

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 1 August 1984

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

GAMBLING: CASINO

Burswood Island: Urgency Motion

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Clive Griffiths): Honourable members, I have received the following letter—

Mr President,

In accordance with Standing Order No. 63, I desire to acquaint you of my intention to move, at the appropriate time today—

That the Council at its rising adjourn until 9.00 a.m. on Sunday, 5 August, for the purpose of debating, as a matter of urgency, the Burke Government's failure to protect the public interest by its decision to permit Burswood Island to be considered as the site for a Casino.

I believe that the Government stands condemned for its choice of Burswood Island on the grounds that:

- (a) The site is public land that should be preserved for future generations as a parks and recreation reserve.
- (b) The choice of Burswood Island was precipitous in that its suitability as a Casino site had not been subjected to even the most elementary scrutiny that usually accompanies other major developments.
- (c) Since January, 1984, the Government has consistently failed to take action to prevent the site from being lost to the people of Perth for all time.
- (d) It has put the private sector to unnecessary and unwarranted expense in leading venturers to the belief that all hurdles relating to the site had been jumped.
- (e) The people of Victoria Park, Rivervale, Kensington and neighbouring suburbs have been treated with total contempt in that no account has been taken of local opinion regarding the site.
- (f) The Perth City Council has equally been treated with contempt in that the Government has failed to consult properly with this local authority, preferring instead to impose its views on the Perth City Council as a *fait accompli*.

- (g) The relevant statutory bodies with responsibility for land and foreshore management and environmental control have been ignored, with opinions either not sought at all or sought only after the Government has been reminded of its statutory responsibilities.
- (h) The haste with which Casino proposals were dealt with by the Government's ministerial casino committee gives rise to the belief that they were not adequately considered by the Government, contrary to the Premier's written assurances to the mover on 8 February 1984.
- (i) It is guilty of window-dressing of a cynical kind in allowing Burswood Island to be lost as a greenbelt while allegedly creating a new greenbelt across the river in East Perth.

Yours faithfully,
Hon. Phillip Pendal, MLC.
Member for South Central Metropolitan.

In order for this motion to proceed, it will be necessary that it be seconded by four members standing in their places.

Four members having risen in their places,

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [2.35 p.m.]: I move—

That the Council at its rising adjourn until 9.00 a.m. on Sunday, 5 August, for the purpose of debating, as a matter of urgency, the Burke Government's failure to protect the public interest by its decision to permit Burswood Island to be considered as the site for a Casino.

I believe that the Government stands condemned for its choice of Burswood Island on the grounds that:

- (a) The site is public land that should be preserved for future generations as a parks and recreation reserve.
- (b) The choice of Burswood Island was precipitous in that its suitability as a Casino site had not been subjected to even the most elementary scrutiny that usually accompanies other major developments.
- (c) Since January, 1984, the Government has consistently failed to take action to prevent the site from being lost to the people of Perth for all time.
- (d) It has put the private sector to unnecessary and unwarranted expense in leading venturers to the belief that all hurdles relating to the site had been jumped.

- (e) The people of Victoria Park, Rivervale, Kensington and neighbouring suburbs have been treated with total contempt in that no account has been taken of local opinion regarding the site.
- (f) The Perth City Council has equally been treated with contempt in that the Government has failed to consult properly with this local authority, preferring instead to impose its views on the Perth City Council as a *fait accompli*.
- (g) The relevant statutory bodies with responsibility for land and foreshore management and environmental control have been ignored, with opinions either not sought at all or sought only after the Government has been reminded of its statutory responsibilities.
- (h) The haste with which Casino proposals were dealt with by the Government's ministerial casino committee gives rise to the belief that they were not adequately considered by the Government, contrary to the Premier's written assurances to the mover on 8 February 1984.
- (i) It is guilty of window-dressing of a cynical kind in allowing Burswood Island to be lost as a greenbelt while allegedly creating a new greenbelt across the river in East Perth.

In moving this motion I want to make it clear from the outset that it is not my intention today to debate the question of the establishment of a casino in Western Australia. As members in this House would know, that is a matter that the Government decided upon some months ago, and legitimately so, as a policy decision. Subsequent to that decision of the Government it received the endorsement of this Parliament, albeit an endorsement that was given reluctantly on the part of some members, but who do not have any dispute with the Government now, because it has the right to proceed along the path of establishing Western Australia's first casino.

What this motion does intend is to canvass the major areas of public concern that have been given scant attention by the Government. In the first instance I would put it to members that it is the siting of the casino which is causing considerable public concern and, therefore, it is part of the subject matter of this motion.

Secondly, there is occurring in the community grave disquiet over the manner in which the Government has handled the slimming down of the short list of those people who were contenders for that first casino licence.

In dealing firstly with the matter of siting the casino, I want to re-establish before the House my own credentials in matters of this kind.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Why do you have to re-establish them; I thought they were established?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: If the Minister for Industrial Relations would listen he would be interested in them.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not like this grovelling.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: When the past Government was in office and I was in my first term as a member of this Parliament, on two separate occasions I opposed activities that were proposed by that Government where those activities were to impinge adversely on the river system that runs through my electorate and where they were to impinge upon the foreshore network that surrounds my electorate. On one of those occasions a proposal was put to the Court Government for the mining of limestone on the Canning River in Shelley. I was the first member of Parliament to take public issue with the Government on that matter.

Earlier, with other parliamentary colleagues, including yourself, Mr President, I was involved extensively in fighting the then Government's plans that were submitted via the Main Roads Department for the bridging of the Canning River at Ferndale. To answer Mr Dans, my reason for mentioning those two matters is to underline, in the minds of members in this House, that I have a track record since being in Parliament of fighting very strongly any proposal which I consider would adversely affect the river system of this city or the foreshores adjoining it. The decision to site the casino on Burswood Island, in my opinion, clearly falls within that category.

Western Australia and its capital city have a unique opportunity to preserve and extend a green belt surrounding the metropolitan area. It is an opportunity which comes but once. If it is missed in the first place it will take 100 years to repair the damage.

History may have a habit of repeating itself. In 1927 the Perth City Council was a leading opponent of a move by the Government of that day to have the Royal Perth Hospital located in Kings Park. I am hoping that on this occasion the Perth City Council will follow its current instinct and repeat the actions of its predecessors of 1927 and similarly reject the possibility of the casino being sited on Burswood Island. To allow the casino to be sited there would be the greatest example of official short-sightedness that we have seen since this Government came into office.

During the course of my address I shall ask where the planners stand on this issue. Where is the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority standing on this issue? Where are the environmental experts standing on this issue?

If in 1927 it was an attack on the city environment to consider placing the Royal Perth Hospital in Kings Park, I put it to the House today that the 1984 version of putting a casino on Burswood Island should meet with the greatest degree of resistance from this Government. It was a Labor Government in 1927, under the then Premier, Mr Collier, which finally prevented the Royal Perth Hospital from being located in Kings Park. Premier Collier said then about that proposal the following words—

It cannot be pleaded in a new city such as ours, that land conveniently situated cannot be found on which to build our public institutions, and that we are therefore forced to utilise our open spaces. What we want, in fact, is not only to preserve all our available parks and reserves, but to make greater provision, as opportunity offers, for the immensely greater population which our metropolitan area must carry in the future.

I repeat, the Labor Premier of 1984 will rue the day that he permitted a casino to be built on Burswood Island if the words which were uttered by his own Labor predecessor 57 years ago are ignored.

There has been in this whole sorry mess a headlong rush by the Government to permit a casino to be established on Burswood Island. Since January of this year, when the first signs were appearing that the Government had selected it unofficially to be the site, I have made my own position clear as a local member, and that was that I would never agree to it or allow my vote to permit the casino to go ahead on that site.

I repeat: The casino is not the issue. That has been decided upon. The real issue, as it was in January this year when I first raised it with the Government, is still a question of its siting.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Come on, you are always knocking development.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Rubbish!

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The Government's decision on Burswood Island is quite incomprehensible to anyone who cares to look at the evidence which has been made available in the last eight months. For example, a few weeks ago, on 17 July, Councillor Silbert of the Perth City Council suggested that an alternative site could be the shoppers' car park. By Sunday, 22 July, fully five days later, that option had been rejected.

The Parliament is entitled to ask why. How is it that the merits of that site could have been considered, discussed, weighed up, and rejected, all in the space of five short days?

Mr President, I put it to you again that is one of the many factors which lead many people to believe that there has been an unhealthy desire on the part of some to hurry up the process by which a casino would end up on Burswood Island. Who was it, for example, who first suggested Burswood Island to the Government? More particularly, who within the Government first chose Burswood Island as the site? Equally pertinent, what were the criteria used at the time to select what amounts to Perth's front door, the welcome mat of Perth city? These are very simple questions, but the Government has been very reluctant to answer them.

The Government told us officially on 5 April this year what many of us knew unofficially for many months; that Burswood Island was to be the site. But on that occasion the Premier went to some lengths to say to the people of Western Australia that, Burswood Island having been chosen as the site, it would nonetheless be subjected to satisfactory transport, environmental, and planning requirements.

I put it to you, Mr President, that in the light of events that followed the release of that statement, in the most charitable context of the House, the words contained in it were misleading. If the Government was serious about subjecting Burswood Island to the most comprehensive and exhaustive environmental study, why is it that it took a member of the Opposition parties in this Parliament to have the matter referred to the Environmental Protection Authority?

The fact is that on 21 June this year, fully six weeks after the Premier had announced that Burswood Island would be the site and that it would be subjected to exhaustive environmental studies, no approach had been made to the Environmental Protection Authority, and no approach had been made to the Department of Conservation and Environment, save the one approach made by that member of the Opposition parties; namely myself.

I was asking the Government to exercise its obligation under section 56(1) of the Environmental Protection Act. I put it to members that it is insincerity at its greatest to announce one month that environmental studies of an exhaustive nature will be carried out and then to find six weeks later that no such inquiries have even begun.

I shall make a final observation on the environmental side of the argument. It is passing strange

that the environmental lobby of this State has gone to sleep over this issue. Where are the people who, when the previous Government was in office—

Hon. D. K. Dans: Don't speak too soon.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: —were willing to march up and down St. George's Terrace and protest on the steps of Parliament House the minute it was decided to cut a branch off a tree? On this occasion, one of the major environmental bodies in this State, the Conservation Council of Western Australia (Inc.), has been strangely silent.

Indeed, I contacted the Conservation Council to ask it why that was the case. I suggest its answer was rather lame. The answer given to me by the president of the council was that, having limited resources, the council had not yet got around to looking low enough on its priority list to consider Burswood Island. Yet it is strange that, on the day I approached the Conservation Council, it had found the time, the energy, and the resources to make public comments about Alan Bond's marina proposals in an area below the Majestic Hotel site in Applecross. So it does not hold water when the Conservation Council—

Hon. Peter Dowding: The marina is not meant to hold water?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am delighted to know that the Minister is at least alert enough to pick up my unintended puns.

I was entitled to ask why the Conservation Council could find the time to attack many environmental issues when the previous Government was in office and how it seems to fall asleep when this Government makes a major attack on an important part of the foreshore which is under reservation for parks and recreation.

A second element in this matter is town planning. In the same announcement to which I referred previously which was made by the Premier on 5 April, he told us that, apart from the environmental studies which would be undertaken, exhaustive planning studies would occur. To this day, those studies have not occurred or even begun. In particular, I refer members to section 27A of the Metropolitan Region Town Planning Scheme Act 1959-82. In reading this section I again remind members that it was left to a member of the Opposition parties in this Parliament to indicate to the Government its own statutory obligations and planning functions in regard to Burswood Island. Section 27A reads as follows—

The Authority—

That is the MRPA. To continue—

—may, with the approval of the Minister, carry out on land held by it that is reserved under the Scheme for the purposes of parks and recreation such works as may be incidental to the maintenance and management of the land or be conducive to the use of the land for such purposes . . .

Simply put, that means only the MRPA may permit any sort of work on Burswood Island and that work can be permitted only if it is incidental to the maintenance of Burswood Island planning.

No-one in his right mind would suggest that a casino is incidental to the maintenance of the land on Burswood Island. Therefore, by extension, it means that, under the present law, it is illegal for a casino to be sited on Burswood Island.

The point I make is that the Premier himself told us in his announcement on 5 April—they are his words—that planning requirements would be met and observed. If anyone can tell me how it is that under section 27A the planning requirements will be observed and met, I shall be most happy. The fact is, and Mr Dans and Mr Dowding know it, major amendments to the Act will be required to change the status of that land to permit the casino to be built there.

