

## **KIMBERLEY LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS PRECINCT**

### *Motion*

Resumed from 21 October on the following motion moved by Hon Jon Ford —

- (1) That this house expresses its concern at the comments made by the Premier to the Committee for Economic Development Australia conference on Tuesday, 3 March 2009 in which he referred to a proposed LNG precinct to the north of Broome and stated —

... we are proceeding in developing an LNG precinct to the north of Broome. That's not the spectacular part of the Kimberley coast, it's flat tableland, no people living within probably 30 or 40 kilometres of the area ... That's important, we're trying to do that by negotiation, the timetable is the end of this month. If we can't do it by negotiation, the State will resume the land. I'll do that reluctantly, but we will do it. We will not hold up economic development and we will not deny the people of the Kimberley—and particularly the Aboriginal people—the opportunity from some economic independence and some economic security.
- (2) That this house calls on the Premier to —
  - (a) explain how he can claim to be negotiating in good faith when he put on public record that if he does not get a negotiated outcome, he will resume the land to develop an LNG precinct to the north of Broome; and
  - (b) explain why he is presenting a veiled threat to Indigenous people in respect of this matter and whether this is a sign of things to come.

**HON KEN BASTON (Mining and Pastoral)** [11.11 am]: Yesterday I commented on a newspaper article by Robert Taylor, referred to by Hon Jon Ford, that appeared in *The West Australian* on 28 April. It refers to a signing of an agreement at James Price Point. It states in part —

Yesterday, everyone participating in the ceremonial signing of an agreement between the site's traditional owners, the Jabirr Jabirr people, gas giant Woodside and the State and Federal governments for use of the land made a point of saying they would do everything possible to preserve the area's environment, natural and cultural heritage.

I have already mentioned that the minister has made a statement about Camden Sound and the whales. The article continues —

Easier said than done. The other word bandied about a lot was “trust”, which is what many local people are relying on to deliver them the benefits of a \$30 billion project which they hope will see them collect up to \$2 billion in compensation over 30 years.

One of the most important points of the article comes next. It states —

“We're actually talking about a future that is inclusive for all of you, for all of your children and all the other children of the region,” ...

That was a quote from the Legislative Assembly member for Kimberley, Carol Martin. She is a well-known member of Parliament in the Kimberley and is, of course, the first Indigenous woman to be a member of the Western Australian Parliament. She stated —

“If we need industry we've got to trust them to do the right thing. I'm willing to trust them.”

Carol Martin is willing to trust the Premier and the deals that he has done, and I think that is fantastic. Another article that appeared in *The West Australian* on 31 March 2009 had the heading, “Martin tells anti-gas hub celebrities to butt out”. The article states —

Kimberley MP Carol Martin has backed a gas hub at James Price Point 50km north of Broome and told Eastern States activists such as Midnight Oil band member Rob Hirst to “piss off” to their own communities.

She was actually a little more explicit than that, I might add! The article continues —

Ms Martin said the gas hub would help ease poverty for local Aboriginals and told Hirst and others who have campaigned against the plan to “butt out”.

I admire her for her stand. She obviously has the support of the people of the Kimberley, otherwise she would not have been re-elected. She has spoken out very succinctly on that matter.

There are other things that we need to think about when considering where the gas hub should be placed. I have mentioned the suggestion of a pipeline from the Burrup Peninsula, where all the other liquefied natural gas precincts are. There is also the issue of security, and we need to make plans. We have already seen the disruption that can be wreaked on our domestic gas supply by incidents such as the Varanus Island hiccup. If we are going to think about the future, we need to ensure that LNG hubs are placed further apart from each other for security reasons. If there had been an explosion at the Burrup Peninsula, one can imagine the damage that would have occurred; we were pretty lucky that it happened on an island. Dare I say it—the possibility must not be ruled out—there is also the risk of a terrorist attack. That could cause enormous damage to Western Australia and shut us down. The effect of the Varanus Island explosion was that some 30 per cent of our domestic gas supply was cut off; imagine the damage that could be brought about by an act of terrorism upon our LNG hubs. It is very important that we look strategically at where our LNG hubs are placed so that they can be protected.

