should be theirs for the asking.

I have on a number of occasions in this House raised the question of the siting of the casino on Burswood Island. I have no intention, members will be relieved to know, of covering the same ground again tonight, but I do want to make a reference to a particular Government publication, because I suggest that the Government is breaking its own laws and its own policies and rules in its intention to establish the casino on Burswood Island. A publication was produced by the Government in 1981 dealing with the metropolitan region scheme. Under section 5 of that publication this comment appears concerning the implications of planning on a metropolitan-wide basis—

The Metropolitan Region Scheme depicts certain areas which are "reserved" for various purposes. A large proportion of this "reserved" area is already owned by the Authority or other public authorities, whilst the remainder is in private ownership. The

types of Scheme reservations which are most likely to affect private property are those for parks and recreation and those for roads of regional significance.

The significance of what I am saying is this: The area of Burswood Island is one of those which is categorised as being for parks and recreation reserves; not because I say that, but because that is what is shown officially in the map of the metropolitan region scheme. The concept has been embraced by this Government and by the Minister who sits in this House as the Minister for Planning.

This Government publication states, under the heading of "Parks and Recreation Reserves"—

The reservation of areas for recreation within the Scheme is essential to safeguard important regional landscapes and recreation areas from development so that they can be enjoyed by the public at large.

That is a quote from the Government's own document, yet I repeat, the land in question—namely, Burswood Island—is of this category; that is the category of parks and recreation reserves. This Government is prepared, and has been prepared since 5 April this year, to hand over all or part of Burswood Island for the construction of a casino.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is not handed over anyway.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Mr Dowding knows that from 5 April this year, the Government formally announced that Burswood Island was the most acceptable and appropriate place for the siting of a casino.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Subject to what?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Subject to environmental studies.

Hon. Peter Dowding: And what?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: A situation which the Government did not bring about until I pressurised it—subject also to planning requirements, which I am now attempting to pressurise the Government into undertaking, and subject to the traffic studies, which to my knowledge have not yet commenced.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Neither has the construction of the casino.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: My point is, it will hang like a millstone—

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL:—around the neck of this Minister for Planning. One of the Ministers of this Government was personally responsible for the

despoilation of one of the major parks and recreation reserves—

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Mr Dowding should tell me if I am incorrect.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Yes, you are.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: That is what the metropolitan region scheme states. A copy of that scheme exists, amongst other places, in the library of this building. Burswood Island is classified as "parks and recreation reserves".

Hon. Peter Dowding: Did you never read the amendment.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: That is correct.

Hon. Peter Dowding: We should give you a lesson in planning; you clearly need it.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I repeat, this says that the reservation of areas—

Several members interjected.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: —for recreation within the scheme is essential to safeguard the regional landscapes.

That is poppycock, because these people do not intend to safeguard that important regional landscape at all if they intend to have a casino built there. It goes on as follows—

Residents of metropolitan Perth have been well provided with recreation areas largely due to the foresight of decision makers of the past.

Certainly not to the foresight of this Government, and I agree with that statement. To continue—

For instance the decision was made last century to reserve Kings Park, an area of some 400 hectares remaining substantially as bushland, located on the doorstep of the Perth city centre.

The Authority has recognised the need to look far into the future with respect to recreation requirements.

I will break off here to say that is precisely what the MRPA is supposed to do, but this Government intends to chop off that far-sighted vision in order to do exactly what this plan aims to prevent, because this plan under the metropolitan region scheme aims to ensure that Burswood Island remains a park and recreation reserve.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Are you suggesting that it is unspoilt bushland at present?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: That is another problem the Minister for Planning has. He obviously needs a hearing aid or else he needs to attend Parliament a bit more regularly, because I have said a dozen

times if I have said it once, and in two syllable words that even he can understand, that I accept and acknowledge that Burswood Island in its present state is an eyesore. But so too was Heirisson Island a few years ago. It was thanks to one of the Minister's predecessors who had far more foresight than the present Minister—

Hon. Kay Hallahan: We don't know that yet.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Yes, we do.

