

# Legislative Assembly

Thursday, 19 March 1981

## MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY

The Legislative Assembly met at 8.00 p.m.

The SPEAKER (Mr Thompson) took the Chair.

## PROCLAMATION

The Clerk of the Assembly (Mr B. L. Okely) read the Proclamation of His Excellency the Governor (Rear-Admiral Sir Richard John Trowbridge, K.C.V.O., K.St.J.) summoning the second session of the Thirtieth Parliament.

## VISITORS

*Welcome*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Thompson): In the few minutes prior to the arrival of the Usher of the Black Rod, might I take the opportunity on behalf of the members of this Assembly to extend a cordial welcome to our visitors. I welcome them sincerely and hope they enjoy their stay this evening.

## SUMMONS FROM THE GOVERNOR

The Speaker and members, in response to summons, proceeded to the Legislative Council Chamber; and, having heard His Excellency the Governor (Rear-Admiral Sir Richard John Trowbridge, K.C.V.O., K.St.J.) deliver the opening Speech (*vide* Council report *ante*), returned to the Legislative Assembly Chamber.

## COMMUNITY WELFARE

*Children's Institution, Forrestfield: Petition*

**MR BATEMAN** (Canning) [8.42 p.m.]: I have a petition to present to the House. It reads as follows—

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER  
AND MEMBERS OF THE  
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE  
PARLIAMENT OF WESTERN  
AUSTRALIA IN PARLIAMENT  
ASSEMBLED:

We, the undersigned residents in the State of Western Australia do herewith pray that Her Majesty's Government of Western Australia will urgently support an appeal from the residents of Forrestfield to oppose a proposal by the Department for Community

Welfare to build a Children's Institution in Forrestfield. Your petitioners consider this facility would be better located in Canning Vale (where facilities and community services are more readily available for such an institution) or north of the river to give a better balance of these institutions in the metropolitan area.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will give this matter earnest consideration and your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

The petition bears 3 036 signatures and I have certified that it conforms with the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly.

**THE SPEAKER**: I direct that the petition be brought to the Table of the House.

(*See petition No. 1*).

## QUESTIONS

Questions without notice were taken at this stage.

## MINING AND PETROLEUM RESEARCH BILL

*Leave to Introduce*

**SIR CHARLES COURT** (Nedlands—Premier) [9.13 p.m.]: Without notice, and in order to assert and maintain the undoubted rights and privileges of this House to initiate legislation, I move—

That leave be granted to introduce a Bill for "An Act to promote and co-ordinate research for the development of the mining and petroleum industries, to establish the Western Australian Mining and Petroleum Research Institute and for incidental purposes."

Question put and passed; leave granted.

*Introduction and First Reading*

Bill introduced, on motion by Sir Charles Court (Premier), and read a first time.

## GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

*Distribution of Copies*

**THE SPEAKER** (Mr Thompson): Accompanied by members of this Chamber, I attended His Excellency the Governor in the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Speech which His Excellency was pleased to deliver to members of both Houses of Parliament. For the sake of greater accuracy, I have caused printed

copies of the Speech to be distributed among members of this Chamber.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: FIRST DAY

#### *Motion*

**MR WILLIAMS** (Clontarf) [9.15 p.m.]: I move—

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

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

I acknowledge with pleasure the opportunity to move the Address-in-Reply motion to His Excellency's Speech. In doing so, I will confine my few remarks to the development of our resources.

Mining has always been to the forefront of economic development in Western Australia. As early as 1892 and 1893 the discovery of gold, first in Coolgardie and then in Kalgoorlie, heralded an era of prosperity and development for this State.

In 1890—two years before this gold discovery—the State's population was 48 000. Some 10 years later, as a result of the discovery of gold at Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie, the State's population increased to 180 000. Only another 10 years later, our population had increased to 280 000.

The infrastructure which followed the discovery of gold was quite outstanding, even for those days. Soon after gold was discovered, the railway line to Kalgoorlie was completed, followed by the completion of the water pipeline project. These two developments in themselves created and developed many thriving townships.