We also have to be careful that we do not create the perception—particularly in the eastern states, where all the voters are—that the LNG precinct at James Price Point will wipe out the entire Kimberley. I will relate to members a little incident that happened recently. I was sitting on a plane, travelling to Broome, next to a young lady who was travelling to Broome from Sydney for a holiday. She was a lawyer; during a two-hour flight, one finds out quite a bit about the person one is sitting next to, if the person wants to learn about what is happening in the Kimberley. She asked me about the proposed LNG precinct, what it represented and how big it was. She said that it was a big issue in Sydney and that people were talking about it. The last thing her mother said to her before she left Sydney was, “Darling, make sure you take a flight over the Kimberley while you’re there, because it won’t be there much longer.” That relates to the statistics I alluded to at the beginning of my speech. Before we landed in Broome, I pointed out to her the site of the proposed LNG precinct—we were high enough to be able to see it from the aircraft—and that put things into perspective for her. I asked her to reassure her mother that the Kimberley certainly was not lost!

Perhaps this motion should have been amended to read, “That this house congratulates the Premier for the comments made at the Economic Development Australia conference and the certainty that they brought to the negotiations leading to positive outcomes for the proposed LNG precinct at James Price Point.” Perhaps then the government could have supported the motion; we would have been right behind a motion of that ilk. However, I will not move the amendment. As Hon Jon Ford said when he moved this motion, a lot of water has gone under the bridge and we have moved on. I think that many people can see the advantages of the Premier’s vision to give the people of the Kimberley, including the Indigenous people, the opportunity for employment.

Hon Jon Ford made reference to how we are regarded internationally. We are providing an example internationally and demonstrating that we are prepared to get on with projects, get projects moving and that we are prepared to do business here in Western Australia. We will cut delays for the benefit of all Western Australians. The benefits of the LNG precinct will flow to the region, to Western Australia and to Australia as a nation. We are all beneficiaries of this project, and the benefits to the Kimberley will be huge. When I ask Indigenous taxidrivens in Broome what they think, they very quickly tell me that they cannot wait to have more than just tourism in that area, as that lasts for only seven months a year, and they need longevity of jobs for the whole year.

I will not go on any longer. I have made the point about the value of this project and the value of some firm judgement by the Premier in coming to a decision on a very acceptable site, and I look forward to its development over time.

**HON ROBIN CHAPPLE (Mining and Pastoral) [11.20 am]:** I thank members for their contributions to date. The motion we are dealing with was moved by Hon Jon Ford, which enables members to stand and address many of the issues arising from his motion. First, I must congratulate the Labor Party for its approach to the development of this area. The Labor Party created the Northern Development Taskforce. The Northern Development Taskforce comprises a wide-reaching group of people that was going through a site-identification process. Many sites—in fact, many hundreds of sites—were being looked at by the Northern Development Taskforce. The people on that task force had worked tirelessly, at some level with a degree of concern, to come up with a process that was accepted by the community and, indeed, was environmentally the most suitable location. In that regard many people were on that group representing many organisations. I will not name them all, but the group was chaired by Duncan Ord, and Duncan was doing a pretty exceptional job in a very difficult circumstance.

The groups that were on that body were the Pearl Producers Association of the Kimberley, tourism groups, representatives of the environment groups, the Kimberley Land Council and many others. A series of meetings was held both here in Perth and in the regions, and the task force was going through a genuine, legitimate

process. It was bringing all the people together in one forum to nut out their concerns and to come up with a potential location for gas development in the Kimberley.

Although I say “come up with a potential location for gas development in the Kimberley”, the terms of reference actually extended well beyond the Kimberley. This was modified after the initial meetings of the Northern Development Taskforce when concerns were raised that brownfield sites that existed in the Pilbara were not being considered. Both at federal and state levels it was agreed that areas outside the Kimberley should be looked at as potential locations for a gas hub; indeed, the issue of whether we should be looking at a gas hub for some of the security-based reasons we heard the honourable member opposite speak about was considered.