Therefore, I submit that the statement made by the Premier on 5 April was dishonest in that the requirements of the planning Statute would be met.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Will you apologise for that statement when I get onto my feet?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: It depends on what the Leader of the House says. However, so far I have no grounds to even consider making an apology, because the Chairman of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority agrees with me.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I agree with the chairman, too.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: It was the Chairman of the MRPA who made this public statement and I prompted him to do so. It was not some voluntary admission on his part that section 27A was not going to be observed by the Government of the Leader of the House.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you repeat what the chairman said?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I shall repeat it.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I want to hear it, because I might have agreed with something that I should not have agreed with.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Section 27A of the Act is rather clear and even the Leader of the House and his colleague on the front bench know what it says.

I asked a person in the media, Janet Wainwright, why the MRPA remained silent when section 27A of its own Act prohibited a casino being built on Burswood Island. Mrs Wainwright took my comments and observations on section 27A to Mr Wilkins. He agreed—he was quoted publicly by Janet Wainwright to this effect—that the land could not be used unless changes were made to the Act.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It does not need changes to the Act. It means unless the processes of change were proceeded with, and there were two alternatives. You should not start telling fibs in Parliament, Mr Pendal!

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am sure we shall be interested to hear the Minister's explanation as to how he will overcome the provisions of section 27A. He will have to get rid of the Chairman of the MRPA, which he intends to do anyway, and he will certainly have to get rid of many other people in order to use land in contravention of section 27A. That is my entire point.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You are a babe in the planning world. I don't accept that.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You surprise me, Mr Pendal. Before you proceed down that track, I have the first report of the Casino Control Board.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will honourable members cease their interjections?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Lest it be thought that the MRPA is some sort of ally of mine—it may well be a temporary one in this matter—I shall refer to another issue which involves the MRPA to show that, if it does not act in this case along the lines I am suggesting, it will be guilty of the grossest form of double standards that any member can imagine.

Mr Pratt would recall asking me, in 1981, to second a motion of disallowance regarding a town planning decision affecting the Wungong Gorge. The relevance of that action to this situation is this: When that motion was sponsored by Mr Pratt, it was to excise from the MRPA's proposals certain properties in the Wungong Gorge which he and I felt had been unfairly included in that reservation order.

It is passing strange again that the MRPA should go to such lengths in 1980 to effectively take from a private individual, land which he owned and place it in a reservation order, whereas four years down the track, the Government is wanting to pinch the same sort of parks and reserves land. In other words, the process is in reverse, with the MRPA to this point being silent. The Government cannot have it both ways. It cannot have the situation about which Mr Pratt and I

complained several years ago, with the MRPA attempting to take someone's land and place it in a certain reservation and four years later, for the MRPA to be silent when the Government intends to take some land of the same status out of that category and make it over for the use of a private individual, a casino operation.

Those two situations give cause for alarm. In the nine or 10 months I have spent dealing with this matter the comment has been made frequently to me that Burswood Island is an eyesore. I acknowledge that it is, but that is no reason to say we ought to authorise the building of a casino there.

It is only seven years ago that Heirisson Island was in that same category. Members would know that in 1977 Heirisson Island was an eyesore. It was only through the combined efforts of the State Government of the time and the Perth City Council—particularly Ossie Edwards—and the private sector, as a lead up to the sesquicentennial celebrations for Western Australia, that Heirisson Island was turned from an eyesore into the showpiece it is today.

It is therefore no argument to say that because Burswood Island is an eyesore, the way to pretty it up is to stick a casino there. That is nonsense, and, if the Government is serious about getting rid of an eyesore on the front door of the city, it has the power to discuss the matter with the Perth City Council in order to come to some arrangement whereby Burswood Island can be restored and rehabilitated in the same way as Heirisson Island was seven years ago.

There is an element of complete hypocrisy in regard to the planning studies going on for East Perth at the moment. Mr Dans would know that the Premier's brother has been put in charge of a study into the green belt on the East Perth foreshore—not even 150 yards from Burswood Island. The Premier's own brother is being asked to chair a committee of the Lord Mayor of Perth and a few other people to discover how they can create a green belt in that part of East Perth.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: It is not important enough for a Minister to do it?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I would not now think so, Mr Lewis. Can anyone tell me the sense of wanting to create a green belt in East Perth and to destroy one on Burswood Island? It is not as though they are 150 miles apart; they are part of one piece of land, with a sheet of water down the middle; the Swan River. It makes no sense at all for Government members to make big fellows of themselves by prettying up East Perth and ignoring a green belt on the other side of the river.

That is another element in this whole sorry mess which has not been explored properly.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind honourable members that the rule associated with the reading of newspapers in this House has not been altered.

Point of Order

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr President, what about looking through newspapers to gain information to make a speech?

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no point of order, therefore the member has no right to be talking.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I would like to canvass the way in which the local authority has been treated in this matter; namely, the Perth City Council. Earlier this year I placed questions on the Notice Paper which were responded to in as unsatisfactory a manner, treatment I imagine we will see again on this dispute today. I point out again to members of this House that it is this Government which is committed—in writing—to give a greater role to local government. It is this Government which has publicly committed itself to bringing about more autonomy and power for local government. Yet, what do we find? On 17 April of this year a story appeared in *The West Australian* on page 58 headed, "Perth City Council miffed by casino decision". The story read as follows—

The Perth City Council last night handed out a mild rebuke to the State Government over its announcement that a casino would be built on Burswood Island.

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much audible conversation. I suggest to members that they cease that activity.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The second paragraph of this newspaper article stated—

The PCC said that, as planning authority for the island, it should have been consulted before an announcement was made.

Of course, the Perth City Council should have been consulted before an announcement was made, but was it? Of course it was not. The only way the Lord Mayor was informed was by the premature release of information at that time which forced the Premier to get onto the telephone and ring him and make his apologies for having failed to inform the Perth City Council before that date. It was no good informing the Perth City Council when the site had been chosen. The Perth City Councillors and officers want to know those things before a decision is made. It is only then they can make any sort of input to the Govern-

ment as to whether it is a good site or whether it should be moved 200 yards, or provide any other mature consideration on the proposition. That is the contempt with which the major local authority in this State was treated by this Government. The Government was hellbent on determining that Burswood Island was the site, no matter what.

On 17 April, the same day that the story appeared in *The West Australian*, I asked the Leader of the House representing the Premier a question. In brief, I asked whether or not the consultation took place. We now know that it did not. If it did not take place, why did it not? The Leader of the House said—

The Premier advised the Lord Mayor in confidence—

I interpolate here by saying that he certainly did. He advised the Lord Mayor only a couple of hours beforehand because he knew it was going to be made public. He said—

The Premier advised the Lord Mayor in confidence that the Government intended to proceed with the development of the casino on the Burswood Island area.

However, the Government has stated that the development of a casino on Burswood Island will be subject to satisfactory transport, environmental and planning requirements being met.

I repeat: That is a misleading comment. It may not have been intended to be misleading at the time. However, in view of what is contained in the comment, it is misleading.

Section 27A prohibits a casino on Burswood Island, so that it is quite impossible that planning requirements will be met. That is another reason that the Government ought to seriously reconsider its options in this matter.

Whatever conclusion one comes to, it can only mean that the Government has long made up its mind that Burswood Island was to be the site. It would not matter what anyone said or what local government councillors said. Some local government councillors who belong to the Australian Labor Party were disgusted with the Government's decision. They have been to see me in my office to say so.

The question that the Government needs to answer on the first part of this motion is: What were the criteria which led it to believe that Burswood Island was, in its words, "the best site available near Perth"? Did it reach those conclusions after consulting people whose opinions would ordinarily be valued? Did it consult the Minister for Planning? I think not.

Did the Government seek the opinion of the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority? It did not. Did it consult the Perth City Council? I have demonstrated already that it did not. Did it refer to the Swan River Management Authority? The Waterways Commission and the Swan River Management Authority have statutory obligations in relation to that matter. Were they asked anything? They were not; as late as several weeks ago, I checked and they had not been consulted. Was the Commissioner of Town Planning consulted before he was sent off to China? One assumes that he was not.

Again, one is entitled to ask how the Government reached a conclusion about that site being the best available site if it did not ask any of the organisations or individuals who were in the best position to have a proper input into what was the best site.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Do you have a better site? What is your proposed site?

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: There are probably several sites. If the member wants to debate this matter, I will be happy to do that. However, that does not form part of my complaint today. I have already said to the member and to other members that I am not complaining about the establishment of the casino. I am talking about the inappropriate choice of site made by the Government.

The second part of my letter contains many other points and touches on the process whereby the Government eliminated the contenders to develop the casino site so that it could narrow the short list down to the present two contenders.

In the space of 18 months this Government has been shown to be amateurish, inept, incompetent, and totally lacking in any understanding of how private developers and architects work. That has been shown in the way that the Cabinet subcommittee acted on this occasion. There is plenty of evidence of that, some of which has been made public. It shows that those people have been treated with contempt. I do not know whether the Government meant to treat those people with contempt.

[Resolved: That motion be continued.]

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The Government may not have intended to treat those people with contempt, but that has been the conclusion that I have drawn from its attitude.

I now intend to outline the reasons for my conclusion. On 16 April this year, the Leader of the House will recall that he signed a letter to Mr J. Christou of Colin Rule Christou and Associates, Regency Centre, 1st Floor, 949-951 Wellington Street, West Perth. I understand that it was a

fairly stock letter; it went out to most of the contenders, if not all of them. It stated a number of things about which members of the House need to be aware. It reads—

Further to the Premier's letter dated 11th April to you, I am now enclosing a copy of a map which outlines the site nominated by the Government for the proposed casino complex.

As you will be aware, the area has been used for a variety of purposes, including sanitary landfill, for many years and it is in a generally degraded condition. Parts will not be suitable for building. It is, however, a prime riverfront location and has many natural advantages.

As announced, the decision to endorse the Burswood Island site is subject to transport, planning and environmental safeguards being fulfilled.

So far so good. We then get to what I consider to be a vital piece of information in the letter. It states—

As you would expect, the Government is not anticipating applicants to submit detailed plans and specifications.

However, the concept of the development together with the planned level of investment and the nature of the facilities proposed will naturally be important considerations.

That is vital on 16 April because of the criticism that develops later in this correspondence. At that point of time, 16 April, the Government was merely looking for interest in the idea. It was looking for what architects might call "schematic plans". It was not looking for the detail of where a door might be put or where the casino room should be. I ask members to bear in mind that this was the process all the contenders that we know about went through in order to be told that they were no longer on the short list.

On 5 June, approximately three weeks later, that same person, Mr Christou, received a letter from Mr Shimmer, the Executive Director of the Department of Administrative Services. Again, it is important to bear in mind the date. The letter of 5 June stated—

Dear Mr Christou

The Minister for Administrative Services, the Hon. D. K. Dans, M.L.C., has asked me to acknowledge with thanks, receipt of your submission relating to the development of a casino complex on Burswood Island.

The letter continued with other less important matters. I again ask members to remember that at that stage, on 5 June, all that the contenders had

done was to put forward the broad plans which they had been asked to put forward in the previous letter, and unbeknown to them, they were but one month away from having their plans completely rejected.

The story continues. On 7 June—two days later—a letter was sent under the signature of Mr Shimon which read as follows—

Your submission to develop a casino complex on Burswood Island was examined by the Cabinet Sub Committee on Tuesday June 5, 1984.

So far, so good. It continues—

As a result of that examination, the Cabinet Sub Committee, which comprises—

The Hon. B. T. Burke, M.L.A. Premier

The Hon. D. K. Dans, M.L.C. Minister for Administrative Services

The Hon. J. M. Berinson, M.L.C. Attorney General

The Hon. J. P. Carr, M.L.A. Minister for Police

The Hon. D. C. Parker, M.L.A. Minister for Minerals and Energy

The Hon. P. M. Dowding, M.L.C. Minister for Planning

invites you and/or your representatives to meet with the Sub Committee to provide verbal expansion of your written submission.

Nothing untoward so far. Indeed, all the people who received the letters had every reason to believe that their submissions would be considered in depth, particularly as they had an invitation to meet these six Ministers at another meeting to be held on Tuesday 3 July in the Minister's office. The problem was that the person to whom this letter was directed did not get the benefit of having his case heard by those six people, because they were not present. Mr Burke was away and Mr Berinson arrived 40 minutes late for a 45-minute interview. He walked in and someone asked, "Have you got any questions, Joe?" I do not know what Joe's reply was but I am sure the Attorney General, perhaps to his everlasting relief later, was present for only five minutes of that man's submission. The applicant received an invitation to put his proposals before six Cabinet members. However, he did not eventually see those six men. The Premier was away which reduced the number to five, Mr Berinson was absent most of the time, reducing the number to four, and although the Minister for Planning was physically in attendance he may just as well not have been present. At one stage when the tenderer

held up his submission, the Minister for Planning said, "What's that?" The representative of Mr Christou said, "That's our submission, haven't you read it?"