In addition, the infrastructure established at that time encouraged primary producers to open up farming land and provided opportunities for the many who came for the gold but stayed to do other things. As farming land was established, so the State's road network spread and additional townships were established.

Until about 1960, this State relied to a great degree on primary production and mining. However, in the early 1960s a new and exciting dimension in development was experienced in this State, with resources the like of which had never before been seen. I believe the Government of the day deserves to be complimented for its initiatives

and expertise, firstly in breaking down the barriers of the Commonwealth's persistence in refusing to allow the export of iron ore and, secondly, in encouraging and enticing both Australian and overseas companies to invest in our State.

From those humble beginnings, through the initiatives taken by the Government of the day, in conjunction with companies such as Goldsworthy Mining Associates, Hamersley Iron, Mt. Newman Mining, and Western Mining Corporation—to name but a few—the export of iron ore from Western Australia alone, which in 1966 amounted to \$69.5 million, today has increased to some \$1 500 million.

Likewise, in that same period, the work force in the mining industry increased from 8 000 to over 21 000, representing a significant annual growth rate of 10 per cent. The increase in mining activity also produced a significant increase in the work force of related industries such as commerce, the professions, the service industries, and the community in general. Direct employment in resources development has increased by 20 000 while over the same 20-year period the overall work force of this State increased by 300 000. So, the multiplying effect of the mining industry is quite obvious.

Let us look to the future. The investment in resources development in Australia over the next five years is estimated to be \$34 000 million; of this amount, Western Australia is expected to share in \$12 000 million, or nearly 40 per cent of the total. When it is considered that only 8.5 per cent of the population of Australia live in Western Australia, it is seen this is a mighty effort indeed. This 8.5 per cent of the nation's population already is responsible for producing 20 per cent of the nation's exports. When the vast developments of the next five years come to fruition, that proportion could easily increase to 30 per cent of the nation's exports.

**Mr Bryce:** Who owns it?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The inflow of outside capital into Australia last year was \$3 000 million and this year it is expected to total \$4 000 million. While these are large sums of money it must be realised that they are helping with the development of Western Australia. Western Australia could not develop its resources without these moneys because of the limited amount of money available in Australia for work on resources such as these. Therefore, the Commonwealth Government should realise this and relax the Australian equity that it requires for such projects.

Mr Tonkin: And leave an empty quarry.

Mr WILLIAMS: The maximum Australian participation is desirable. However, we must take a reasonable attitude towards implementing these guidelines.

By 1984 it is expected that another 11 000 persons will be required in the construction work force. However, this figure is conjecture because in certain areas it is already considered that the figure could increase to as high as 21 000 or 22 000 because of the consequential and other growth. When one bears in mind the past experience of the infrastructure and the multipliers the mind boggles at the number of workers who will be required both in the mining industry and the non-related industries. All this is finally measured in terms of people, and most important of all the increased numbers of families which will make up our community. Frankly, that is what it is all about—people.

With vast numbers of workers being required for our future development, the Government has achieved a great deal by providing a manpower planning committee. It is a tripartite group including the trade union movement, the Confederation of Western Australian Industry, and the Government. This committee has been planning as far as is practicable to cope with the problems of the massive developments which are expected in the near future and, above all, to provide a work force where the majority of the work on the construction sites can be done by Western Australians.

We have three alternatives: either we train our own tradesmen, we look overseas for skilled tradesmen, or we have a blend of the two. Fortunately, the third alternative is the obvious choice. The committee has decided that the manpower should mainly be trained in Western Australia and so it approached the Government which in turn approached the Federal Government and jointly these Governments have funded a \$12 million programme to train 1 000 persons in the metal trades. Already schemes have been established to train people in the building industry: people such as scaffolders and riggers.

This approach is most commendable. It is one which will give additional benefits to many of our young people and will add to the already record number of apprentices being trained in this State.