There is an issue sometimes that in creating a gas hub environment, facilities are put too close together. Although there are synergies of economics and scale by having one gas hub, from a security perspective there can be some difficulties. I go back to the Varanus Island incident, when the Varanus plant was knocked out because the two pipelines that were feeding out of that were in close proximity, so that when one went, the other one—although it did not actually go—was damaged to an extent that it could not be utilised. There is therefore some value in establishing gas hubs a discrete distance from one another.

Having said that, I have in front of me a map of the various places that were being considered. As I said, there were most probably 80-odd in the original issue that were being considered by the Northern Development Taskforce. It is interesting to note that, as that group got together, with advice from federal and state environmental experts, areas were moved in and out of the decision-making process. I am not talking about the final analysis, as we never actually got to that because, unfortunately, the Northern Development Taskforce was knocked on the head by this government when it came to power.

However, we had got to the point at an early stage at which we had narrowed it down to two or three islands and a number of locations on the coast. It had been narrowed down to Gourdon Bay, which is just south of Broome; Quandong Point; James Price Point, where the project is now proposed to go; North Head; Perpendicular Head; Packer Island; Koolan Island; Wilson Point; the Maret Islands; and the deliberations were still going on. My understanding is that by the time the Northern Development Taskforce had come to its final conclusions, North Head had also been removed from its thinking.

It was, therefore, of interest that, after the election was concluded and the coalition was established, the Premier came out and said completely off the cuff that it would be located at North Head. I am aware that many of the people involved in the processing asked, “Where did that come from?” It was not even in our thinking at that stage; it was not even in the committee’s thinking; or, indeed, the department’s thinking. It seemed to be one of those knee-jerk reactions that we tend to get from the Premier from time to time. I remember the canal we were going to have; I remember a number of other issues that have always just been trotted out on a whim, rather than by checking with departments and others.

When it comes to the Browse Basin gas development, as I say, the Northern Development Taskforce had been meeting and having lengthy discussions with the traditional owners, the KLC and others who are not party to the KLC. There seems to be some idea that the KLC represents all Indigenous claimants; that is not the case. The KLC represents a large majority of claimants right across the Kimberley, but it is interesting to note that the KLC does not represent the traditional owner from that area, Mr Joe Roe. Joe Roe is a former member of the KLC and has made a number of statements recently. Probably the most important one was in *The Weekend Australian* of Saturday, 3 October 2009. In an article by Nicolas Perpitch, Mr Roe, as the cultural representative of the area, was asked whether he would support the development at James Price Point. The article states —

He says he voted no as part of his responsibilities to protect the cultural “songline” from north of the Dampier Peninsula to James Price Point and south to Bidyadanga. “I don’t think you’ve got to give up one part of the area to save the Kimberley. I want to keep my culture and heritage alive, not destroy it,”  
...

Roe says it’s up to the federal and state governments to support health, education and other basics, and these shouldn’t be dependent on a land deal.

That is, dependent on an LNG hub. I think one of the problems we face, whether it be in the Kimberley, the communities of Roebourne or wherever else, is that there seems to be some imperative that, rather than supplying the services that Indigenous communities should be entitled to, we force Indigenous people to negotiate a financial outcome so that they themselves can supply the very things that, indeed, this government, past governments and even the federal government should be providing to those communities. Indigenous communities are no different from European communities; they deserve exactly the same level of service and succour. Having said that, I point out that there are many areas in the Kimberley, irrespective of race, culture or creed, that are crying out for services. I do not think those services should be dependent on whether those communities accept a liquefied natural gas hub on their doorstep.