Hon. Peter Dowding interjected.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: But I had to press the Minister and his cobbler, the Minister for the Environment, and I have documentary proof of it which I have produced.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. Peter Dowding: You couldn't push a razor into a plum pudding.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is out of order in rudely interjecting immediately after the President has told him to come to order. If the Minister does not like to obey the rules of this place, there is a very good solution to the problem, and I am just in the mood to put that into effect.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The same publication states—and it is a Government publication—

When the Metropolitan Region Scheme came into effect in 1963, a total of 26 700 hectares was reserved for "Parks and Recreation". Amendments since then have increased the area reserved to about 32 000 hectares, of which approximately 18 000 hectares are controlled by the Crown, or public authorities such as the National Parks Authority and local councils. Since 1963, the Authority has purchased almost 12 000 hectares of land for recreation at a cost of \$53.3 million (up to June 30, 1982).

If a Government has used public funds to purchase land for a parks and recreation reserve in order to plan in a far-sighted way into the next century for the people of the metropolitan area, by what right does this Government undo all that planning of the last 21 years? By what right does it intend to give away an area such as that for the purpose of having a casino erected? In this House I have asked the Minister for Planning what was the attitude of the MRPA to the alienation of that land, but I have been repeatedly refused any sort of answer. We are even led to believe that the MRPA has not even considered the matter. If it has not considered the matter, perhaps we ought to remove those members who currently form the MRPA.

Hon. Kay Hallahan: They have only just got there.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Do not worry about that. I have been down to see the new chairman and I am hoping he might bring members opposite to their senses before they start to undo all the work of the last 21 years. If Hon. Kay Hallahan or any Government member wants to deny that this area of land is reserved for the specific purpose of parks and recreation as distinct from a casino, please let me know about that.

Hon. Peter Dowding: When you went down, did you get a quick lesson in the planning process? It would have helped you.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Please tell me why.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You would have learnt about amendments to the metropolitan region scheme.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I know about the amendments to the metropolitan region scheme because I have helped defeat one of them in this House, so do not let the Minister try to tell me about what procedure must be adopted. I was one of those who pointed out publicly, in relation to the Burswood Island land, the responsibility the Government had under the various Statutes, a responsibility that it was content to overlook or ignore in the months leading up to and after the decision being made to choose Burswood Island as the site for the casino.

What is more, there is an area of land outside Perth that you, Mr President, would be well familiar with, and it is land surrounding the Wungong Gorge. The MRPA is currently in the process of putting a parks and reservation order over that land, which I might add covers privately owned land, not Government or publicly owned land such as that belonging to the Government in the case of Burswood Island, but privately owned land in the Wungong Gorge. That land was the subject of another disallowance motion moved by Hon. Ian Pratt and seconded by me in, I think, November 1981.

The MRPA is attempting to make the same move in this Parliament in 1984 that it made in 1981. Mr Dowding should not shake his head, because for this very reason I have been down to talk with the new Chairman of the MRPA to see whether I could get some sense out of him. One of the arguments I was able to raise with him was: How could he, the MRPA, the Minister, or the Government, justify putting that reservation order on this private property in the Wungong Gorge, property owned by a Mr Herbert of South Perth, when at the same time the Government has been prepared to lift that reservation order on its own land at Burswood Island? It just does not make sense and it is an unjust act both in relation to Mr

Herbert, the landowner in the Wungong Gorge, and in relation also to the land that a long time ago—long before this Government came to office—was reserved for parks and recreation reserves in the area of Burswood Island.

The silence of the Government on this question is deafening. People will be demanding answers both in the Parliament and outside it as to why the Government has been prepared to sell its soul for a little bit of glitter that will be the casino.

If that is not enough to make my point, I refer to the fact that in 1978 the Royal Western Australian Bowling Association made an application to the Government of the day to build some bowling facilities on Burswood Island. The proposition involved an extensive array of bowling greens, but in addition to that, there was to be a low level development—a building. The RWABA was denied that chance, being told that it could not carry out that work because, as the then deputy president of the association (Mr Norm Fraser) said, he was told that the association was denied access to Burswood Island for that sort of development because it would take at least 15 to 20 years for the rubbish that had been dumped on the island to consolidate enough for foundations to be laid.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: When was that?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: That was 1978, some six years ago. If someone could be told six years ago that it would take another 15 to 20 years for the rubbish to consolidate, a simple mathematical calculation shows us that it will be another nine to 14 years before that rubbish will have consolidated. Either people are being told untruths today or they were being told untruths six years ago.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Is there not a third option?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: What is the third option?