Knowing the vast sums of money involved, the vast number of projects involved, the work force involved, and the training programmes involved we should appreciate that none of this can be achieved if we have industrial problems. I cite one

of those industrial problems now, and I refer to the Hamersley dispute last year.

Mr Barnett: Did you say "cite" or "incite"?

Mr WILLIAMS: That strike lasted 95 days and cost \$95 million in export income. It also cost the employees \$7 million in lost wages, which in itself is a disgrace. The State Government also lost \$4.4 million in royalties. It must be appreciated that the royalties from these companies are absorbed in programmes such as the building of roads, hospitals, and schools.

Mr Hodge: Not so much in hospitals.

Mr WILLIAMS: Every time such a strike occurs it places an added burden on the taxpayer, who has to meet the loss because of the loss of the royalties. The taxpayer either has to pay more direct tax or have fewer services.

A further problem which is unnecessary and is of concern to the mining companies is the problem of demarcation disputes between unions. Such disputes should never be allowed to create strike action.

Mr Tonkin: It is the policy of your Government!

Mr WILLIAMS: Surely the unions can come together and amicably settle their problems. If they cannot they should take their dispute to arbitration immediately and let the matter be quickly settled in that way. Demarcation disputes are not a cause for strike action. Furthermore, no company should expect to suffer strike action because of a demarcation dispute and, frankly, no Government should allow this to happen.

Mr Tonkin: Why does not the Government change its policy and allow amalgamation?

Mr WILLIAMS: Another matter causing concern to mining companies, both Australian and overseas, is the constant clamour by certain sections of the community for a resource tax. It is time people realised that these mining companies are paying their share in company tax. They are also paying millions of dollars in indirect taxes and charges. In addition they are employing thousands of people who in turn are paying tax. It should be realised that from their initial capital investment, the mining companies in the north-west have had to provide two-thirds of this amount for infrastructure costs. For those people who do not understand what is meant by infrastructure, I am referring to ports, railways, roads, water, power, housing, hospitals, and schools.

Mr B. T. Burke: Alcoa paid no tax for five years.

Mr WILLIAMS: People should realise the amount of money, the millions of dollars, so saved by the Western Australian and Australian Governments.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: The companies are also expected to pay royalties. This year the State Government alone expects to receive \$88 million.

Mr B. T. Burke: Less than Jamaica receives.

Mr WILLIAMS: How much more can these companies be expected to pay? Recent studies show that some projects are paying 66.4 per cent of their income to Governments in taxation. When members consider that in countries such as Canada, India, and South Africa comparable companies are paying to their Governments only 54.6 per cent, I would say that the Australian Government is receiving 12 per cent more than the norm.

My concern is that if we are not careful we will kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Mr Speaker, this State is set to enjoy a sound development programme of greater magnitude than at any time before and including the exciting

1960s. It will take all sections of the community, all sections of the labour movement, and all sections of industry to make this a reality. The gavel is in our hands. With good management and strong Government, and above all, common sense, this goal will be achieved.

Government members: Hear, hear!

MR SPRIGGS (Darling Range) [9.29 p.m.]:  
Mr Speaker—

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat and the House will come to order!

Mr SPRIGGS: I formally second the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Mr Davies (Leader of the Opposition).

#### ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE: SPECIAL

SIR CHARLES COURT (Nedlands—Premier)  
[9.30 p.m.]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday, 24 March.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.31 p.m.*

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

**HOSPITAL: ROYAL PERTH**

*Cardiothoracic Unit*

1. Mr DAVIES, to the Premier:

During the Premier's reported visit to Royal Perth Hospital last Monday, why did he dismiss the complaints of distressed cardiac patients and their worried relatives about inadequate facilities in the hospital as being hospital administrative matters, when in fact the problems arose because of his Government's failure to make available to the hospital adequate resources to provide proper facilities?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

In answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question: I want to make it clear that I have never, at any stage, dismissed the Government's responsibility in the matter at all. What I did explain to the people concerned, who had obviously been arranged there by someone in a high position in the hospital to try to cause the maximum amount of embarrassment—

Mr Davies: That is a rotten thing to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order!