In relation to the other options that were put to the Northern Development Taskforce, two areas were being looked at. The first was the heavy industrial area of the Hedland industrial estate, which was formally the home of the BHP Billiton hot briquetted iron plant. This is an area that has all the gazettals; it has no cultural issues and, as such, is an ideal location for such a facility. In fact, we know that Woodside has been looking at options for the location of the Browse Basin development. It is interesting to note that, in that debate, Woodside seems to be arguing with its joint venture partners. Of the two options that seem to be on the cards at the moment, there is further development on the Burrup Peninsula and/or development in the Kimberley where, in fact, \$140 million closer to the Browse Basin development, in terms of pipeline infrastructure, is the Port Hedland industrial estate. This is an industrial estate that has a deepwater channel already leading to it. The local government in that area, the Town of Port Hedland, has actively sought the gas development for location in its community, and has accordingly passed a motion in its council. That motion has been sent to government, seeking the development of LNG facilities at that location. That location, or even the potential location of Ronsard Island a bit further south from there, would provide an opportunity for a stand-alone gas development that does not impinge on the Kimberley or, as the Premier has rightly stated, on the rock art of the Burrup Peninsula, and goes to suitable land with deepwater access. It also resolves the commercial risk associated with the joint siting of LNG facilities.

I really want to touch on what Woodside's role is in all of this. Given the Premier's statement about North Head and what is in the documents supplied to the Northern Development Taskforce, it is interesting to ask: guess who wanted North Head? It was Woodside. The Premier seems to have made his call on the basis of the interests, not of the community and not of an assessment process, but of his mate Don Voelte. In that regard, I attended a meeting called by Woodside on Monday, 4 May, at the Hilton Hotel in Mill Street. A lot of people attended the meeting. It was supposed to be a report-back on Woodside's Pluto development. As I have a longstanding interest in the Pluto development, I went to that meeting, not fully aware of what the meeting was going to be about. It was the usual cocktail soiree involving federal and state ministers of the Crown, industry leaders, the Chamber of Minerals and Energy et cetera. Having enjoyed the alcohol and the nibbles, we were called into another room where Don Voelte and another chief executive officer of the Pluto project gave, I think, a three-slide PowerPoint presentation, and then it basically stopped. The three-slide presentation showed three sets of pictures about how the Pluto development was going. Then the executives proceeded to go off on a tangent and started berating the audience about the ability of joint venture partners in a development to have more say over the development than the proponent. They said that they were seeking changes from both state and federal governments to allow the single proponent to override the interests of its joint venture partners and have the development located where it wanted. This meeting had nothing to do with Pluto. I could see among the audience the little light bulbs going on all over the place when it was realised that this was just a beat-up by Woodside to try to convince those present to override Shell and the other joint venture partners in the Browse Basin development—BHP and others—who have the desire to move the plant away from the Kimberley—not on environmental grounds and not on the grounds that I might espouse, but on economic grounds.

**Hon Jon Ford:** I was at that meeting. My recollection of it was that they were seeking a majority decision to override so that there was not a single participant able to veto the whole project.

**Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE:** That is correct. But having spoken to the proponents to find out their positions on it, it appears that the only company that has an interest in going to the North Head development is, indeed, Woodside. I have, luckily, been able to speak to some of the corporations, and there is a divergence of views. Some of the corporations want to hold off on the development and husband the resource; others are considering a floating LNG facility; and others want the development to go to the Burrup. I think it is the relationship between Mr Voelte and the Premier that pushed this North Head idea; whereas, in fact, the Northern Development Taskforce, of which I was a member, was indeed thinking along the lines of James Price Point. It was not a unanimous viewpoint, but it was the viewpoint of the collective of that group.

There are interesting components attached to the Premier going out on a limb and nominating North Head. Comments have been made by the Premier and others that nobody is living in the area. I was there recently and spent a lovely afternoon in a house about six kilometres from James Price Point, enjoying the view and again sipping a glass of wine. I went further up the coast, a little closer to James Price Point, and met a small outstation of Indigenous people, who live very close to the site. There seems to be a complete lack of knowledge about what is actually going on in the immediate area. It is incorrect to describe this area as being devoid of occupation. The mines department is in the process of trying to remove that house, because it is located on a mining lease. However, that mining lease has been exempted from mining under the Mining Act because of its heritage environmental values.

**Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich:** For how long has that house been there?

**Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE:** Most probably for about 30 years. It is a really remarkable place. It is all hand-built out of stone, and it has beautiful arches. Part of the house is in disrepair, but part of it is being lived in. It is in an

idyllic location. We really do need to get away from the notion that this is a flat piece of country and that no-one lives there. Also, as I think Hon Jon Ford has mentioned, many people in the community of Broome visit this area on a regular basis for camping and fishing, because it is easy to get to and is extremely beautiful.