Hon. Peter Dowding: That is an absolute falsehood. You are going around peddling silly rumours like that and you should know better.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I have a complete transcript of that meeting.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. Peter Dowding: He is just a disgruntled applicant.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Of course he is disgruntled.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You should not go around peddling material which you have no way of confirming.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister will come to order. He knows he is out of order carrying on a long conversation with Hon. P. G. Pendal and I ask him to cease.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Whether or not the other three Cabinet members had failed to read the submission, I do not know.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is obvious that you do not.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: On the basis of what I have said so far the people involved have good grounds to be disgruntled.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is a fabrication.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Half the members of the subcommittee were not present or were there and did not know what they were supposed to be deciding on. It is a farce to suggest that six Cabinet Ministers of this State scaled down the tenders, because they did not. The Premier was away, the Attorney General was 40 minutes late, and the Minister for Planning did not even recognise the document under discussion.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You are a liar and that is a fact.

Withdrawal of Remark

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister knows that his comment is out of order and I ask him to withdraw the unparliamentary comment he just made.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I withdraw the unparliamentary comment but make it clear that what the member said is not correct.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister cannot qualify his withdrawal.

Debate (on motion) Resumed

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The meeting later took place in Mr Dans' office on 3 July.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Half the meeting took place in my office but it became too hot and we then adjourned to a better location. Let us get the record straight.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am sure the Minister for Administrative Services would have adjourned to a far more comfortable place than his office, and good luck to him. We are not squabbling over whether the decisions were made in comfort but whether the decisions were poorly made.

If there is any doubt about the indecent haste with which the Government decided to trim the number of applicants on the short list, I refer to the telex from one of the most reputable international concerns so far as the casino industry is concerned. I refer to Conrad International Hotels and the telex sent by the executive vice president of that organisation.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I remind the member that I made an offer to the Opposition to look at all the details. I will make the member eat his words and he will get himself into trouble if he continues in this way.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Mr Dans uses that excuse every time he gets into trouble.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. D. K. Dans: I could destroy the business integrity of a number of people with whom you have been dealing.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader of the House and Hon. P. G. Pendal will come to order when I ask them to. The Standing Orders of this House provide the opportunity for any member to make a comment and refute any of the comments someone may be making at an appropriate time. I ask the Leader of the House, who has constrained himself on this point very well indeed, to continue in that vein and we shall all get along nicely.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: On 30 June that telex was sent to Mr Dans and it was signed as follows—

Yours very truly,
Conrad International Hotels,
A subsidiary of Hilton Hotels, U.S.A.
Gregory R. Dillon
Executive Vice President

If he is something else and in charge of cockroach development in the United States or some other place it does not say so here. I understand he is a

man of the highest possible repute. The telex stated—

In accordance with our discussion and the meeting you, Gordon McAlister and I had with the Minister, Mr Dans, during my recent visit to Perth, this will serve to confirm that Hilton Hotels, U.S.A., through its wholly owned subsidiary, Conrad International Hotels, is most interested in participating in the development and assuming the management of the proposed hotel casino presently being planned for Perth in Western Australia.

It is one of the largest international hotel chains.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is not an international hotel chain.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: It is one of the largest international accommodation groups.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is not. I will tell you more when I am on my feet.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am advising members of what was sent to the executive director of the Minister's department. Bearing in mind that the decision to eliminate people was made, at least we think, on 9 July, we have here a telex to Mr Dans expressing interest and thereby suggesting that Mr Dillon sees this process continuing for a long time to come.

It is early days yet, and no decisions will be made until a host of things are worked out. Indeed, Mr Dillon is so professional in his approach that he continues—

We have previously advised you that subject to the establishment of a responsible investor group satisfactory to your Government similar in structure to the Jupiters Trust established in Queensland final codification by the Western Australian Government of all legislation . . .

In other words, subject to all of those things, "we would be interested in being in a casino deal in Western Australia". The telex continues—

We are quite aware that the Government of Western Australia your department and others are only in the preliminary stages of establishing a hotels/casino . . .

Hon. D. K. Dans: And that is correct.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: Preliminary! It is nine days before half the applicants will be wiped out. There is nothing preliminary about that. The decision is almost made, but Conrad International Hotels does not know it.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I wish you were right.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The decision, in respect of those who have been chucked off the list, has been made because Mr Dans made that announcement.

We move on to 4 July. Now we are getting closer to the deadline when the Government will say, "You, you, you, and you are all out, and remaining are only you and you". At that stage, the whole bang lot have the full belief that the situation is in its early stages. However, on 4 July Mr Christou of Colin Rule Christou and Associates wrote to the Minister in the following terms—

Thank you for meeting yesterday with Members of our consortium along with your Cabinet colleagues.

Then he went on to outline and to reiterate what his venture would comprise. On page 2 of that letter, the following appears—

Negotiations have commenced with Mr Gregory Dillon,—

That is the man who sent the telex to which I referred earlier. The letter continues—

—Executive Vice President—

What about this, Mr Dans? It continues—

—of Hilton Hotels Corporation with regard to their being appointed as hotel and casino operators.

This contender was confident that he was still in the race, that many hurdles would have to be jumped before the Government came to a decision, and that many months would pass before any applicant is decided upon, because that is what Mr Christou said in his letter, as follows—

We appreciate that there is much discussion and negotiation required between all parties prior to the granting of a licence...

They were not nine days away from decision day; they were a mere five days away.

Hon. D. K. Dans: He said, "granting a licence".

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: The man writing the letter actually believed that his submission would be considered seriously by the Government. Here he was running around the neighbourhood, fixing up international connections in order to put a serious proposition to the Government; but unbeknown to the company, the axe was about to fall and the Government was about to make a decision to get rid of all but two contenders. If that is not an indication of the rank amateurishness—and I am not putting it any higher than that; I have not suggested any corruption involved in this—

Hon. D. K. Dans: I hope you do not, or I will wring your neck on the floor of the Chamber.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: I am saying these are the actions of a totally incompetent Government—of a Government that does not understand how businesses operate. How could a Government build up people's expectations like that and chop them off at the knees when they believe they are still in the race?

We are getting closer. On 5 July a letter was sent by Mr Dans to the person who wrote the earlier letter I quoted. I ask members to bear in mind that shortly I will quote from another letter that would have been being written almost at the same time as this, but at the other end of the city. Amongst other things, the letter from Mr Dans to Christou contained the following—

Prior to presenting the Sub Committee's recommendations to Cabinet, I seek your assurance that you have had ample opportunity to present your case and that you have not been disadvantaged in any way during the processing of this matter.

What a strange thing to say. It is almost like some sort of guilty conscience—protecting one's flanks from something that one knows will happen. Only the writer would know what he was protecting himself and the Government against; but here we have the Minister on his bended knee, asking all the contenders for the casino licence to give him an assurance that they have had ample opportunity and have not been rushed.

On 6 July, the following letter was received in response to the Minister's letter—

Dear Mr Dans,

Thank you for your hand delivered letter dated July 5, 1984 concerning the assessment of submissions for the establishment of a casino in Western Australia.

This is the letter written by Mr Christou, and it continues—

It was a pleasure to present our case to your Sub Committee on the 3rd July, 1984—

Ultimately, it did not turn out to be a pleasure, according to what the Christou group told me. The letter continued—

—which we considered to be preliminary discussions.

"Preliminary discussions", and only three days before they get the chopper! The writer of this letter believed that the discussions were only preliminary. In the same letter, the following appears—

We consider that the expressed interest in our proposal by the internationally experienced and prestigious Hilton Hotels Corporation must assure further serious consideration of our submission...

That was a pretty pious hope, as it turned out. Further on in the letter, the following appears—

Whilst our verbal presentation to your Sub Committee focussed on the concept and design of our proposal, we urge you to take full account of our forty-nine page written document and our drawings which form the significant part of our submission.

If Mr Dans thinks I have misunderstood the information passed to me, let me tell him what one of the observers at the meeting saw, as follows—

It appeared from some of the questions asked during the meeting that some members of the Committee may not have fully studied our submission in detail and this naturally is of great concern to us.

What a devastating indictment of a six-man Cabinet subcommittee! That is a pretty charitable way of saying it, because the way I put it earlier was less charitable but to the same effect. This man is saying that the people on the six-member committee did not know what the contender was talking about.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I will be kind to those people when I get up.

Hon. P. G. PENDAL: That is a shocking indictment of the way the Government oddly and strangely whittled down the number so only two were left in the ring. The information I have continues—

In view of the above, we would appreciate confirmation of your Committee's understanding of our position with regard to funding, investment, and the appointment of an operator, prior to your Committee's making a recommendation about our proposal to Cabinet.

I move on to the final chapter of the four-week farce. Bearing in mind the build-up, bearing in mind everything I have said—I have not bothered to refer to all of it, but I understand when other firms were tossed out they were told the same story—on 9 July, in a letter to Mr Christou, Mr Dans said—

Dear Mr Christou

BURSWOOD ISLAND CASINO

This letter confirms the Government's decision to select those submissions submitted by Swan River Park Ltd and Tileska Pty Ltd...

That is all they got after weeks and weeks and after having their hopes built up. As Mr Dans knows, a number of people were asked to provide additional information by Friday, 6 July, and in one case this involved a 200-page submission.

I have questions on the Notice Paper asking six Ministers—not the Premier as he is absent and I presume I cannot ask questions of him at present—to explain when they read all that additional information sent to them. The information I have from the people who supplied that additional detail suggests to me that the magnitude of the additional material was such that there was no way at all the information could have been digested by those six Ministers and for them to make a decision and then go to Cabinet, allegedly, which did not meet, although Mr Dans said on television that the Cabinet had met on Monday, 9 July and decided to whittle the numbers down to those final two contenders. It does not add up. Therefore I am suggesting that the Government ought to stop this farce in mid track right now and do two things, neither of which is extraordinary, and both of which should have been done six months ago.

First, it should appoint an independent outside body away from the Cabinet subcommittee. I am not suggesting a Cabinet subcommittee has no role to play, but Cabinet should never have permitted itself to be placed in this position. I am sure no other Cabinet would have given such cursory treatment to such expensive proposals put before a Government. I challenge Mr Dans or any other Minister to say that any Government has given this sort of consideration to a project that might be worth as much as \$300 million, and even this figure it has been suggested has been very loosely thrown about.

No-one can suggest that the Government had the time to maturely assess everything that was in all those 17 proposals which were then whittled down further and further until only two remained.

So, as a matter of public interest in order that people can have confidence in what has been done so far and can accept that everything is above board, the Government should appoint an outside body to review every one of those submissions from the very start and some independent body should be asked to consider the siting of the casino somewhere in the metropolitan area. While those two things are not done by the Government, while the Government permits the current situation to exist, rumours and innuendos will continue that may well be without any foundation whatsoever. I urge the Government to act accordingly.

HON. D. K. DANS (South Metropolitan—Leader of the House) [3.44 p.m.]: I listened very patiently to the long diatribe by Hon. Phillip Pendal and I am fully aware of why he moved his urgency motion. It is simply a result of the Government's offer yesterday to take into its confidence the Leader of the Opposition and the

Deputy Leader of the Opposition in another place and the Leader of the Opposition in this House, and in a private session in my office to go through all the questions raised and give answers without damaging anyone. I understand that that was sweeping the ground away from under Mr Pandal's feet, because I know that Vi Sands of the Red Castle is always ringing up about his inactivity in his electorate, and I noticed that he used the personal pronoun about 10 or 15 times at the beginning of his speech to impress his electorate.

Let me start at the end. One of the things Mr Pandal and others will not take into account is that all the submissions were in the hands of the subcommittee on 31 May.

Sitting suspended from 3.45 to 4.02 p.m.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Before the afternoon tea suspension I said I would not be very long in answering these matters because I understand the reason Mr Pandal made his run today.

I still have not heard from the Opposition in answer to my generous suggestion that the Leader of the Opposition in this House (Hon. G. E. Masters) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Hassell), and his deputy (Mr MacKinnon) could come to my office where all the facts would be outlined for them. I hope they accept that invitation. Mr Pandal seems confused because Mr Masters would allow him to come down and see all the exhibits. As I said, by way of answer to a question without notice, we still have all the material available. That is all there with the exception of the tender by Pennant Holdings, a South African company, and two or three letters which are of a highly confidential nature.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You do not think that is the reason Mr Pandal introduced it today?

Hon. D. K. DANS: I do not think, I know. He is a good tactician.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You know this would have been raised in the party room 24 hours before.

Hon. D. K. DANS: I am not interested in what happens in the Opposition's party room. Members of the Opposition are busy reading our Press reports and reports on conference decisions. I do not know how they have time to discuss Liberal Party matters in their party room. Let us get back to the nitty-gritty.