Hon. Peter Dowding: There are different sorts of buildings.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I thank the Minister very much. A casino is a lot heavier than a one-storeyed, low profile building of the kind the RWABA envisaged six years ago.

Hon. Peter Dowding: But a one-storeyed building cannot offer pylons that go through to the heart, whereas a casino can. Any nit could understand that difference.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Apart from the abuse and the cheap aside, I thank the Minister for the lesson in engineering. It does not, however, answer the question I have raised before in the House; namely, if it was valid in 1978 to deny a community organisation, which is one of the biggest

sporting groups across the length and breadth of Australia—lawn bowls—access to Burswood Island on the grounds I have indicated, on what grounds does this Government reverse that decision to allow a casino to be built there in 1984? That is a simple question to which the Government will not respond, and for months the Government has evaded the issue in many different ways, even to the extent that it would not itself voluntarily move to a position where an environmental impact statement was ordered into the siting of the casino at Burswood Island. Again, people have been asking questions and getting no answers.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: Do you think the Government would give away Kings Park?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Ordinarily that would be an absurd question, but in this case Mr Ferry may be closer to the truth than he thinks, because in 1927 it was a Government of this sort that wanted to give away Kings Park.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Who was going to build the hospital up there?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The Collier Labor Government. One of the groups which showed intestinal fortitude at the time was the Perth City Council. It said that it was no argument to say that a new Royal Perth Hospital at Kings Park would take only a little space. Even as Mr Nevill would know, the Royal Perth Hospital has now expanded enormously and it has cribbed its way across Wellington Street—and perhaps if Mr Edwards would stop interjecting he might learn something.

Hon. Graham Edwards: It is expanding more under this Government than it expanded under the previous one.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The weight of the interjection is staggering! I suggest that the member continues reading the comic or whatever he is reading and leaves the interjections to other people who know something about it.

Hon. Peter Dowding: He is reading Pendal's mind, which is written on the back of a postage stamp.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: In 1927, when Royal Perth Hospital was a tiny establishment, the same argument was used in support of a plan to build the new Royal Perth Hospital at Kings Park—it would not take up much space! It is that sort of short-sighted thinking of that time that I am pleading with the Government to avoid 57 years later, because the Royal Perth Hospital now has a huge extension, in addition to which we have the Queen Elizabeth II complex on the other side of Perth, a complex which was never envisaged in

1927. If we add those two sites together and consider that they were both contemplated for Kings Park in 1927, we realise we would not have any of Kings Park remaining today. That is the sort of short-sightedness we want to avoid. That is why the interjection of Hon. Vic Ferry is by no means absurd.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You would have sold them off to some entrepreneur.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: If I have to repeat it again for the benefit of someone like Mr Nevill, I will despair. They are the simple facts and the Government will have to live with the consequences. I guess I will at least have some satisfaction in being able to say to my constituents and others, "Look, you can check the *Hansard* record. I did what I was able to do. I campaigned in the Parliament against it; I campaigned publicly against it. The Government simply would not listen; it knew it all. The Government was not prepared to look at another site for the casino; it was hell-bent—in terms of getting an equity in the casino and wanting to use Government-owned land—on getting Burswood Island." Mr Nevill, it will be a black mark against this Government for a long time to come".

Hon. Mark Nevill: It may not be built there.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The member says it may not be built there, and if it is not I will be delighted because then the plans for Burswood Island could proceed along the lines that have been envisaged for three or four years; that is, to turn the place into something which will enhance this city and not detract from it, as would any sort of large building, whether it be a casino or any other edifice.

Consistent with all of that, but on a different subject very briefly for a moment, I would like to refer to another matter to do with the city's historical precincts, and one on which I would seem to be in a position to put something forward to the Government. We should be encouraging people to preserve the area of Mends Street in South Perth. It is an area about which I have put the proposition, both to the South Perth City Council and more latterly to the National Trust and others, that it should be preserved and developed as some sort of historic precinct, if only because it is one of those parts of the metropolitan area that still has a substantial number of turn-of-the-century or nineteenth century buildings which are capable of being preserved. In this case it is significant that most of the buildings worth preserving are in fact publicly owned, so we do not run into the sort of problem that Governments experienced in the early part of the 1970s both in

WA and across Australia. In the case of the Palace Hotel it became a headache for the authorities of the day to try to find a way to preserve the hotel as an example of the architecture of its time. It became a problem simply because it was privately owned and therefore to entice an owner in these circumstances to forgo the chance of high-rise development is sometimes a very difficult matter indeed.