Mr B. T. Burke: Passing the buck again.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Davies: Say that outside the House.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I have said it already, and more.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will resume his seat. It grieves me to have to issue a warning at this early stage of the Parliament. If those who are answering questions are subjected to harassment from members on the other side of the House then I will curtail questions without notice.

I ask members of the House to give the Premier the opportunity to answer the question in the same way the Leader of the Opposition was able to ask the question.

Sir CHARLES COURT: I explained to the people who confronted me that the Government had made adequate financial facilities of an ever-increasing

nature available to the Health portfolio of this State and that it was important they understood that. The sum of \$539 million is a very large part of any State Budget and I suggested to them that the remedy—to make better use of this money—was in the hands of the administration and of the profession itself. The Government has adopted a concerned attitude, and I believe a very practical one.

**LIQUOR**

*Western Australian Wines*

2. Mr STEPHENS, to the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) What does the Minister's department do to promote Western Australian wines—

- (a) locally;
- (b) interstate;
- (c) overseas?

(2) Is the Minister aware that the Australian wine industry, including internationally acclaimed wine personalities, has expressed surprise after being shown the Western Australian Parliament House wine list?

(3) Is the Minister aware that the Western Australian Parliament House wine list—

- (a) contains several Eastern States wines that are recognised for their lack of distinction;
- (b) is not representative of the major wine growing areas of Western Australia;
- (c) does not contain several Western Australian red, white and fortified wines that have received world-wide acclaim and have been judged to be among the best in the world?

(4) Is the Minister aware that as a member of the Joint House Committee he is in a position to influence the selection of wines purchased to stock the Western Australian Parliament House dining room and refreshment room?

(5) What action has the Minister taken to correct—

- (a) the poor standard of wines available at the Western Australian Parliament House dining room and refreshment room:—

The SPEAKER: I ask the member to resume his seat. The first part of the honourable member's question was in order: that is, the earlier part when he asked the Minister what his department was doing to promote Western Australian wines. That part of the question which related to the wines which are served and are available at Parliament House is clearly not a matter which is within the ministerial jurisdiction of the Minister. It is a matter for the House Committee, and the honourable member knows that well. The member can communicate with that committee.

I would suggest that the rest of the member's question is related to wines served in Parliament House. If further parts of the question come within the responsibility of the Minister's department then the member may continue to ask his question.

Mr STEPHENS: I will conclude my question by asking: What action does the Minister propose to take?

Mr OLD replied:

Mr Speaker, I am a little sad that you have ruled the last part of the question out of order because I would have loved to answer it. In answer to the member for Stirling—

(1) to (5) My department provides extensive technical assistance to the local wine industry, and that is well known to the member; if indeed he takes an interest in the wine industry, as he has evidenced tonight.

My department provides extensive technical assistance to the local wine industry. It has helped to initiate, plan and conduct several seminars in the three major wine producing areas in the State. Marketing and promotion have been major topics at these meetings. In co-operation with the Department of Industrial Development and Commerce my department has been involved in a number of inter-State and overseas activities to promote Western Australian wines. As Minister for Agriculture and not as a member of the House Committee, I have been very active in this House to ensure

that a very good range of Western Australian wines is made available in the dining room.

It is untrue to say that the major wine producing parts in this State are not represented because something like 15 Western Australian wines from the Swan Valley, Margaret River, and the Frankland area are available in this House. As to the quality, I submit that is a matter of opinion. My belief is that they are of excellent quality and I am very proud of them.

### HOSPITAL: ROYAL PERTH

#### *Cardiothoracic Unit*

3. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

I refer to a statement made by the Minister on a radio news bulletin at 8.00 a.m. today. In that bulletin the Minister blamed the problems at Royal Perth Hospital on the administration. In a further statement at 8.30 a.m. the Minister blamed the Commonwealth. Then, in another statement later in the morning the Minister said the situation arose because of competition and empire building between the hospitals.