I want to talk also about the environmental values of this area. This area has a range of native flora and fauna, and fish stocks. One of the key issues in this area, and to a degree it was acknowledged by the Minister for Environment recently when she announced the establishment of a marine park at Camden Sound in the Kimberley —

**Hon Donna Faragher:** It was a very good announcement!

**Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE:** It was a tremendous announcement. Unfortunately, it did not go far enough. The reason I say that is that the minister obviously has not read the “Kimberley Cetacean Survey 2009” report. That is a report on the distribution and behaviour of the whale species that visit that area. It is acknowledged, as the minister said in her announcement, that Camden Sound is a breeding area for the humpback whale population. That survey found that more than 1 000 humpback whales visit Camden Sound. Also, 22 000 whales migrate into that area. If 1 000 whales can be found in Camden Sound, where are the other 21 000 whales? I can tell members where they are. Camden Sound is the birthing area for the whales. Therefore, it is a very important area. However, after the whale cows give birth at Camden Sound, they take their juveniles to James Price Point and Pender Bay so that they can go through their education process. I have had the privilege of flying over that area in the past and of filming the whales while they are training their juveniles how to breathe. When the whale cows come up to breathe, they put their juveniles on their backs and transport them up so that they can learn how to breathe at the same time. That is also where they teach their juveniles how to do their whale calls. The whale cows also beat their tails to call the juveniles back in. It is quite spectacular to see that from the air. If a juvenile gets too far away from its mother, the mother starts slapping her tail, and the juvenile comes belting in back to mum, sometimes from more than a kilometre away. All this learning activity and interaction takes place at James Price Point and Pender Bay.

The 2009 Kimberley whale watch survey to which I have referred states that the survey has attempted to compare the relative concentrations of whales between Broome and Camden Sound, and that a new picture has evolved that indicates the importance of the Kimberley coast to this recovering population of humpback whales. I need to explain to members that there are a number of whale breeding groups around the world. Group A is in the south west Atlantic; group B is in the south east Atlantic off the coast of West Africa; group C is in the southern Indian Ocean; group D is in the south-eastern Indian Ocean; group E is the south west Pacific; group F is the central South Pacific; and group G is the south east Pacific. The breeding group that we are obviously interested in is group D, which is in the south west Indian Ocean off the north west coast of Western Australia. The breeding group D population is now thought to be the largest single population of humpbacks in the world. These whales and their habitat should be regarded as one of Australia’s national treasures. However, the continued recovery and survival of these whale species will be assured only if we can provide an adequate level of protection and management for the calving and training grounds of these whales in their trek to the Atlantic and to their main feeding grounds. Therefore, as well as being a diverse environment of flora and fauna, what also makes this region so special is that it is a training ground for the world’s largest breeding population of humpback whales.

As I have said, Camden Sound is where the birthing process takes place. However, further along the coast, where juvenile whales are roaming around and trying to get their training wheels sorted out, so to speak, we will be putting this emerging population of juvenile whales right in the middle of an area of development, and right in the middle of potential prop damage, because they will be in the path of thousands of tonnes of deadweight shipping. Many of the whale populations around the world are showing signs of prop damage. These whales should not be put at risk of that.

I want to talk now about the industrial development of the Kimberley region. We seem to have formed the idea that the Browse Basin proposal, the Woodside proposal and the Inpex proposal were the drivers for this development. They were not. It is clear from the “Regional Minerals Program: Developing the West Kimberley’s Resources: Main Report August 2005”, on which the Northern Development Taskforce was based, that it is about a lot more than that. That is also clear from a report that was produced by Gaffney, Cline and Associates into the development of an LNG industry in the Kimberley. The Northern Development Taskforce—which, as I have said, I support—was limited to dealing just with the proposal to develop an LNG industry in that area. It did not consider any of the downstream and articulation issues associated with that LNG industry. Back in June 2008, when that task force looked at North Head, Perpendicular Head, Quangdong Point, Cockatoo Island, Wilson Point, the Maret Islands and Bigge Island for the development of an LNG industry, one of the key issues was how to get the gas out of the area—that is, what the pipeline routes would need to be, and how long the pipelines would need to be to get that gas to the domestic market. We were not allowed to look at that because