The applications were received at my office on 31 May 1984—that was the closing date. I say here that we will not accept the Opposition's proposition that our procedures were wrong, and I make no apologies for the professional way we went about our tasks. However, I am sorry we

arranged to see six applicants when there was no requirement whatsoever for us to do that.

The applications were received in my office on 31 May. The Cabinet subcommittee met and with its officers determined those applicants which would not get a guernsey. That was our charter. I have not heard very much grizzling or sniping from those people who went out in the first round. At least they were proper businessmen and knew what was involved in a tender situation. When they failed to make the grade they did not squeal. They were thoroughbreds, and thoroughbreds do not cry.

After the people we did not think would get into the starter's hands were pushed out of it, all the submissions were sent to the Treasury for careful evaluation. When people were called for their interview that evaluation by the Treasury was in front of me and other members of the Cabinet subcommittee. It is the normal procedure for us to have a clear indication of where we are going before people come to see us.

We made our decision, based on experience I picked up in Queensland, which was to leave two people in. I will not tell members the reasons we made that decision, or why we did not go on with the others. I am sure Mr MacKinnon, Mr Gayfer, and other members understand that if I were to make public some of the reasons given to us by the Treasury as to why those people were not considered it could seriously damage their standing in the business community. It is the normal procedure not to give that information.

The commercial decision was, and always has been that if a person applies for a job and he dips out, he is not given the reason. I am sure when in business the President and other members in this place were never foolish enough to tell a person the reason he did not secure a position.

If a reason is given in the industrial scene it could result in trouble. If an unsuccessful tenderer is told the reason he was not successful, it could cause a disaster. Mr Gayfer would never write to a person to explain the reason if such a situation occurred with Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. He would not provide the reason a person did not have his tender accepted; it would be a disaster. Those things are simply not done, and the Government will not do that on this occasion. It would be stupid to engage in that kind of behaviour.

Despite the fact that people said we had the submissions for X number of hours and a couple of day only, we had those submissions under scrutiny long before the people came to the meetings. I will answer later some of the fatuous questions about extra material being requested.

I want members to understand that I am a cautious person and value my integrity, as do other members of the subcommittee. Therefore, we took the precaution of having notes taken at all stages of these interviews so that we could go back over them to check whether people did say what they thought they had said. This was so that if a case of sour grapes arose we would have a record of what was said.

If a person tells himself a lie often enough he starts to believe it and that is what has happened. Mr Pental—

Hon. Peter Dowding: Who is not here!

Hon. D. K. DANS: —made reference to the Hilton group. I cannot hold him to what he said but he said something to the effect that it was a large international accommodation company. It is not. It changed some years ago and it now operates in the United States of America. It is a casino operator in Las Vegas and it is in the process of becoming a casino operator in Atlantic City.

The submission received from the Hilton group was for it to become a casino operator. The Government received two submissions from companies wishing to become operators. However, the Government was not in the business of looking for operators; it has had, at all stages, a clear concept of what it wanted. After all, is not the Government charged with the responsibility of doing the job, and is there something wrong with the Government having a concept? Is there anything wrong with the Government selecting the two groups which came close to the concept the Government wants? That is what has happened. I think the Government went too far in trying to be courteous.

Only one group was honest enough to say that the Government had conducted everything to plan and that was the Bond group. Pennant Holdings did not whinge about the results.

I am prepared to tell Mr Masters why the Government arrived at its decision and I am sure that he would then agree with what the Government decided. I am referring to the question of selection. I am not worried about the date which appears on any letter or when it was sent. I ask members to remember 31 May.

Mr MacKinnon has been in Government for many years and he knows the procedures that are adopted and that every committee must follow a system. I do not have the expertise my colleague, Hon. Joe Berinson, may have to go through the complex financial propositions which have been thrown up. The Government is not involved with that at the moment and has only been involved

with concepts. I do not want to go beyond that point because it is the way in which the Government approached the task.

Let me refer to the other part of Mr Pental's rather fruitless exercise. He said that no engineering examinations had taken place. That is not quite true because test bores have been drilled. Contact with the MRPA is to fall within the province of the Casino Control Committee, which will meet the expenses, but in order to hurry the matter I made an application to the EPA under section 55 instead of the committee making application under section 56.

What has happened is this: A Casino Control Committee is now operating and I have received its first report in which it conferred with the MRPA. I am aware of the problems which exist. The committee will confer with all the other authorities in respect of whether it is feasible to establish a casino on Burswood Island. The committee is an independent authority.

The reason the Government chose Burswood Island as a site for a casino is quite clear; that is, because the Government owns the land. Members should not run away at the mouth, as Mr Pental has done, by saying, beyond a shadow of a doubt, a casino will be established on Burswood Island; because if the recommendation from the Casino Control Committee is that the casino should not be built on that island, then as far as I am concerned one will not be established on that site. I am completely dispassionate about casinos.

The Casino Control Committee will undertake the preliminaries and then, of course, it will commence on the nitty-gritty; that is the examination of the final two contenders. The Government has chosen two contenders and one of them will have to drop out at some stage. I suppose that when one is selected the one that is not successful will do a lot of whingeing; that is quite normal. It could well be that both contenders will not measure up. That is a distinct possibility. If they do not measure up we will have to go back to the drawing board and start all over again.

All those things which the Opposition has claimed the Government has not done are in the process of being done by an authority which is completely divorced from the Government, and that is the way it must be.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: If Burswood Island does not measure up you will have to select another site and recall applications.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Off the record, if Burswood Island does not measure up one of the possibilities would have to be a complete recall of applications.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: That is what I meant.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is obvious why that would have to happen.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I hope the Minister understands that it is not off the record.

Hon. D. K. DANS: It is off the cuff. Should the Casino Control Committee find that Burswood Island is a suitable site for this major development and that all the conditions can be met it will start sorting out the two contenders. In addition to the Casino Control Committee's inquiries, I have had reason to have some investigations made into the two contenders. When the committee has sorted out the two contenders the hard part will commence.

Hon. P. G. Pental: When you lose your dough!

Hon. D. K. DANS: The Government does not have any money involved in the casino. As soon as a choice has been made an agreement will be drawn up and that is when the hard things can happen. It was during this stage that the Genting Group withdrew from the casino development in Queensland. Mr Hall was misquoted in the Press because the reasons stated for the withdrawal were incorrect.

I had a long discussion with the person in charge of the casino project in Queensland and I also spoke with the Assistant Treasurer in that State. I received also a communication from the Premier of Queensland which appeared in the Press and he said—

Hon. P. G. Pental: That Genting was a good bloke.

Hon. D. K. DANS: He said—

This is to certify that Genting Berhad, a participant of the World Resorts Consortium, has the integrity and was acceptable to the Government of Queensland as a casino operator and participant for the casinos on the Gold Coast and in Townsville. This was borne out by investigations made by the Casino Control Division. Due to commercial reasons, they withdrew from the participation. We continue to hold the company in high regard and would commend them as operators for other casinos.

As noted in the second reading of the Casino Agreement Bill in the Legislative Assembly on the 23rd March, 1983, the then Treasurer, Dr. L. R. Edwards, M.L.A. said—"My association with the Jennings Group, the Superannuation Fund and World Resorts left nothing to be desired concerning the integrity of all parties and the way in which they behaved in negotiations. No criticism whatsoever can be levelled at the direc-

tors, the lawyers and the people associated with the Jennings Group, the Superannuation Fund and those from World Resorts".

What we have here is nothing new. We accepted there would be people flying kites.

Hon. P. G. Pental: You realise I did not raise this in my motion; it is irrelevant to the motion.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Most of the motion is irrelevant, so I thought I would answer in kind.

Hon. P. G. Pental: You have 17 points to answer.

Hon. D. K. DANS: Mr Leyshon says this—

In all fairness, I consider that the opening paragraph should reflect that Noel Hall was incorrectly reported by the Western Australian press.

I suppose all journalists get quotes wrong sometimes. To give that group due regard, the reason that it withdrew was first of all that it did not like a provision which we will have in our agreement; that is, that the casino licence can be revoked for any reason whatsoever by the Government. Any sensible person knows the Government would not revoke a licence like that after an investment of many millions of dollars without good reason.

More important was the intention of trying to relate the Townsville casino to the Jupiter casino at Surfers Paradise. That is just between the people I spoke to and the people from the Hilton group. When the Berhad group got out the casino excuse it managed to get hold of the Hilton group. The Hilton group did something it never normally does. It took a holding in the casino. Normally it would not do that. Greg Dillon of the Hilton group impressed on me they were merely casino operators and the application came along as an operator.

I do not know that there is much more to say, except that I think the committee has acted in a very professional way. I repeat my offer—I hope I get a reaction here—that in order to clear up any misunderstanding the honourable member is welcome to view all the documents, uncensored. He can spend as much time as he likes reading them, and I will show him a film prepared by one of the contenders.

Secondly, as to those issues raised with respect to what the Government is not doing in regard to planning and all the Government departments which are involved, that is now being handled by the Casino Control Committee and will continue to be handled by it. I already have one interim report on planning from the Casino Control Committee. I am quite happy to show the member that report, should he so desire, on a confidential basis.

Thirdly, the reason that I do not want to go into some of the other matters which I might be required to answer by way of questions is that it would be embarrassing. I would like everyone in this Chamber to understand that. I do not want to hide it; I am prepared to let members know about it, and I cannot do much better than that. In fairness, we believe that we acted correctly. We received the applications, we referred them to our departments, we sorted out those that we did not think would be worth another look, we went to the extent of interviewing the others—we were not required to do that at all—and we made a decision as soon as we could.

All the other matters are being attended to, and for the life of me I do not really know what we have done wrong. There is no way that I could speculate as to what the Casino Control Committee will come up with. Most members know Mr Jarman, a man of very high standing in the business community. He is a top man.

The committee is composed of top businessmen who probably do not have any relationship to our party. Mr Shimmon is the executive officer. The final decision will be made by an independent authority. That is why it was set up. When Mr Pandal says that the decision is nearly ready to be made, and I said I wish it were—I have said a couple of months—I think it will be a very long time before any final decision is made.

We will be advertising next week Australia-wide for a chief casino control officer. That is another step in the security system.

Hon. I. G. Pratt: You or the committee?

Hon. D. K. DAns: The committee will advertise for that position.

Last but not least, while there is no requirement to do it, I have had an interview with the Commissioner of Police. I asked him to recommend how to go about engaging a retired police officer. I do not mean someone who has retired under the age rule. I said I would take his advice to assist the committee. This was done in Queensland, but only on a term basis. Queensland did not appoint the police officer until such time as the casino operator, or the people who had the contract, had been selected. I believe that the police officer should be engaged at an early stage and should remain for evermore, always there as a person skilled in investigation and capable of giving the Casino Control Committee from time to time, whoever they may be, the benefit of his investigation.

I suppose the next question is, why a police officer? Police officers know other policemen, and if they are the right kind of people they know their

way around the world. It is a well known fact that policemen will talk to policemen.

What I am saying is that I believe we have done everything possible. It is unfortunate that some people have sour grapes.

I would like to conclude on this note: It is unfortunate that one of those participants was an extremely good friend of mine—we are still friendly, though perhaps not quite as friendly as before, but I sincerely hope still friendly; and this is one thing I can say publicly: One applicant is a member of this party and he has stood as a candidate. I hope he had no illusions about getting some inside running. This Government would not make any decision on that basis, and I do not know of any other Government which would make a decision on that basis.

Some expectations were bumped up a little too high, and I suspect that may have occurred as a result of that association. I reject the propositions put forward by the Hon. Phillip Pandal and I hope the House rejects the motion.

I conclude on this note: I look forward with eagerness to the Leader of the Opposition in this House taking up my offer to examine the propositions, because I do not consider this matter to be political. It is something which must be seen to be as well put together as possible with no hope of anything going wrong by way of favour, dishonesty, or patronage. As we move down the track that facility will be available to the Opposition at any time it wants to exercise its right while we are in Government.

HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [4.31 p.m.]: I am a little sorry the Leader of the House was so anxious to jump to his own defence—

Hon. D. K. DAns: I am not defending anything.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: —because I wanted to ask him a question. It relates to a matter in which I have become very interested and bears purely on the site. I am not interested in anything else.

As the Leader of the House is aware, previously I was Minister for Works, Water Supplies, and Conservation and the Environment. During that time a considerable amount of study occurred on the part of the Public Works Department with regard to the problems experienced on the flood plain. I am very serious about this and perhaps the Leader of the House could obtain a written answer to my question, because I am placed in an embarrassing position as a result of the decision to build a casino on Burswood Island.

The problem of the use of the flood plain by all sorts of authorities has been given world wide at-

tention. It is not a matter which is confined to Western Australia. However, this State is very old geologically and the flood plain causes great problems. Specific examples of these problems may be given. Everyone would understand what I am saying if I mention the example of Yunderup where roads and all sorts of things have been built on the Serpentine plain. The structures form dams. When water comes down onto the plain, instead of spreading over it and being inches deep, it builds up and becomes feet deep. As a result people there cannot obtain insurance cover on their properties.