In view of the apparent confusion as to where the blame should lie, when will the Minister admit to the truth of what is happening to the welfare of people in Western Australia? It may be that a person's death was caused by the actions of the State Government.

When does the Minister intend to grasp the Westminster principle of ministerial responsibility and take the responsibility of his own decisions and those of the Government in the health field?

Mr YOUNG replied:

In answer to the last part of the question: One of the very important principles of the Westminster system of Government is the fact that the Premier and the Treasurer of this State bring down a Budget every year and the Government is judged by that Budget, and the way the finances of the State are run. I am quite happy to take my share of the responsibility for the

Budget, as every member on this side would do.

During the preparation of the Budget, the Premier made it very clear—he also explained to the House—that the increases in nurses' wages and those of other hospital employees meant the wages would have to be absorbed within the hospital system.

It is not true, as the member for Melville claims, that people have blamed the death of a person at Royal Perth Hospital on the Government of Western Australia.

Mr E. T. Evans: Didn't you read this morning's paper?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr YOUNG: Those people were critical of the system and were calling for more funds to be made available, as well as more beds. It is totally wrong to suggest that the Western Australian Government is entirely to blame or is partly to blame for the situation that exists in the hospital system in this State.

Mr E. T. Evans: Well, South Australia.

Mr YOUNG: I heard an interjection from the other side of the House. I remind members on the other side of the House that New South Wales has had to close 800 beds, and that is under a Government different from the Government of this State. Similarly in Tasmania which has had a Labor Government for a number of years, the hospital system is near collapse.

We must keep in perspective the fact that we are looking at a single frame in the film of time, and at the moment that frame shows there is increasing pressure on the Royal Perth Hospital.

Mr Skidmore: What about looking after the sick for a change?

Mr YOUNG: This has been caused by a number of different factors which the member for Melville would well know. One is the increased demand caused by the overall system, and I admit quite readily that I blame this on Canberra, and I have done so on a number of occasions.

Secondly, there is an increased demand on the super-specialties provided by the Royal Perth Hospital caused by an

increase in expertise and technology, and probably this is quite proper from the point of view of both the people who perform those specialised services and the patients.

Mr Skidmore: Are you suggesting they should not carry on that way?

Mr YOUNG: I want to make it perfectly clear that there were no cuts in the budget of the hospital system in this State. What had to happen was a rearrangement of priorities, and I referred to that this morning. As a result of wage increases, a rearrangement of the general facilities available within those hospitals had to be made to enable them to balance their budgets.

Although I would like to see the situation come about where we can decant patients from the Royal Perth Hospital into peripheral hospitals, and in turn decant some patients from the peripheral hospitals into the private hospital system, that cannot come about until the Federal Government changes the existing system of health and the health insurance system of this country.

## ABORIGINES

### *Employment*

4. Mr GREWAR, to the Minister for Labour and Industry:

(1) Has the State Government participated in the national strategy designed to stimulate the employment of Aborigines?

(2) If "Yes", to what extent?

Mr O'CONNOR replied:

I thank the honourable member for some notice of the question.

An Opposition member: Yes, three months!

Mr O'CONNOR: The Opposition can be smart if it wishes. The answer is as follows—

(1) and (2) Since October 1978, the Western Australian Government has been participating in the national strategy designed to stimulate the employment of Aborigines. The Public Service Board has been the co-ordinating agency for the Government departments and instrumentalities.

Under this programme costs incurred during the training period—generally 39 weeks—including wages, leave, living-

away-from-home allowances, and travelling allowance are recovered in full from the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Youth Affairs under the NEAT scheme.