the Northern Development Taskforce was constrained to considering the footprint of an LNG hub, not the associated infrastructure—the roads, the airstrips, the towns or whatever else. At that stage, Perpendicular Head was becoming one of the preferred options, with the pipeline being only 860 kilometres long to get the gas down to the Dampier to Bunbury pipeline.

When we talk about an industrial development, it is never just about the hub; it is about what goes with that hub. That is why I refer back to the August 2005 “Developing the West Kimberley’s Resources” report, put together by ACIL Tasman Pty Ltd and WorleyParsons, and published by the Department of Industry and Resources. Let us have no misconception about what the proposals were. The first thing the report did was to identify what the resources included, as well as LNG, bauxite, lead, coal and iron ore, and that any development on the coast needed to consider the development of all these resources. Any members who are monitoring the mining industry would know that about a third of the Kimberley is under tenements for bauxite held by Norsk Hydro Australia, a Norwegian-based corporation. It is being quite proactive about developing this bauxite resource in the Kimberley, along with a smelter and infrastructure for getting the product to the coast. This is where the 2005 report comes in. It identifies that if we are to have an LNG development in the area, we need to have a hub—a combined industrial facility. It is interesting to see what is also proposed in the 2005 report, when we look at how it anticipates that some of these things will occur. According to the report, once the Browse field is developed and comes on stream—there are many aspects to the Browse field; not just Woodside—a transcontinental pipeline will be developed. The report states —

The location where the pipeline comes ashore from the Browse field must be carefully selected so that the pipeline can easily be constructed, cultural and environmental impact is transitory and minimal.

The pipeline basically runs along the bed of the Fitzroy River until it gets to the Lennard Shelf development, which is halfway to Halls Creek. We must always consider, when we are looking at these developments, that they are always the corollary to other developments. That is one of the problems we quite often face.

This morning I received a briefing from a mining company, whose representatives came to see me. I will not mention the name of the mining company, but I can say that that company was ahead of the game. The representatives said that they would give me the company’s total proposal; not a stand-alone first ambit claim, but what the company anticipates doing over the next 20 years, and the full extent and scope of its proposal. I commend that mining corporation on its approach. Rather than an incremental approach, proposing a small development in one place and then later on announcing a doubling or tripling of its size, this corporation is fair dinkum and came to me in the first instance to tell me its grand plan. Not so the government. The government has a grand plan. It is spelt out in this 2005 report, which lists every commodity, the volumes, and the routes of all the pipelines. However, in dealing with the Browse Basin, the Woodside development of James Price Point, we are told that none of this other stuff will happen; it will not be part of this development. But it is a part, and it is a lie for anybody to go on the record and say that there will only ever be just one development. We know that the Browse Basin fields include many proponents apart from Woodside, who will be looking to develop their resources. We hear that Shell will be developing its resource with a floating process, and many of the others are indicating already in their documents on the internet that they have known carbon dioxide emissions, known volumes of gas and known terajoules that they want to bring onshore. Why, in developing a project like this, are we fixated on Mr Voelte, Woodside, and the Premier’s desire to have a little hub. In fact, the whole issue is much grander than that. I urge the government, and anybody who wants to look at how these resources are to be developed, to look at the whole picture rather than an isolated little pocket. I have talked about the environmental values and where Woodside is taking us with this. It is beholden on the government, rather than listening only to Woodside—which by international standards is a very small LNG corporation—to start asking BHP Billiton, BP, Shell, Chevron and other partners and proponents in the developments of Browse and the Ichthys gas fields what their views are on things. It should not listen only to someone who has the ear of the Premier.