In the case of Mends Street, South Perth, the police station, which is perhaps one of the finest buildings in the South Perth area, is a good architectural example of its time and it is owned, of course, by the State Government. Just up the road, the post office is owned of course, by the Federal Government. On the other side of the road is an old building which is now used as a theatre and which is owned, I think, by a public body. The old municipal chambers again, I understand, are still in public hands. The only other building that you, Mr Deputy President (Hon. Robert Hetherington), might be aware of in that precinct is the Windsor Hotel which, fortunately, is owned by the University of Western Australia and has been owned by it for a long time. I indeed, the University of WA is doing a few things at the moment to retain that part of our history. It is interesting that at the time I put this proposition to the local authority, the owners of private premises proceeded quite independently along the lines of antiquating a number of shops so that they, in effect, were attempting to turn back the clock to put them in some harmony with the other buildings in the street.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: They were responsible for the upgrading of the village, as we call it, and should be commended. It is magnificent.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am delighted to hear that.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: The *Hansard* reporter would agree with me, too.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Many people live in that part of South Perth and Mr Gayfer is one of them. Indeed, the area has been enhanced by that simple act of the shop owners. They can see the value commercially in enhancing those buildings in that way to their ultimate commercial benefit. The reason I mentioned it here is that it may reach a stage where the Government, along with the local authority, will be asked perhaps to try to find some way of giving the other private landholders in the area some form of land tax holiday or concession whereby it would be worth their while to try to ensure that any new buildings conform to that nineteenth century architecture. Mends Street really does represent one of the last

opportunities, I think, in the metropolitan area of Perth for retaining and enhancing some fairly fine buildings from the previous century. If this proposal lands on the desk of any Minister, I hope it gets plenty of support.

With those comments, I support the motion.

HON. MARK NEVILL (South-East) [8.09 p.m.]: It is with pleasure that I support the motion moved by the Attorney General. The Budget has been well received, and I congratulate the Government, the Attorney General, the Premier, and those people who put it together. It is a very cohesive, very positive, and very well, targeted Budget and some of the comments which have been reported show that community reaction to the Budget has also been good. In the latest edition of the *Press Gallery Report* a spokesman from one major employer organisation described it as fantastic. That is a bit extravagant for me, but perhaps it is.

Tonight I want to address my remarks to a problem in my electorate which has been recognised for quite some time; that is, the need to rationalise the mining education institutions in Australia, particularly in Western Australia. I will refer to a report which was prepared on the subject and called "The Education in Australia of Mining Engineers and particularly Metallurgists, a Need For Rationalisation". This report is a joint Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy and Australian Mining Industry Council submission to the Commonwealth tertiary education committee. It spells out some very stark facts which have great implications for mining education in this State, particularly for mining education in Kalgoorlie.

The report indicates that there are eight mining engineering courses in Australia and 10 metallurgy courses. Western Australia has three of those 10 metallurgy courses being offered, and over about a seven-year period the industry needs about 60 mining engineers and 60 metallurgists, so members can see that in WA we have far too many of these courses, particularly metallurgy courses. There are three schools in this State which are all fighting for students. If they were all viable we would have far too many students graduating from these establishments.

This joint committee report recommended that there be four centres of mining education in Australia: One should be in Queensland or the Northern Territory, the second in New South Wales, the third in either Victoria, South Australia or Tasmania, and the fourth in Western Australia.

Currently in WA we have one mining engineering course at the Western Australian School of Mines, which is part of WAIT. That mining engineering course is a single department which has 80 to 100 students. It is viable and very successful. If there were three mining engineering courses in WA, none would be viable. In regard to metallurgy, the total number of graduates predicted in this report as being required between 1982 and 1988 is some 400 metallurgists. Of that number, about 150 would be extractive metallurgists required by the mining industry; that is, 150 over a six-year period. Members can see from those figures that it is very wasteful and really ludicrous that we should have more than one centre in this State producing extractive metallurgists.