The flood plain results in a drastic problem in Perth. In another capacity I am interested in structures which are built on river banks. Everyone knows I am referring to buildings used by scouts and organisations of that nature. Mr Dans would have a very close interest in this, because, through his children, he has been associated with yacht clubs the premises of most of which are located close to the river's edge.

Currently the Public Works Department takes the attitude that if one wants to build, alter, or change the nature of any edifice built near the river's edge, one can use only as much space as is occupied by the existing structure. If the building was as big as this Chamber and one wanted to enlarge it, one would have to build upwards so as not to impede the flow of water.

It is an engineering concept which is simple to grasp that if the walls of the building were extended, one would create an obstruction to the flow of water and the water would bank up and become deeper.

As I understand it, the PWD has established some ground rules for the MRPA which are firm and unequivocal. One simply cannot build any further obstructions on flood plain areas. That policy may be highlighted by a statement which appeared in *The West Australian* of Saturday, 23 July last in which Alex Harris, a well known lady journalist writes—

PERTH'S long run of flood-free winters could change drastically in the next few years, Emeritus Professor C. A. Parker warned yesterday.

"All it needs is an unusually high rainfall over the degraded land in the huge Avon River catchment," he said.

"The result could be horrific inundations along the Swan River."

Professor Parker said that the damage would be equally severe in thousands of square kilometres of prime farmland as far east as Merredin and Lake Grace, as well as in towns such as Northam and York.

The article goes on to explain that, in its virgin state, the land had absorbed a great deal of water. He goes on to say—

These soils will now shed water at least twice and probably four times the rate they did in their virgin state.

The point of interest is that there is danger of flooding. The Swan River faces the prevailing storm winds, a bank up of water results, and floods occur.

Therefore, I ask the Minister why an application to build a virtually inconspicuous boatshed will be stopped in its track if it is proposed to locate it anywhere adjacent to the Swan River. I am talking about a case about which I was approached. It related to Mr McKenzie's electorate and he probably knows all about it. That development was stopped in its tracks. With all my influence with the PWD—and I used to have some—

Hon. D. K. Dans: You did not use your influence, did you? I am just saying we have not used it and you are saying you used to use it.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Well, persuasion then. With all my persuasion, I could get no joy. There was plenty of sympathy. Mr Bob Hillman, an engineer whose sons were both sea scouts, was full of sympathy. However, they were adamant that no building could be erected on the flood plain because of the deleterious effect it would have on all the other people who enjoy the proximity of the river and want to use the parks alongside it. It does not matter what one constructs, water will bank up and in times of bad floods, it will spread.

Is Burswood Island out of the flood plain? Has Burswood Island been raised by landfill to the point where it no longer constitutes part of the flood plain? Is it so high that it is removed from all the limitations laid down by the PWD?

Members should bear in mind that the PWD's attitude on this matter is in the interests of the community at large. It does not want to save itself the necessity of spending money on levy banks and the like. Based on world wide experience, the PWD adopts this policy in the certain knowledge that if a couple of floods occur within a year or even if a 100-year flood happens, the possibility of obtaining any insurance cover from that time forward is negligible.

If one has a house which is in danger of being flooded, that is it—one cannot get insurance cover. If members do not believe me, they should go to Melbourne and ask the people who live along the Yarra where this problem has been experienced. They should ask the people who live in Charles

Street, Bunbury where the problem has been experienced.

I am not interested in any talk of corruption or anything else. I will accept what the Leader of the House has said; it is a matter of time. I am interested, as I thought Mr Pandal may be, in the site. My point about the site is that Burswood Island appears to be flat and flood prone.

It seems to me that with the wind in the north-west quarter banking up the mouth of the Swan through Fremantle and heavy rain over the outer drainage area extending way out past Merredin and north almost in line with Geraldton—this was mentioned in the newspaper on Saturday 23 July—we could have all that water draining down the Avon and its tributaries, and running to Perth. How will this development face up to the limitations placed on building in flood plain areas laid down by the Public Works Department? Has the Government considered this?

Hon. Peter Dowding: Yes.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Is Burswood Island so high that it does not create any problem at all?

Hon. D. K. Dans: I will let you know.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The Minister will let us know. He ought to, because a number of people are concerned about this.

Hon. D. K. Dans: We will let you know.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am very surprised that Mr McKenzie has not received some complaints because he knows in some areas up his way boatsheds and facilities are wanted.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Those problems have been addressed and are again being addressed.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am very pleased to hear it because it is causing quite serious concern.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Naturally.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I happen to agree with you, Mr MacKinnon.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I knew Mr McKenzie would agree with me; that is why I mentioned his name. Members may notice that Mr Dans never brings my name into an argument unless he is pretty sure I will agree with him and I never bring Mr McKenzie's name into an argument unless I am pretty sure he will agree with me. I know Mr McKenzie is a sensible and well-balanced man who is loyal to his area.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Watch out, Fred, something is happening.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Assassination by flattery is an awful thing.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I am just bringing out into the open something that up to date no-

body whom I have heard of has made so much of a whisper of. Mr McKenzie is probably being loyal.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Can I give you some information which might help Mr Pandal? We looked at it in the Cabinet subcommittee when we were looking at applications and at the drawings.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Is that right?

Hon. D. K. Dans: We had some very good information on it before.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: The reason must be that the Government does not expect floods to get that high.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Mr MacKinnon, it is not that at all. Some people have never heard of flood plains.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I have heard of them.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I know. I am just telling you this.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I want to bring these points forward. Mr President, you represent South Perth and you would know that the Sir James Mitchell Park area is part of the flood plain of Perth and it must be expected to be flooded. Even in a comparatively mild winter like this winter areas of Sir James Mitchell Park have been covered with water. The wall around the Swan River is about four feet high. I walk along it reasonably regularly and sometimes it is completely clear whereas at other times the water is lapping the top of the wall, not from flood, but purely and simply from wind effect. The north-west wind banks up the water all the way from Fremantle, and in Perth water we see it comes up from four feet to four feet six inches and it will run over the bank and onto Sir James Mitchell Park. It only requires that to coincide with the sort of rains mentioned here by Emeritus Professor C. A. Parker, as reported by Alex Harris, for us to be in real trouble.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: Together with the degradation of the Avon Valley.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Mr Gayfer must not be so touchy. He is getting almost as bad as one or two other members I might mention. He will be running away and sulking soon! I am talking about a flood problem and I would be very grateful if the Minister could write to me a full and satisfactory explanation, and perhaps he might be kind enough to give a copy to Mr McKenzie.

Hon. Peter Dowding: I am quite happy to arrange a briefing for you on the control measures and arrangements.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I ask the Minister to send a copy to Mr McKenzie.

Hon. Peter Dowding: He has his own ways of getting information.

Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: He will get the problem bowled up to him, too. The problem does not extend only to people on the Swan River; it extends also to the Yunderup area, Queens Gardens, and the area under the control of the Leschenault Inlet Management Authority, and indeed all the flood plains. I cannot, for the life of me, see how all the necessary works could be put into Burswood Island without affecting flood control over the flood plain of the approaches to Perth. I just cannot see it because I have a fair idea of what is contained in the land out there because I was Minister for Health while it was being used as a landfill area. Indeed, some members might recall a great trial and tribulation that occurred during the 1960s when some anatomy samples from Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital were inadvertently taken there. I know what has gone on at Burswood Island. It is flat, low lying country, to the best of my knowledge classified as a flood plain. I would appreciate an explanation as to how the Government will make absolutely certain that it will not experience any kinds of problems such as those enunciated by the Hon. David Parker's father, Emeritus Professor, C. A. Parker, and reported in the Press on Saturday 23 July and to which the Public Works Department has given a tremendous amount of study.

HON. G. E. MASTERS (West—Leader of the Opposition) [4.47 p.m.]: I listened with great interest to the debate and have particular interest in the comments made by the Hon. Graham MacKinnon. I too was a Minister for Conservation and Environment for the short time of two years.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Very good comments. I will answer them, too.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: So I did take notice of the flood plain area that the Hon. Graham MacKinnon talked about. At the same time I want to comment on the statements made by the Hon. Des Dans. I guess most people in this House one way or the other have invested in business enterprise and the way the Government has gone about its business seems cock-eyed to me. I am not saying that in his statements Mr Dans has not been sincere, but it does seem to be a badly managed business arrangement. We saw this Parliament agree to a casino being established in Western Australia.

Hon. D. K. Dans: And a control committee.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The site was not decided.

Hon. D. K. Dans: But the control committee has decided upon it.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, but in effect we said, yes, there will be a casino under certain conditions in Western Australia.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I am very much aware that you did not set the site that has been mentioned.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Government of the day said, "Righto. We want submissions". It received many submissions which would have cost a lot of money. Submissions are not cheap to produce and they incorporate a lot of work and a great cost—not tens of thousands of dollars, probably hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Government received these expensive submissions and then decided that Burswood Island was the option it preferred. It must have done so because it said, "We have received these submissions and our position is that we favour Burswood Island".

Hon. D. K. Dans: We asked them to tender on the basis of Burswood Island being the site.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That gave an indication to the public surely and certainly to me that the Government favoured the proposition of Burswood Island.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I do not dispute that. I have made no secret about it.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is hard to understand how the Government could have operated in this way. It went to the tenderers and asked them to prepare an application for Burswood Island costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. Those people would have prepared those submissions and I understand the Minister responsible has said that the environmental examination and investigations will now take place. Surely to goodness the environmental tests should have been carried out before those people were required to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It is just bad business. How on earth can this be done when doubts exist about Burswood Island's ability to cope with a major development for some of the reasons given by Mr MacKinnon, and others? To ask people to spend that sort of money and to give an indication that a casino would be built on Burswood Island when no substantial environmental investigations have been carried out is ridiculous.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I said in my second reading speech that it would be at Burswood Island and that applications would close on 31 May.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I know that. I am saying that in recent times the applicants have had to spend a great deal of money putting up a proposition for Burswood Island which may never

eventuate because the environmental tests and impact studies have not been carried out.

If the Government decides Burswood Island—or any other site—is a possibility surely the first thing to do is to submit the idea to the EPA and the Department of Conservation and Environment and say, “We favour Burswood Island, can you give us a report”?

The Government did it the wrong way around. It said “You put in the applications and we will look to see if it is possible”. The Government is playing with people’s money. One would not enter into a business proposition like that if one were organising it. The testing should come first. One would ask whether it was feasible, and then start the development plans. I find it difficult to understand what is happening. Although Mr Dans explained the situation in a reasonable and quiet manner—and it is nice to hear it—his explanation must leave some doubts as to why the Government has gone about the matter in this way.

I was interested to hear Mr Dans say that one of the reasons is that Government land is involved. That is an important statement.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I said that in my second reading speech, too.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: It is obvious that the reason for the site being chosen was that the Government wants to keep its finger in the pie. It wants a slice of the action one way or another; that can be the only reason.

It is astounding to me as a former Minister for Conservation and Environment that the environmental issues have not been properly canvassed and the effect of a major construction on a reserve has not been checked. This development may cost \$200 million or \$300 million; those figures have been bandied around. Let us say it is \$100 million. It is a major construction on low lying ground, a flood plain on the banks of the Swan River, involving roads and communication networks, and it will create traffic problems; yet a proper environmental investigation has not been carried out.

I understood Mr Dans to say that some investigations have taken place, but for any major mining project in a part of this State such as the Pilbara or the Kimberley, even if there is nothing within 100 miles—the normal procedure requires an impact study.

Hon. D. K. Dans: That is all going to happen.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The point I am making is that in normal circumstances a development requires an impact study before the go-ahead is given and before major consideration is given to it. Mr Dans says this will take place. People have

been required to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, weeks of effort and a great deal of time in meetings and in submitting applications.

Hon. D. K. Dans: They were aware of all those problems.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That may be, but it is a needless waste of money.

The Government has obviously decided that Burswood Island is a strong possibility for the casino—it has made a decision and I am not arguing about that—but it is public land managed by the Perth City Council, and it has not carried out a major environmental study to see if this development is feasible. It is a strange way of going about this business; it is back to front.

Hon. D. K. Dans: The first thing is a major engineering study and then a planning study. If those things fall down it is not much good doing an environmental impact study.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I cannot accept that argument. Having been a Minister and knowing how things worked in the past with major projects, I find it impossible to believe that environmental studies—

Hon. D. K. Dans: We already have one report.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Only a minor one.