Up to the present 283 Aboriginal persons have been taken in as trainees, of these 26 being employed since 1 January 1981, as follows—

- 13 Agriculture Department
- 11 Agriculture Protection Board
- 9 Community Welfare Department
- 6 Department of Corrections
- 3 Crown Law Department
- 18 Education Department
- 1 WA Egg Marketing Board
- 2 Fire Brigades Board
- 1 Fremantle Port Authority
- 2 Forests Department
- 3 Government Stores Department
- 2 Government Printer
- 2 Hospital Boards
- 2 Karrakatta Cemetery Board
- 1 Department of Labour and Industry
- 3 Main Roads Department
- 67 Medical Department
- 4 Metropolitan Water Board
- 1 Perth Museum
- 1 Perth Mint
- 1 Probation and Parole Board
- 26 Public Health Department
- 2 Public Service Board
- 11 Public Works Department
- 13 Regional Administration
- 57 State Energy Commission
- 2 State Engineering Works
- 1 State Government Insurance Office
- 12 State Housing Commission
- 2 Department of Tourism
- 2 Town Planning Department
- 1 Treasury Department
- 1 Department of Industrial Development

283

#### HOSPITAL: ROYAL PERTH

##### *Cardiothoracic Unit*

#### 5. Mr DAVIES, to the Minister for Health:

When did the Minister for Health first become aware of the inadequate

facilities at the Royal Perth Hospital cardiothoracic unit, and why has he done nothing about it, bearing in mind that last year the Government amended the Hospitals Act to give the Minister the right to take action in just such a situation?

Mr YOUNG replied:

I do not know what relationship the Leader of the Opposition draws between amendments made in legislation last year and any tests that I might take in respect of the running of a department of surgery.

Mr Davies: You gave yourself the power to direct hospitals, you might recall. You introduced the Bill.

Mr YOUNG: To direct hospitals to do what?

Mr Davies: To take specific action—whatever you like.

Mr YOUNG: Either the Leader of the Opposition was advised very badly, or he does not recall very accurately the legislation that was enacted.

Mr Davies: I do not think you do.

Mr YOUNG: I gave myself the power to reappoint boards, and to reappoint the chairmen of those boards.

Mr Davies: And direct boards.

Mr YOUNG: I have never wanted, and I would never take upon myself, as a layman, the power to direct medical practitioners on the way they run a unit.

Mr Davies: Of course not.

Mr YOUNG: The day I did that would be the day the Leader of the Opposition could call quite properly for my resignation.

Mr Davies: We will call now.

Mr YOUNG: The Leader of the Opposition asked when I first became aware of the problem in the cardiothoracic unit in the Royal Perth Hospital. I cannot give him an exact date, but I spoke with cardiothoracic surgeons in my office some three weeks ago. From the day I spoke to those surgeons, I have been working to try to bring about some form of reassessment of priorities in the Royal Perth Hospital and, within the financial restraints of the Budget, to see what could take place to assist that unit.

Mr Davies: How are you going to do it if you can't direct the unit? You have just said you cannot direct the medical practitioners.

Mr YOUNG: Certainly I would not intend to direct them.

Mr Davies: Well how are you going to do it?

Mr YOUNG: I am talking about my rightful role in respect of the management of funds.

Mr Davies: You have trapped yourself.

Mr O'Connor: He has not.

Mr YOUNG: I have discussed with the hospital board ways in which the situation might be relieved. Quite contrary to the belief of the Leader of the Opposition, I understand the problems of the cardiothoracic surgeons. I have been working as assiduously as I can to try to overcome the problem. I believe that with a little bit of goodwill on the part of the hospital the problems can be overcome.

Mr Skidmore: How can the hospital give you goodwill?

Mr YOUNG: I have had further talks with the hospital today, and I will have more discussions in the future. I believe most of the problems can be overcome, but that does not solve the main problem I referred to in my reply to the member for Melville.

## HOSPITAL: ROYAL PERTH

### *Deterioration of Service*

#### 6. Mr HODGE, to the Minister for Health:

I direct the Minister's attention to the fourth paragraph in the leading article on the first page of today's edition of *The West Australian*. It reads as follows—

Professor Lawrence Beilin, WA University professor of medicine at RPH, said that the service the hospital was providing was deteriorating as a result of State Government policies.