James Price Point is a special part of the Kimberley. It is just one of the ecosystems that evolved to make up a suite of ecosystems that exists throughout the Kimberley. This suite of ecosystems is not now replicated anywhere else in the world, because we have trashed just about every other part of the world, just as we have taken to dealing with the south west. The Kimberley is one of Western Australia and Australia’s last refuges. It is also, I believe, one of the world’s last refuges. We need to go to that area and stop looking at it just as a footprint for industrial development, and start marvelling and appreciating the wonders of an incredibly unique environment, whether it be the Wandjina paintings that proliferate, the rock caves or, further into the east Kimberley, the Bradshaws, the black-headed pythons or the different concentrations of crocodiles and dugongs. Get out there, look at it, appreciate it, and understand that we are the custodians of something that is increasingly important at a global level. If we continue to think about this as just another area to be dug up and shipped out and from which a load of money can be made, that is not the sort of world I believe we should be leaving to our children.

In conclusion, I genuinely encourage members to get up to that country—I am more than happy to go there with them to show them around—and see and appreciate what is there. It is wondrous, and it should not be destroyed by the props of a gas tanker.

**HON NORMAN MOORE (Mining and Pastoral — Minister for Mines and Petroleum)** [12.01 pm]: I have listened with great interest to the contributions of the three members who have spoken on this motion so far, and I would like to make a few comments on each of those contributions.

Hon Jon Ford, who moved the motion, began by telling us that the Labor Party supported the liquefied natural gas precinct at James Price Point, and then spent another two hours telling us why it was a bad decision. That seems to be the way in which the Labor Party operates in this house on a range of issues. The government brings in legislation that is tough on law and order and the Labor Party says it agrees with it, and then it spends the next two or three hours—or days or weeks or however long it takes—telling us what is wrong with the legislation. If Labor Party members want to have two bob each way and sit on the fence, it is entirely up to them, except that the public only hears that, yes, they support something, or, no, they do not support something; the public does not actually listen to the whole debate. That is a pity really, because having two bob each way really does not bode well for any future Labor government being able to make any hard decision.

I listened with great interest to what Hon Jon Ford said because I know he is very passionate about the Kimberley, as are we all. He spent some time trying to denigrate the Premier for putting a bit of pressure on the decision-making process, as if the processes of the previous government were somehow or other going to lead to some sort of conclusion. The Northern Development Taskforce wandered around in circles for a very long time; it was just getting no place.

**Hon Ljiljana Ravlich:** That's a load of nonsense!

**Hon NORMAN MOORE:** The member would not know, because she lived in some strange little environment that was completely divorced from any reality when she was a minister. I do not think she actually knew what she was doing; she certainly did not know what the rest of her colleagues were doing. The election was called six months ahead of time, and during the election campaign I was at a meeting when the Inpex proponents came to tell us that they could not wait any longer for the Labor government to make a decision about a site in the Kimberley on which Inpex could develop an LNG plant. They actually wanted to do it in Western Australia; they wanted to build it in the Kimberley, but they could not get a site. Their patience had expired, and so they took the decision and advised us, during the campaign—but said that we were not allowed to tell anybody—that they would be going to Darwin. They said that they could not even get the Minister for State Development or his chief of staff to take their calls, but at least the opposition had been prepared to meet with them to discuss their concerns. They asked us not to make it a political issue and not to raise the matter publicly because they did not want to get involved in a political debate, and so it was not a political issue during the election campaign from the point of view of the opposition. I understand that other people may have commented about that, but we certainly did not.

However, that told me that we had a government with a Minister for State Development—the now Leader of the Opposition—who was not prepared to make decisions that had to be made to get industrial development in Western Australia. He was not prepared to make decisions at all. Indeed, the Minister for Energy; Resources; Industry and Enterprise, Fran Logan, even told ministerial conferences that Western Australia did not need any more business, and that we already had too much and we could not cope. He told industry not to come to us with their projects because we were too busy and we did not need any more. That whole attitude permeated that government, and it did absolutely nothing.