Hon. H. W. Gayfer: It will be an interesting agreement; \$250 million spent on land they do not own.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: That is right. The point I am making is no major environmental study has been carried out. Normally, under the Act, a proposition of this sort would require an impact study.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I wish you had taken up my offer before you engaged in this debate.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I will take advantage of the Minister’s offer to go to his office and look through the documents, but this forum enables the public to understand what is going on and the Press to report what is happening. It is no good my going to the Minister’s office and studying documents when we can get him to stand up and explain it publicly. We are talking about public land; it has nothing to do with the offer to see the details and facts and figures.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Are you refusing that offer?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Had the member been listening he would have heard me accept the offer, but so that his slow mind can absorb it, I say again, yes I will accept it.

Hon. Garry Kelly: That is on the record.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: So long as it is on the member’s record, which is a bit slow.

If we had decided on this proposition while in Government and said "Right, we will have a major development on Burswood Island", whether it be a casino or whatever, we all know what would have happened; the so-called environmentalists would have come out like a swarm of bees. Had we dared mention someone would spend \$100 million on Burswood Island, a public reserve, there would have been a march up St. George's Terrace and rent-a-crowd would have been outside waving flags and shouting "Down with the Government". Mr Dans and his colleagues would have been there saying "Well done, we agree with you". Yet now that the Labor Government is proposing to do this the Conservation Council has not uttered a word. I think that casts some doubts—

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is far too much conversation and I ask members to tone it down.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: The Conservation Council of Western Australia would have marched the streets if we as a Government had proposed this sort of development; it would have gone mad. Yet nothing has been done, not one person has appeared on the steps of Parliament House. There must be serious doubts about the integrity of some of those people.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Do you regard it as an issue?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I put the proposition to members opposite that some people have talked about forests and forced the Government to make decisions in the south-west that put hundreds of people out of work. They have done all sorts of things in relation to bauxite mining areas; but when it is a city development on a public reserve there is no demonstration. I have not read a single comment.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Give them time.

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I doubt the integrity of those people. If they are sincere they will make some sort of public statement after this debate. They should do that. They will say, "Our council was mentioned in Parliament. We were criticised for not making any statement on the proposed development of one of our beloved reserves". If that is reported, we could expect someone from the Press to say, "What do you think? Do you think it is a good idea or not?"

Hon. D. K. Dans: Would you like me to ring up the greens so you can have a demonstration out there?

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: I want to know why there has been no reaction. I am staggered by the silence. I doubt their sincerity.

Hon. Garry Kelly: They have their priorities right!

Hon. G. E. MASTERS: Yes, they have got their priorities right. It is the Labor Party's rent-a-crowd.

This has been a nice, quiet debate. I am trying to make an important point. I am concentrating on the environmental issue because it has been past practice that proper environmental procedure should be followed. We have the Environment Protection Authority. Three men were appointed to that authority, with the support of the Labor Party, I am sure, to carry out a very important job. That authority was given independent status when we were in Government. Its three members are totally independent. They are not Ministers of a department or members of any group with vested interests. They are three fine, highly qualified people. The Government should have used them well and truly before this time.

The Minister knows very well what the Act says and the powers it sets down for dealing with pollution and environmental damage. I cannot understand why those tests and examinations were not carried out before the applications were called for. I say with great sincerity that the Government has dealt with this matter in the wrong way. The Government and the Minister, with all their goodwill, have not received good advice, wherever it came from, and have dealt with this matter in a back to front way. The environmental studies should have been carried out long before the applications were called for.

I draw the Government's attention to the System 6 report on the Darling Range. That report was completely approved by the Government only a few weeks ago. It mentions Burswood Island but does not lay down any set rules for Burswood Island. It accepts that Burswood Island has been reserved for public enjoyment and for public recreation and not for putting large buildings on.

In accepting the System 6 report, the Government also accepted a document entitled *System 6—A Major Conservation Milestone*. It includes an introduction by the Premier and a picture of the Premier on its first page. It states—

I am pleased to announce that my Government has accepted the general principles and recommendations of Part I of the System 6 Red Book Report and has decided that the detailed recommendations in Part II will be progressively implemented as far as possible...

I am confident that the System 6 Report will become the blue print for the com-

munity's conservation and recreation needs in the Darling System until the early part of the 21st Century.

A major study was carried out during my time and during the time of Hon. Graham MacKinnon which was approved in total by this Government. Recreation reserves have been set out clearly on page 26 of that document. That information is there for the public to see. It refers to Burswood Island as a recreation reserve. I do not know whether one would call a casino a recreation facility.

In conclusion the Government has gone about the development of a proposed casino badly. It has approached its development back to front. The Government has cost developers a great deal of money, perhaps needlessly. Certainly, many people have lost money needlessly. It seems that the Government is contradicting the System 6 report which it accepted only six weeks ago. There is a lack of sincerity and many hidden reasons why the development of a casino on Burswood Island is being pursued by this Government.

HON. PETER DOWDING (North—Minister for Planning) [5.17 p.m.]: The Opposition is really very tired and very disillusioned by its change of leadership in this House. It is clearly demoralised by the movement of its shadow Ministers, some of whom have faded away from the front bench. One can understand why we have heard this performance today. What is fascinating is that every time there is the potential for a major development in WA, the Opposition does not support that development. It does not take advantage of the offers made by this Government to peruse information on a confidential basis. Those offers were never made by the Opposition when it was in Government. However, this Government is prepared to make those offers in the interests of WA. The Opposition carps, criticises, complains, spreads innuendo, and, in some cases, spreads deliberate untruths in order to try to show that it knows how things ought to be done and nobody else does.

One thing that must be understood is that, at all times, the processes in relation to the casino have been expressly stated by the Premier to be processes which have been subjected to proper planning and environmental considerations. That is what the undertaking was about and that is what will occur. The fact that it did not occur overnight suggests that we take our responsibilities seriously.

Let us consider, for instance, Mr MacKinnon's query. I take it that his query was about the flood plain. It is interesting that, as far as I am aware,

he has never asked any of the responsible Ministers this question.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I just asked it.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Has Mr MacKinnon produced a letter which was written prior to today. Since the Government's announcement of the intention to site a casino on Burswood Island, he has not drawn to the Government's attention the knowledge that it is a flood plain. He has not sought to put that information before the Government before this time. He has used this time to jump to his feet and float the idea that the area is a flood plain because he thought it would be a nice idea. He did not take his responsibilities seriously enough to write to the relevant Minister at the time of the publication of the announcement for the development of a casino or even to put a question to me before today. That is the attitude that I think will condemn the Opposition to the Opposition benches for a considerable time.

The Opposition is not interested in Western Australia. It is not interested in getting the development of the casino up and running. That development will involve hundreds of millions of dollars of investment and will involve many jobs that we need in this State, both in the construction of the casino and in its operation. The Opposition hangs back and abuses the Government in this Parliament. It criticises the Government and raises fears which are not realistic fears.

We have seen exactly the same behaviour from Mr Peter Jones in the last two days. He has issued some of the most scurrilous, yellow Press releases that I have seen. Does he care about Western Australia? Does he, like the members sitting opposite, really care about getting a major project off and running or does he just run around and criticise? We do not claim to be perfect. Although this is not one of those times, there may be times that we do not dot all of the "i's" or cross all of the "t's".

This is not one of those occasions, although there may well be times when it does occur. However, I hope that we on this side would be men and women enough to admit our mistakes. The Opposition does not want to achieve an objective. I note that Hon. Sandy Lewis, feeling the spark of enthusiasm, has returned to his seat to listen. The Opposition is not interested in this issue. Mr Pental is not interested in the jobs that could be created but only in the political kudos.

Hon. P. G. Pental: I am interested in my electorate.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr Pental is not interested in anything. His problem is that in his long diatribe this afternoon he did not come up

with one concrete reason that appropriate procedures should not be followed. He forwarded no reason that we should not follow the course of action we have set in motion; that is, identify an area we believe is appropriate and then move on to proper planning processes.

Hon. P. G. Pental: You did not.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: We did and we shall continue to follow that action.

Several members interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Mr Pental has had his go, although it was pretty pathetic. At the end of the day when the final decision is made there will have been adherence to all appropriate levels of planning procedures. This effort is pathetic on the part of the Opposition and it indicates the lack of discipline and respect that Mr Masters is able to engender in his own backbenchers. Yesterday Mr Dans offered Mr Masters access to the very information Mr Pental is speculating about.

Hon. P. G. Pental: You want to share the blame.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: It is our responsibility and we do not want to share the blame with anyone. We will take the kudos and the blame, if any. Mr Masters was offered access to the information and it would be most inappropriate for us to bring it into the public arena. Mr Lockyer, who has been engaged in business, may understand this point even if Mr Pental does not; there are very good commercial reasons that one would not put on the Table of the House material concerning the assessment of people's credibility, credit worthiness, and appropriateness to engage in activities of this type.

Several members interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The Opposition was offered access to that confidential information, but rather than allowing Mr Masters to take it up, the rebellious backbenchers popped up with an urgency motion today in an attempt to gain political kudos before they are informed on a confidential basis about the reasons that the decision was taken.

It is indicative that business cannot trust the Opposition in this State to act impartially and in the interests of the State. We see that all along the line. Business people are coming to us and saying that although traditionally they have supported the Liberal Party, they cannot tell Liberal members anything without its being used to make political mileage. We must concern ourselves with the State. Members of the Opposition are called Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. I hope they display that loyalty to the State by changing to an Opposi-

sition which can be critical but not one that carps for the sake of it.

Hon. P. H. Lockyer: Like you used to.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I believe that in Opposition we played a very important role in correcting the major injustices that the Liberal Party was pursuing and when we finally could not correct them in Opposition the people of Western Australia took the matter out of our hands and decided we were the better and more responsible political party to be in Government.

It is important to ask for whom Hon. P. G. Pental is an advocate. Which of the disgruntled applicants has he got into bed with?

Hon. P. G. Pental: None.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: Which of the disgruntled applicants has he lined himself up with? He has not sought a confidential inquiry from Mr Dans as to why the particular applicants with whom he is so friendly have been rejected. He has not sought information, but has popped up saying, "Some have lost and some have won, and I think the process is wrong". It is a pity that the Opposition is evincing so much hostility to the casino proposal. I have made my position quite clear on this issue; I am not excited about involvement in gambling. I do not enjoy gambling or regard it as an area of recreation. However, the community seems to wish to have access to this type of activity and the Government is proposing a development which will involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in this State. The Opposition seems to regard that as a bad thing. Perhaps Opposition members are really saying that as they are not in Government they would rather destroy the project so that in the end result they can be critical of the Government for not getting major developments up and running.

Hon. P. G. Pental is not being partisan for his electorate in this issue; it is a red herring. The area he represents in Parliament, like all electorates, has numerous matters that need ongoing attention and no doubt his lack of reasonable representation has led to more pressing problems than most electorates have. The interests of the people in that area can be adequately protected by the approach proposed by the Government. Contact has been made with community interest groups and the City of Perth about arrangements that will be made.

Hon. P. G. Pental: You met them afterwards.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: I met with the Lord Mayor on a number of occasions, not afterwards. The Lord Mayor received in my presence the assurances of the Premier that all decisions will

move down the appropriate planning approval lines.

Hon. P. G. Pendal: Afterwards.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: The City of Perth will be involved in the consultations before the final decision is made.

Several members interjected.

Hon. PETER DOWDING: If Mr Pendal had, in fact, bothered to go to Burswood Island he would see what a large area of land is involved. If he had bothered to ask he would have been informed that the Government's proposal required the applicants to identify the public areas that would be established in conjunction with any casino. A casino could be a room; a small bar could be the place in which betting occurs. A casino could be a 400-room hotel. However, whatever is developed on Burswood Island, there will be a major development of public open space for recreational purposes for the public of Western Australia which can be developed in conjunction with the casino. Who will be the winner from that? Mr Pendal will not open the development so I guess he will complain. However, the people of Perth and Victoria Park, and indeed all Western Australians, will benefit from the public facilities established alongside the casino.

If the Opposition was serious about its concern regarding the casino it would have taken the opportunity offered by the Government to have information about the reasons that certain decisions were made. Armed with that information I think Mr Masters would have been forced to try to slip a bandaid across Mr Pendal's mouth. Judging by the lack of loyalty we have seen on the Opposition benches, I am sure Mr Masters would be unsuccessful in that.

Several members interjected.

HON. I. G. PRATT (Lower West) [5.21 p.m.]: It was interesting to hear the Minister for Planning commence his speech by talking about the elevation of Hon. Gordon Masters to the position of Leader of the Opposition, because that gives us the chance to highlight the loyalty which we show to Hon. Gordon Masters and the solidarity of our approach as an Opposition.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Hon. I. G. PRATT: It was interesting to hear the Minister mentioning movements on the back and front benches of the Opposition. It is a pity the Hon. Peter Dowding did not concentrate on the movement on the benches of the Australian Labor Party when he was sacked from the Minerals and Energy portfolio and placed into what the ALP considers to be the minor role of Plan-

ning. If ever we wanted an exhibition by the Government of the status it gives to planning it is demonstrated by this exercise relating to the casino. In fact, that planning role has been non-existent.