This year three courses were advertised as being capable of producing metallurgists. At the West Australian School of Mines we have the course of a Bachelor of Applied Sciences in extractive metallurgy, at the WAIT Bentley campus we have a Bachelor of Applied Sciences and Metallurgy, and at Murdoch University we have a Bachelor of Science in Mineral Sciences (extractive metallurgy) being offered. Also at the Bentley campus of WAIT there is a chemical engineering course which deals quite extensively with mineral processing and extractive metallurgy.

The problems within the WAIT group—and that includes the WA School of Mines—are being addressed and I expect that there will be rationalisation and that those problems will be solved internally. I have been given an assurance that that is being undertaken.

Recently in the Press the Chairman of WAIT (Dr Don Watts) was reported to have said that there were not enough funds for tertiary institutions. One of the ways of rationalising many of these institutions is to eliminate duplication. It is very clear in my mind that one of WAIT's metallurgy courses must go. There is no room for two courses. I also believe that the Murdoch University course in extractive metallurgy should also be phased out.

If we look at the Murdoch University Handbook for 1976 we note that the university offered a mineral science course. Over the last seven years the emphasis of that course has been changed deliberately from one of mineral science to one of extractive metallurgy. That course has really emerged by stealth, having moved into an area to which there was no need to move.

This joint committee report of the Australasian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy and the Australia Mining Industry Council, in its

recommendations to the Commonwealth committee for funding on a viability needs basis for the 1985-87 triennium, said that the joint committee had little difficulty in deciding which schools of mining engineering and metallurgy should not have special funding. Its recommendations were as follows: The first course should be at the University of Queensland. The second course should be an amalgamation of the schools of mining, engineering, metallurgy, and geology at the University of New South Wales. The Victorian situation is not all that clear. It is not clear whether the course should be established in Victoria, South Australia, or Tasmania.

However, for Western Australia the committee has come out in support of the school of extractive metallurgy and mining at the Western Australia School of Mines at Kalgoorlie. Having said in the report that the committee had little difficulty in that choice, I believe the School of Mines in Kalgoorlie has many attractions. It is the oldest school of metallurgy in the State and it has been the traditional place for metallurgists to be trained. The School of Mines also has the only mining/engineering course in the State, and to maintain that accreditation with the Australian Institute of Engineers it must also have a school of metallurgy and of geology, because mining engineers undergo training in those two areas. If the school of metallurgy at the School of Mines in Kalgoorlie is not viable, the Western Australian mining engineering course is in danger of collapsing, and that is the only one in the State.

The other strong argument for supporting the Kalgoorlie School of Mines as the centre for extractive metallurgy is the argument for decentralisation. The other courses are all in the metropolitan area and it will be a good thing if we can get any courses into the country areas. I would imagine that many members in this House support that view.

I believe that Kalgoorlie is the best place at which to continue the extractive metallurgy school, because it has a very broadly based mining area and there is a strong mining community to support it. The Kalgoorlie region, which goes from Norseman to Leinster, has a broad range of metallurgical plants and mills in which it is essential for students to gain experience during their course.

There is a variety of gold treatment plants in that area and all treat different types of ores. Many of those ores have different characteristics which require major and occasionally subtle modifications of their mills. The area has carbon in pulp plants there, as well as roasters for treating the sulphides and tellurides. So all these things are in that area where the school is established at the

moment. They are essential to give those students a broad practical base.

At Teutonic Bore, as members from that area would know, we have a copper-zinc-silver plant which concentrates the sulphides. I have visited that plant and it is a unique and efficient plant.

At Leinster and Kambalda we have plants for concentrating the nickel sulphides. Furthermore, south of Kalgoorlie is the nickel smelter which also adds another dimension to the training available to the students at Kalgoorlie's School of Mines. North of Kalgoorlie we have the Kalgoorlie Metallurgical Research Laboratory which I hope in future years can be put to better use. It is a costly facility and I would hope that a facility like that could be used in conjunction with the Western Australian School of Mines to do research work.

I have another strong argument for maintaining the school of extractive metallurgy at the School of Mines. The students who study there will be living in an environment in which most will ultimately work. It is a lot easier for someone who has done a course in Kalgoorlie to adapt and live in a mining community. I doubt whether that transition would be anywhere as easy and comfortable for a student who did his course at one of the metropolitan establishments.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Do you think WAIT would alter that direction at all of being involved?