**Hon Ljiljana Ravlich:** It's gone downhill since you took office—that's for sure!

**Hon NORMAN MOORE:** When this government was elected it was confronted with the Inpex decision to go to Darwin. The former government should bury its head in the sand in total shame. It lost a \$15 billion project because it could not make a decision because it was all too hard. It did all right in government with government revenue because the private sector did all the work; the former government just sat there and watched it all go by. It could not cope and told people not to come here because there was too much business already and Western Australia could not handle any more. It did not understand that the resource industry is all about the future, not about just now. If the mines of tomorrow are not found today, there will not be any; if the gas fields and the oilwells of the future are not found today, there will not be any. Every resource project is finite—it has an end time and it runs out. If this resource industry is to continue to provide the wealth of this nation—not just of this state, but of this nation—people have to get out there and do the exploration and the hard work to attract the investors and the developers for projects that might be 10 or 15 years down the track. But, no, the Carpenter government just sat on its hands and said that we had too much work. It even let Inpex go to Darwin, at an extra cost of probably \$600 million to \$800 million, because it could not find a site in the Kimberley to develop an LNG precinct. How big is the Kimberley, Hon Ken Baston?

**Hon Ken Baston:** It's huge.

**Hon NORMAN MOORE:** It is huge, yes—probably twice the size of Europe, or something such as that. It covers a vast area of the state and has a coastline of thousands of kilometres, but the former government could not find one kilometre of the thousands of kilometres along the Kimberley coast to develop an LNG precinct.

What did it do? It sent off a task force that said to the Aboriginal people that it would decide to go somewhere only if it got informed consent from them. The information process just went on and on and on and on, and no decision was made because it was too hard. The former government could not deal with the political issues, it could not deal with the environmental issues, it could not deal with the native title issues and it could not deal with the Aboriginal heritage issues. It could not deal with any of them because it was just too hard. That is why the Labor Party is sitting over there now—because the people of Western Australia recognised just how incompetent it really was. This Kimberley issue is a classic demonstration of why the Labor Party is now in opposition and sitting over there. It is because it just could not make a decision.

When Hon Colin Barnett became the Premier, he said that we had to make a decision about the Kimberley. As a government, we want a development in the Kimberley—not twice as much at Burrup Peninsula and not an LNG plant in Darwin. We want something in the Kimberley, because the Kimberley economy is two-dimensional—it has the pastoral sector and the tourism industry, with a bit of horticulture on the end. It is a regional economy that needs additional opportunities. The reason we want additional opportunities for the economy of the Kimberley is that the vast majority of people in the Kimberley are Aboriginal people, and the vast majority of unemployed people in the Kimberley are Aboriginal people, and they want something out of this—they want some jobs! They want the wealth that will come from the decisions on the Indigenous Land Use Agreement that will come about in relation to the precinct. As a government, we want to get some development in the Kimberley so that the people of the Kimberley can get employment in the Kimberley. There are Kimberley Aboriginals who fly in and fly out from the Kimberley to the Pilbara to work in the mining industry. Is that what Hon Robin Chapple has in mind for them?

**Hon Robin Chapple:** No.

**Hon NORMAN MOORE:** Should they have to go somewhere else to get a job, or should they sit on their backsides doing nothing for the rest of eternity? That is happening with many of them because there is nothing else to do. That is what this is all about. This is all about opportunities for young people in the Kimberley to have a future in the Kimberley. The potential opportunities for employment and wealth creation that this LNG plant at James Price Point could provide to the Kimberley are immense. It is all about the development of the project, and the ongoing maintenance and operation of the project and the servicing that goes with that. It is about the possibility of supply bases at places like Derby, if that is what the industry decides to do, or the support that the industry gets from Broome. It is about all the opportunities that are available to a vast number of people if this project goes ahead. All we hear from the Labor Party is, "It is a good idea, but ...". We hear from the Greens (WA) that we should not touch anything in the Kimberley at all. That to me is an absolute indictment on the Greens. As far as they are concerned, we might as well all pack up, sit under a tree, contemplate the meaning of life and do nothing. It is all about getting jobs and creating opportunities for people who currently do not have them. It is all very well for members opposite to talk about Aboriginal welfare and all the issues they talk about, but they leave them sitting around doing nothing without any prospect of getting a job because these members do not care about job creation.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.