It is also interesting that the mudslinging frontbencher had a few things to say which we would have taken much more seriously if he was not the member who wasted hours and hours speaking on adjournments when he was in Opposition, saying what should be done about prostitution and two-up when they are matters which his Government has ignored since it came into office, apart from giving a sectional privilege to Kalgoorlie and raiding other mining towns. However, that is in passing.

Hon. Peter Dowding also mentioned the fact during his speech that a certain member of the Opposition was out of his seat. It is interesting that at a time when certain factions such as the centre left are emerging within the ALP, we have Hon. Peter Dowding being referred to as the representative of the "just left". We note that he has just left again. Whenever anybody has anything to say about Mr Dowding—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I was not here during that part of the honourable Minister's speech.

Hon. D. K. Dans: You missed the best part.

The PRESIDENT: If I had been, I would have stopped him, because that matter is not relevant to the motion. I am now stopping you because what you are saying is not relevant to the motion either. I suggest you deal with the motion, which is about a casino.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I accept your ruling most happily, Sir. In my inability to refer to the debate which took place in this House, which I believe should have been answered, I believe I am still correct in referring to the honourable Minister as the representative of the "just left", because in fact that is what he has been all day. Any time something comes up, we find that the honourable Minister has just left.

Hon. Gordon Masters mentioned in his speech—I will reinforce it—the cavalier fashion in which the Government has treated other people's money. Just imagine if the Government were to proceed with the construction of a bridge over the estuary at Mandurah, and it invited tenders and said, "We want you to tender for the bridge. This is where we think it is going to be. Mind you, we haven't carried out any studies yet. We will do that after you have tendered and then decide where it is going to be". The Government claims that its Ministers are business managers!

While I was listening to Hon. Des Dans, I was reminded that this Government is made up of socialists trying to play businessmen. That just does not work; they are just not capable. What Mr Dans said today was an absolute farce.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I noticed your business expertise with the gas pipeline. That will be a living memento to the North-West Shelf.

Hon. P. G. Pental: We are more worried about your gas.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let us talk about the motion.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: I can understand that Hon. Des Dans wants us to talk about the gas pipeline, because he does not want us to talk about the Government's bungling on this issue.

When Hon. Peter Dowding, the representative of the "just left" in this House, was summing up his tirade—one could not call it a submission to the House—he complained about the Opposition's objection to the casino. Not one member of the Opposition raised any objection to the building of a casino, so what Mr Dowding said was just not true. Why was he trying to mislead us? Why was he trying to change the tack of the debate? Because he was on very poor ground; and Hon. Des Dans knows that. Hon. Des Dans is aware that not one member of the Opposition has spoken out—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will not tolerate the constant audible conversation that has been going on in the Chamber for the last couple of hours. The debate is taking a long time, but that is no excuse for honourable members not sitting and intently taking note of the remarks of the speaker addressing the Chair.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Hon. Des Dans reminded our leader (Hon. Gordon Masters) that in the second reading speech on the Casino Control Bill he said that the casino would be established on Burswood Island. He did not say, "It might be", or "It may be", or "We will investigate it"; he said, "It will be there". The people who put in submissions on this would have done so in the firm belief that that was the site in respect of which they were making submissions. Now Hon. Des Dans tells us that the Casino Control Committee will investigate whether it is feasible to put a casino on Burswood Island. Hon. Des Dans told the people interested in the casino that it would be there; he invited their submissions; they spent a great deal of money making submissions; and now he is hiding behind the Casino Control Committee and saying that the committee will decide whether Burswood Island is a suitable site. What sort of business management is that?

That is the sort of business management we have come to expect from socialist Governments which do not understand business and which treat other people's money with no respect. I wonder how much money has been wasted by the people making submissions on this casino. What will happen if the Casino Control Committee finds that Burswood Island is not a suitable site? Will the two companies which have chosen to make submissions in relation to that site be the only ones to make submissions in relation to some other site, or will submissions be thrown open to the other organisations again? Will more money and time be wasted?

If the Government were fair dinkum about the environment and getting the casino off the ground, it could have achieved a tremendous breakthrough for the metropolitan area. I cannot speak for Hon. Phillip Pental, but I am quite sure he would find this suggestion much more acceptable than Burswood Island. The Government should approach the Perth City Council to rezone the site of the cement works for casino purposes and leave it to private enterprise. The Casino Control Committee could still issue a licence for the casino to a group of people with the integrity and the business know-how required. The site would gain sufficient value to make it worth while to shift the cement works from the centre of metropolitan Perth. The people would have to back their money to use the site, but it would not be built on land which is not freehold land and part of a reserve over which the Government has some sort of vague equity so that the owners of the casino did not know where they were. It would be a straight business deal.

Hon. G. E. Masters: On a high block.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: It would not interfere in any way with the flood plain about which Hon. Graham MacKinnon is so concerned. It would not interfere with the zoning of the land under the metropolitan region scheme. A casino there would still enhance that area of Perth and it would still be a good entrance to the city.

But this is a socialist Government and it wants its fingers in everything. It cannot stand seeing the people who take the risks get on with the job. The interesting thing about all this is that the Government wants to give itself an edge when it goes into business. Consider the Argyle diamond share float. In this instance the Government is using taxpayers' money to guarantee income to the people who take shares in the deal. A private mining company does not have that guarantee of taxpayers providing a backing. Ordinary business people have to take a risk with their investments; they do not have this edge the Government is giving itself. The Government wants the lot; it

wants to own the land on which the casino is built and it wants the casino operator to work under conditions that no other commercial operator would face.

Mr President, let us suppose you wanted to obtain a piece of freehold land, perhaps to operate a corner store. Just imagine what everyone else in that situation would have to go through. What I am saying is that this Government has downgraded planning to an absolute zero. Probably the only reason the Minister for Planning holds that portfolio is that the ALP Cabinet is elected after an election and no-one can be dropped from it until after the next election. Government members gave the Minister this portfolio because they considered it to be the least important. No doubt after the next elections, were they to retain office, the Minister would be dropped to where he deserves to be, because his handling of the portfolio has shown him to be not fit to hold office.

But a person wanting to build a corner store would first have to make application to the local authority. The local authority would then have to consider the application and perhaps grant preliminary approval. That preliminary approval would then have to go to the Minister for possible confirmation of the approval from the local authority. The application must then be advertised in the local Press, usually for 90 days, to allow people in the locality to lodge any objection they may have to the proposal. And all this is just for a corner store. At the end of that 90-day period the local authority considers any objections and then makes a recommendation which goes to the Minister's department. The officers of the department look at the recommendation and objections and the Minister finally decides whether to agree to the local authority's recommendation.

In this case the local authority was not even approached. The local residents in whose area this casino will be built have had no say at all; they have had no chance to object as they would otherwise have had were someone wanting to build a corner store. This shows the absolute disregard this Government has for the local residents. This is the way in which it treats local government; the same disregard is shown.

We have the examples of the disdain with which this Government treats local authorities. Last session the Government introduced a Bill to amend the Local Government Act, yet it would not listen to or consult with local authorities until we managed to force the Government to adjourn the debate so that it could talk with local authorities. The Government did not want to know them. We also had the instance of the Government's introducing the South West Development

Corporation Bill, where again this House had to force the Government to pause and consult the local authorities.

We now have this casino matter in which the Government has ridden roughshod over the Perth City Council. In his speech, the Leader of the House simply stated that the casino would be placed on Burswood Island. There was no, "Do you agree? Is it a good idea? Do you have any objections?" The Government was not talking to the local people and giving them a chance to lodge objections, which would be the case were a businessman to seek to establish a corner store. The jackboots fall right on their necks.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I have had one complaint only.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: If the member were to read his local papers he would find other different views.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: They haven't been to me. I have had just one complaint—about the casino, not the location.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: People know the member is not allowed to have an objection, so what is the use of going to him?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Who said that? That is nonsense.

Hon. G. E. Masters: You don't have a choice.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Were Mr McKenzie to object, the same thing would happen to him as happened to Ron Thompson.

Hon. Robert Hetherington: What happened to him?

Hon. G. E. Masters: He got the bullet.

Hon. I. G. PRATT: Mr Thompson had to resign from the ALP because he objected to his party's homosexual Bill. The same would happen to Mr McKenzie were he to object to this proposition. In this case the choice of the successful applicant smacks very much of a police line-up, where someone we are after is lined up with half-a-dozen others and we pick the one we want. In this instance the Government has picked two people.

We need only look at the words spoken by Mr Dans. First we see the words "a slight slip up" and then we see he said that the two were chosen "after the others were pushed out". They were his words. How much consideration is that? He said that the Government intended to site the casino on Burswood Island. The Government then commissioned the two contenders in a way that looked as though the others were not really considered seriously in the first place.

My main intention in speaking today was to highlight how important the planning matters are. The Government should not set itself above the people it governs and give itself separate rules to get into a commercial enterprise, yet that is what this Government has done. It has set itself up as being something different.

From now on, no local authority in Western Australia will know whether it has control over the planning destiny of its area, because it will not know when this Government will say, "We will place a hotel there, a casino there, a meatworks there and a brothel there". That is what it amounts to. Local authorities no longer have any real say because this Government has given notice that it does not intend to comply with planning procedures or to give ordinary people a chance to object to its intentions.

One of the things that led to the undoing of the previous Labor Government was the fact that its Minister for Town Planning did the same sort of thing. He granted tavern sites against the wishes of local authorities, the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority, the Town Planning Board, and the people. He would say, "I think it is a good idea; I will put one there". He overruled the whole planning system, which is exactly what this Government is doing. It does so at its peril, because this will be its undoing, as it was with the Tonkin Government. It should not continue to ignore the people as it has ignored them on this occasion.

The Leader of the House said that there was no requirement for the Government to interview anyone. In effect he was confirming that the whole thing was a charade, saying, "We will make our own decision on the matter".

Whether we have a casino is not part of this discussion. I return to what I said at the beginning of my contribution tonight: The issue before us is whether the Government has acted correctly, honestly, and decently in its handling of this issue. I am not saying that the casino should not be built on Burswood Island. I am saying that the Government's actions over the period spanning the calling for submissions, choosing submissions, deciding on a site, up to now when it is trying to hide behind the committee, have been unacceptable. The Government is saying in effect, "We didn't obey the rules, but the committee will—now that it is all over". The actions of this Government throughout this issue have been absolutely reprehensible.

I think the Government stands condemned, not only by members in this House but also by the people of Perth whose local authority—the Perth City Council—has been shunned over this matter,

and by the people of the metropolitan area and the people of Western Australia.

HON. D. J. WORDSWORTH (South) [5.41 p.m.]: As a former Minister for Lands I have to comment on the manner in which Burswood Island has been chosen as the site for a casino. As members would appreciate, the Minister for Lands is the custodian of public open space and Crown land. I was shocked to find that no consultation with Parliament had occurred.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I named Burswood Island when I brought the casino Bill to this place. It is in the second reading speech. I presume you were in the House. The only person who objected was Mr Pental.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: At that time the question was whether there should be a casino, not where it would be.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Read the second reading speech.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It was not debated.

Hon. D. K. Dans: It is in *Hansard*, and Mr Pental objected.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: The question of whether he objected then or now is beside the point. I am choosing now to express my concern at the manner in which the site was chosen. I have done some further work on this subject as well.

I managed to find a copy of the original Stephenson plan which is an interesting document. It was presented to the library by a former President of this House, the Hon. Sir Les Diver, in 1971. He was on the planning advisory committee of 1955. Glued to the face of the book are the minutes of one of those meetings.

I remind members that Professor Stephenson was asked to come here in 1953 when there was little town planning and the population of Perth was 400 000. Kwinana was just starting and oil had just been discovered in Western Australia. Forecasts were being made then that Perth could contain one million people by the turn of the century. Those predictions proved to be correct. Professor Stephenson put a lot of emphasis on open space. To quote the plan—

Open Spaces. The framework upon which an impressive open space system can be established is clearly evident in the survey. With Kings Park as focal point, a series of disconnected open spaces stretch along both banks of the Swan River. Particularly to the East, many of the breaks in continuity consist of unused or agricultural land. The linking

and extension of riverside reservations form an essential part of the proposals

To continue—

The river, about which the Metropolitan Region has developed, provides a setting matched by very few cities in the world. Not only does its cool, blue expanse appear in delightful views from many points, but its waters also give infinite pleasure to thousands of children, yachtsmen, fishermen and swimmers.