Hon. MARK NEVILL: WAIT has to decide whether it is going to have a course at the Kalgoorlie School of Mines, which is a branch of WAIT, or at the Bentley campus. We need 60 metallurgists and we have three courses; so it is just a waste of money.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: I understood WAIT was going to become more involved in the School of Mines.

Hon. MARK NEVILL: It can do that and not be involved in providing mining engineering and metallurgy courses at Bentley. The funding for the School of Mines comes through WAIT, as some of its academic support staff and other facilities. I believe WAIT Bentley should move out of that area.

Hon. N. F. Moore: I think it will all finish up in Bentley in the long term, which is regrettable.

Hon. MARK NEVILL: The joint committee report has recommended that Kalgoorlie's School of Mines should be the school of extractive metallurgy in this State. I think it is right. That means rather bluntly that the Murdoch school of extractive metallurgy and the Bentley school of metallurgy should be phased out so that

Kalgoorlie becomes the premier mining education establishment in this State for the training of mining engineers and extractive metallurgists.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. G. E. Masters (Leader of the Opposition).

CREDIT UNIONS AMENDMENT BILL

Recommittal

Bill recommitted, on motion by Hon. Peter Dowding (Minister for Planning), for the further consideration of clauses 6 and 9.

In Committee

The Chairman of Committees (Hon. D. J. Wordsworth) in the Chair; Hon. Peter Dowding (Minister for Planning) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 6: Section 10 amended—

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Last eve I took on a suggestion from Hon. Ian Medcalf about a drafting problem that he felt existed with the legislation, as it had been presented, and took advice this afternoon from the relative department—of which I am not the responsible Minister—and the parliamentary draftsman, and as a result, the suggestion of Hon. Ian Medcalf has been agreed to. I therefore move an amendment—

Line 20—Delete the word "or" and substitute the word "and".

I make it clear that the amendment refers to the second of the two references to promissory notes in the proposed amendment to subsection 4 of section 10 of the principal Act.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Hon. Ian Medcalf raised these matters yesterday, during debate. We note now the advice he has given to the Government has been accepted. We are very pleased about that.

I can only say that in a similar circumstance, had Mr Dowding been on this side of the Chamber and Mr Medcalf dealing with the Bill, the matter would not have been conducted with the same decorum.

I do point out to the Minister that Mr Medcalf is meticulous in his study of Bills, and I am sure we all gain benefit from that fact.

In different circumstances we would have seen quite a vicious debate, and that is not the way to achieve things. The way to achieve these changes is by proper consideration, and the decorum that was pursued by Mr Medcalf.

I hope we will continue to have this sort of co-operation again so that the Government will gain great benefit from some of the amendments we are putting forward.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Since the member chooses to crow, may I remind him it is not Sunday, so perhaps his sermons are out of place. In accepting these amendments the Government does not have any of the inhibitions that the Opposition had, when in Government, of being reluctant to accept advice from anyone.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 9: Section 20 amended—

Hon. PETER DOWDING: In this respect the Government has taken up a suggestion of Hon. Ian Medcalf. It is neither a drafting error nor a mistake, or a matter of great policy, but as a

matter of convenience and practice it will avoid the necessity, it is thought, of returning the legislation to this Chamber at some stage in the future to up that limit when conditions require it. In those circumstances I have no hesitation in moving an amendment—

Page 5, line 33—Insert after the passage, "\$1 000 000;" the words "or such greater amount as may be prescribed".

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Bill again reported, with amendments.

House adjourned at 8.32 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

HEALTH: HOSPITAL

Wooroloo: Closure

300. Hon. NEIL OLIVER, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Health:

- (1) Has a decision been made to close the Wooroloo hospital?
- (2) If not, is the matter under consideration?
- (3) If "Yes", when can a decision be anticipated?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) Yes, but the building will be offered to the Prisons Department as a sick bay. A nursing post will be established to care for the civilian population.
- (2) Currently the department is preparing to negotiate with the Prisons Department to effect a transfer of premises to them.
- (3) Negotiations may take some months.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: OFFICES

Dual

307. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Leader of the House representing the Premier:

- (1) Are there any members of Parliament who have more than one electorate office provided by the Government?
- (2) If so, will he provide details?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS: DISPUTE

Maritime Workers' Union

309. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Minister for Industrial Relations:

- (1) Is the Minister aware of the imminent threat of widespread industrial action by the Maritime Workers' Union which is a result of the closing of the PWD slipway at the South Mole?
- (2) What action does the Government propose to take to protect shippers, importers and industry from the effects of such stoppages?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) On Monday, 15 October 1984 at 8.00 a.m., together with the Minister for

Minerals and Energy, I addressed members of the Maritime Workers' Union on the South Mole slipway. Following this meeting the threats of industrial action were lifted and work is proceeding as normal at the port.