In view of that very clear, definite statement made by a senior professional medical person at the hospital, how can he still persevere with his claim that the medical profession at the Royal Perth Hospital is not blaming the State

Government for deterioration of services in that hospital?

Mr YOUNG replied:

I spoke this afternoon with Professor Beilin and Professor Taylor, and part of that interview will be telecast on the "Nationwide" programme tonight. Both the professors made it clear to me that they were not entirely blaming the Western Australian Government for the situation, and indeed, Professor Taylor made it very clear that he understood the great pressures that were being put on the State Government as a result of the Commonwealth policy.

Mr H. D. Evans: Can't you do anything with your colleagues?

Mr YOUNG: Both professors made it fairly clear to me that they recognised the general problem. I admit that perhaps Professor Beilin expressed a greater condemnation of the State Government in what he had to say, but generally speaking most people at the hospital are aware of the situation confronting us, and that situation is very difficult for the State Government to overcome.

## STATE FINANCE

### *State Income Tax*

#### 7. Mr BRYCE, to the Premier:

In view of the Premier's flat rejection of a resources tax, and in view of the inevitable further cutback in Western Australia's share of tax funds from the Commonwealth, can he still guarantee the members of this Parliament that his Government will not introduce a State income tax?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

The member for Ascot makes some presumptions that I think ill become him. First of all, it is not for him to say it is inevitable that we are going to have any cuts. As far as I am concerned we will fight to the bitter end to ensure that we obtain the maximum funds available, and I think he knows in his heart that is just what I will do. We have opposed a resources tax and we will continue to oppose it. I imagine that, like us, the member would like to see the resource development of this State take place at

an ever-increasing rate, as well as enjoy the extra benefits that can come from the added value through processing. Without the resources development we cannot have the benefits of the second phase through processing. Heaven forbid that we ever had a Labor Government in Canberra because it would be committed to a resources tax.

So far as State income tax is concerned, he knows that all State Premiers have told the Prime Minister in the bluntest of terms that they are not prepared to go along with that part of his new federalism tax-sharing arrangement.

#### SIR WALLACE KYLE

##### *Repairs to Residence*

#### 8. Mr JAMIESON, to the Premier:

- (1) With reference to his \$6 000 handout to the ex-Governor, and in view of his statements that he agreed to pay half the cost of repairs to Sir Wallace Kyle's home when he visited him in July 1980, is he aware that Sir Wallace has claimed that the matter was made official and agreed to before Sir Wallace took the appointment of Governor of Western Australia?
- (2) Did he give any assurance to Sir Wallace about his residence prior to his appointment as Governor? If "Yes", was the matter discussed by Cabinet?
- (3) Did the Premier consult with other members of the Government before agreeing to give Sir Wallace Kyle \$6 000 when he visited him at Sir Wallace's home in July 1980?

Sir CHARLES COURT replied:

- (1) to (3) Off the cuff, I could not say whether there was a specific arrangement with Sir Wallace prior to his taking up the appointment. I am not saying there was not such an arrangement, but I have no recollection of an arrangement.

Mr Davies: You know there was not.

Sir CHARLES COURT: However, I will certainly refer to the files on the matter to ascertain whether an arrangement was entered into. I gather the member for Welshpool is claiming Sir Wallace Kyle has said such an arrangement existed. I will certainly check that matter for the honourable member.

However, in regard to the arrangement to make a sensible settlement of a problem which I believe we had a moral obligation to deal with, I point out to the House that I took it upon myself at the time to work out the detail of what was involved and arrived at a contribution, certainly not by any means to cover the full loss incurred but to cover what I thought was a reasonable proportion. As soon as I returned to Western Australia, naturally, I reported to my colleagues. If the member for Welshpool thinks that is an exceptional way of doing things, I just give up. That was the only way the matter could be handled. I also like to feel the Opposition would acknowledge that in view of the service of the former Governor and of the moral issue involved, the Government's action was no more than responsible; certainly, we were not over-generous.