310. *Postponed.*

WILDLIFE: TAMMARS

Special Lease

311. Hon. A. A. LEWIS, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Lands and Surveys:

Further to my question 266 of Tuesday, 9 October 1984, with regard to special lease 3116/6751, would he be prepared to allow the lease to continue until the study of the area has been completed and a review is made of that study?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The lease has until 31 December 1984 to run. Inquiries are being made in respect of the time it will take to complete the study. It may be that results will be made available by that date and a future course of action resolved.

312 and 313. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Parliament House

314. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) Is he aware of the congestion created by the many extra people who now appear to be working in Parliament House?
- (2) Is he aware that most of the office accommodation is below Public Service specification?
- (3) How many persons comprised the *Hansard* section in each of the three years ending September 1982, 1983, 1984?
- (4) Of the above—
 - (a) how many were permanent staff; and
 - (b) how many were casual?
- (5) How many persons comprised recognised office staff of Parliament House and members of Parliament in each of the

three years, ending September 1982, 1983, 1984?

(6) Of the above—

(a) how many were permanent staff; and

(b) how many were casual?

(7) Who is responsible for the employment of staff in Parliament House under parts (3) and (5)?

(8) Has consideration been given to the provision of air-conditioning in Parliament House?

(9) If "Yes" to (8), why were plans abandoned?

(10) When is it proposed that consideration will be given to the extension of Parliament House to decently accommodate all the persons within it?

(11) If consideration is not going to be given, what is to be the solution?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) to (7) These questions do not fall within the areas of my responsibility and should be directed to the Presiding Officers in whom is vested the responsibility for the administration of Parliament.

(8) to (11) These questions should be directed to the Minister for Works.

POLICE

Search Warrants

315. Hon. TOM McNEIL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

(1) Would the Minister advise what steps police must take in order to obtain a search warrant?

(2) What evidence must be provided in support of the issuing of a search warrant before a justice would be expected to authorise such a search warrant?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) In order to obtain a search warrant a police officer must swear a complaint on oath before a justice of the peace.

(2) The police officer must provide sufficient evidence to satisfy the justice that the issue of a search warrant is justified.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

WORKS: FREMANTLE SLIPWAY

Closure

89. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

Referring to his answer to question 309 today, I ask—

(1) On what basis was the resolution achieved?

(2) Was it on the understanding that the decision to close the PWD slipway at the South Mole should be reconsidered, or is it to be closed?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) and (2) This is really a matter between the Maritime Workers' Union and me. Nevertheless, what happened was that both Mr Parker and I were to contact the Commonwealth Government with a view to deferring the closure to see whether it could support the slipway for a further period.

WORKS: FREMANTLE SLIPWAY

Closure

90. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

Do I understand from his answer to my previous question that if the Commonwealth Government does not provide some aid, the decision to close the slipway will go ahead?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The question is speculative and I really cannot answer it while negotiations are continuing because I do not know what the outcome will be. Those negotiations are not part of my responsibility.

LIQUOR: LICENCES

Cabaret Licences

91. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

(1) Is the moratorium still in place with regard to liquor licences and particularly applications for cabaret licences?

(2) Are the only applications that can be considered by the Licensing Court those which have been referred to it by the Minister?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) The moratorium is still in place. The member may have noticed in the Press the other day that there would be a couple of weeks more available to the public so that they could make comment before we decided what to do about the Royal Commission inquiry into the liquor industry.
- (2) The only matters that can be dealt with are those referred by me.

LIQUOR: LICENCES

Moratorium

92. Hon. G. E. MASTERS, to the Leader of the House:

- (1) How many applications have been referred by him since the moratorium came into effect?
- (2) On what basis are decisions for referral made?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) I do not have the answer to this question. If the member were to put a question on notice he would get a specific answer with details down to the last decimal point.