He laid great emphasis upon the reservation of the foreshores. He referred to Burswood Island as follows—

When the reclamation of that part of Burswood Island South of the railway is completed, it could be developed as an admirable centre well served by both regional highways and railway. It is, therefore, suggested that the future use of this area should be as a comprehensive sports centre, including a major oval with provision for the eventual accommodation of 80,000—100,000 spectators.

That is the particular use he set aside for that land. In one chapter he was concerned about the flood plain and he shows houses in Morley Park which had whole gardens covered in water. He said that that sort of thing occurred around Belmont and elsewhere where drainage was poor.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Are you saying that Burswood Island is a flood plain?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: It would appear from what he said that is the reason he set it aside for that particular purpose.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Things must have changed.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: He continued by saying that the most important regional open spaces proposed in the plan include—

- (i) Yanchep park
- (ii) White Lake
- (iii) Forrest National Park
- (iv) Bibra Lake
- (v) Herdsman Lake
- (vi) Burswood Island

He suggested reservation of 445 acres at Burswood Island for a regional sports centre. I think as Perth becomes more and more populated we will need to look after these areas of open space, because they are comparatively small. I am aware also that during this controversy Professor Stephenson did say that he was not against a casino at Burswood Island. However, I did find it a little odd that he said Burswood Island should be treated in exactly the same way as Kings Park. I

can imagine the situation if we decided to build a casino in Kings Park.

I tried to find out when Burswood Island was first proposed as a casino site. I went through the newspaper cuttings in the library and I found the very first cutting on the file was one from the *Daily News* on 4 January 1984 under the heading "Casino Bets Land on Burswood". The matter was obviously being debated then, because the Federal Hotels chose it as a proposed site.

The article stated that Cabinet members supported that area as a possible site because it was owned by the State which could lease the land and gain an equity in the project as a private developer. Right from the start the State Government saw the opportunity to use Burswood Island as a way of gaining a partnership in the whole proposal. It did not take Mr Dempster very long to choose that site for his casino.

I was interested when I heard the Minister say that some boring had been done on the area to see whether it was suitable. I ask: Was this done this year?

Hon. D. K. Dans: Yes.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: I cannot believe someone would put up a large proposal without having some idea of the foundation of the area.

Hon. D. K. Dans: I think you will find a Government department did the boring.

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Perhaps I can make that the subject of a question tomorrow. It will give the Government a chance to tell us when the boring took place. Perhaps it will give us an indication whether anyone had an advantage. On 7 April 1984 the *Weekend News* reported under the heading "Casino Report Troubles Ahead" that major engineering problems would confront the developers of a casino and hotel complex on Burswood Island.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Didn't I say in my reply tonight that there were major engineering problems?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: Like previous speakers I wonder whether those groups which are proposing to build a casino have not been forced into the Burswood Island site, ahead of more suitable sites, in order that the Government can obtain an equity. I believe at least seven or eight other sites would be suitable.

Hon. D. K. Dans: Who said anything about the Government getting an equity?

Hon. D. J. WORDSWORTH: That information came from Government sources and it has been mentioned in newspaper reports. An article which appeared in the Press on 4 January—and it

has been suggested on at least 10 occasions—stated that the Government has an opportunity to get a portion of the cut.

I support the motion.

HON. P. G. PENDAL (South Central Metropolitan) [5.51 p.m.]: I express my gratitude to members of the House and particularly to members of the Opposition for making a number of points during the course of this debate. I express regret that the two Ministers who have taken part in the debate have not addressed themselves to the matter which I put to the House earlier today. In particular, I make reference to the Minister for Planning's contribution. He spoke on everything but planning matters, and that suggests that the Opposition was on the right tack in the first place in saying that the Government has not properly thought out this matter.

I was asked one question which did not have any relevance to the debate and that was: With what group did I align myself? The answer is that I have no truck with any contenders for a casino licence. If I had my way a casino would not be constructed.

I thank all members of the House for the chance to air what is to me an important matter in my electorate and I seek leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION

Election

The following members were elected to sessional committees, on motions without notice by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House)—

- (a) Government Agencies Committee—Hon. J. M. Brown, Hon. Kay Hallahan, Hon. Robert Hetherington, Hon. N. F. Moore, Hon. C. J. Bell, and Hon. John Williams.
- (b) Printing Committee—Hon. H. W. Gayfer and Hon. Fred McKenzie.
- (c) House Committee—Hon. Graham Edwards, Hon. Kay Hallahan, Hon. A. A. Lewis, and Hon. John Williams.
- (d) Library Committee—Hon. Robert Hetherington and Hon. P. G. Pendal.
- (e) Standing Orders Committee—Hon. Robert Hetherington, Hon. P. H. Lockyer, Hon. Lyla Elliott, and Hon. John Williams.

DEPUTY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

Appointment

The following members were appointed Deputy Chairmen of Committees, on motion without notice by Hon. D. K. Dans (Leader of the House): Hon. Robert Hetherington, Hon. P. H. Lockyer, Hon. John Williams, and Hon. Lyla Elliott.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Hon. I. G. Pratt, leave of absence for 12 consecutive sittings of the House granted to Hon. I. G. Medcalf (Metropolitan) due to private business overseas.

BILLS (5): INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

1. Administration Amendment Bill.
2. Bail Amendment Bill.
3. Suitors' Fund Amendment Bill.
Bills introduced, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and read a first time.
4. Stamp Amendment Bill.
Bill introduced on motions by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Minister for Budget Management), and read a first time.
5. Restraint of Debtors Bill.
Bill introduced, on motion by Hon. J. M. Berinson (Attorney General), and read a first time.

Sitting suspended from 6.01 to 7.30 p.m.

TOBACCO (PROMOTION AND SALE TO YOUNG PERSONS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Bill introduced, on motion by Hon. P. H. Wells, and read a first time.

Second Reading

HON. P. H. WELLS (North Metropolitan) [7.31 p.m.]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill will introduce a number of realistic deterrents to the sale and distribution of tobacco products to young people under the age of 18 years. It seeks to repeal the present Sale of Tobacco Act 1916-65, but will retain and strengthen the thrust that it is illegal to sell tobacco products to young people.

A golden opportunity was lost by the Government when it failed to deal with the sale of tobacco to young people when a Bill similar to this one was before Parliament in the last session. The *Daily News* of Friday, 30 June 1984 reported that, "Top-level Government talks will be held soon on

enforcing laws forbidding the sale of cigarettes to minors". This report followed a radio programme on which the Premier was asked a question relating to the sale of tobacco, and I am told that, in that programme as on many other occasions, the \$4 penalty contained in the 1916 Act was given as one of the reasons for the difficulty experienced in enforcing the Act, as it offered no deterrent.

The Government has been provided with another opportunity to see that the law relating to the sale of tobacco products to children is updated in terms of current practices and penalties relevant to 1984.

The Bill seeks to make it an offence for any person under the age of 18 years to purchase cigarettes from a vending machine, as it does for anyone to purchase tobacco for sale to a person under 18 years. It will require the tobacco retailer to exhibit a notice advising potential customers that the sale of tobacco products to minors is prohibited and warning of the penalty for such an offence. It will require also that similar notices be displayed on the front of cigarette vending machines.

Polls have indicated that the community is not happy with the reported increasing number of children who are smoking. The penalties in the Bill range from educational and counselling options for young people under the age of 18 who purchase cigarettes from vending machines, to fines of between \$300 and \$600 for retailers who sell tobacco products to or for use by young people. By comparison, in Victoria, the penalty is \$100 for a first offence and \$500 for subsequent offences.

People who offer or distribute free samples of cigarettes to persons under 18 years commit offences and could be liable for fines of between \$1 000 and \$2 000. If they continue to commit the offences after being charged, they could be liable for fines of \$1 000 a day while the offences continue.

The ultimate sanction against a retailer who continually sells tobacco products to people under the age of 18 years has been provided for in that, if three convictions are recorded in less than 12 months, the retailer risks the further penalty of losing the right to sell tobacco products for up to 12 months.

Young people who illegally purchase cigarettes from a vending machine could be liable for a fine of up to \$100; however, the fine would not be imposed on first offenders who agreed to undergo counselling or an educational programme as may be prescribed.

It is envisaged that the Government, with its large expenditure in this area, could develop an educational programme and arrange counselling suitable for young offenders. It is illegal to sell or give tobacco products to minors in all other States of Australia. In both Queensland and Tasmania it is illegal for young people classified as "minors" to smoke cigarettes. The proposals in this Bill would mean Western Australia would have the most up-to-date legislation dealing with the supply of tobacco products to children.

Provision exists in the Bill to enable the Government to draft adequate regulations to implement the requirements of the Bill.

In the Committee stage an amendment will be prepared that will provide adequate time, prior to the introduction of parts of this Bill, to enable the necessary signs to be printed.

Similar to the Liquor Act, this Bill recognises that some products should not be sold or distributed to minors. I do not suggest that, by merely passing this Bill, we will stop the supply of tobacco products to young people. There are difficulties in implementing any prohibition legislation, but the difficulties do not remove from us the responsibility to have laws aimed at controlling what is considered to be undesirable. For example, it may be difficult to stop murder, robbery, or the breaking of many of our laws, but we still make laws and try to ensure they are upheld.

In the matter of young people smoking, I believe parents and the general public must accept their responsibilities. The Government has a responsibility to ensure that, when a complaint is made, it follows it up.

Just today I was told of a six-year-old child who was seen pulling a packet of cigarettes from his pocket and lighting a cigarette. The person who reported the incident to me was so astounded that he asked the six-year-old lad where he had obtained the cigarettes. The young lad said that he purchased them from a shop. When asked whether his parents knew that he smoked, he said, "I don't know, but I have been smoking for 18 months".

If a retailer sells cigarettes to a six-year-old, he deserves to be charged. He should answer to the community for such actions.

I commend the Bill to the House and urge all members to give serious consideration to the issues it raises.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. V. J. Ferry.

LAPSED BILLS

Restoration to Notice Paper: Assembly's Message

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's request.

QUESTIONS

Questions were taken at this stage.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY: THIRD DAY

Motion

HON. A. A. LEWIS (Lower Central) [7.50 p.m.]: My speech will be in two parts—not today and tomorrow! Hon. Kay Hallahan, as most members of the House, including the Leader of the House would be aware, wanted somebody to make certain that the House realises that today the Federal Sex Discrimination Act is proclaimed. So that I do not appear to be a little chauvinistic, Hon. Kay Hallahan said—

Both men and women will benefit, but women in particular.

Hon. Kay Hallahan this evening is chairing a seminar on the Sex Discrimination Act. I can understand her extreme regret at not being here to say for herself what she feels and any comment I make would detract from what she will tell the House in her Address-in-Reply speech. I felt that as she was so concerned about the proclamation of that Bill today it was only fair that she should have the credit for it.

Hon. D. J. Wordsworth: You are a gentleperson.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I thank Hon. David Wordsworth for that comment.

Is it not amazing that in the last 18 months we have seen the complete and utter double standards of the Australian Labor Party? The Labor Party has always said that it had a policy on this or that, but when challenged it would not give us an answer on what that policy was.

I will run through a few examples of the double standards of the Labor Party. Yesterday afternoon when Hon. Gordon Masters quoted from *Hansard* Mr Dans' remarks, Mr Dans in his usual manner did his lollie, threw his arms around, instructed his Whip to telephone people, yelled and screamed, and threatened again to get at small business and at the small builders in this community—having them called in, pulling off deals. Yet this afternoon when we were talking about a totally different subject, the siting of casinos, he said, "Oh, but we had notes taken, and of course, everybody would agree with the notes taken". That is one set of double standards.

Look at the double standards of the Premier of this State. Let us deal first with Medicare. The Premier says, "Medicare is okay for the worker but no damn good for me. I am going to a private hospital and I am going to have private doctors look after me. Let the workers use Medicare, but I will use a private hospital". That is a double standard.

Look at uranium. Did the Premier fight for Yeelirrie at the ALP conference? He did not fight for it at all. It is all on record that he did not stand up and say a word about Yeelirrie. He did not try to protect the Western Australian interests; but he went along with South Australia continuing with Roxby Downs—double standards all the time.

Look at Mr Mick Young. I do not know the latest news about him; I presume he will be sacked. Look at Mr Hawke and Senator Button. It is all very interesting. The Minister for Planning grins because he thinks double standards are funny. I have not dealt with the Minister yet; I will illustrate his double standards in a moment.

Hon. Peter Dowding: The joke, Mr Lewis, is that you remind me of Paddington Bear.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Minister is about as useful as a wooden frying pan. He does not understand a thing that goes on in this place. He comes in, bashes his gums and then races out again. They will probably nickname him "Cruiser" because he cruises in, fires the odd shot, and cruiser out again.

Hon. Mark Nevill interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mark Nevill is a wheat bag short of a silo, so he should not interrupt.

A member interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He probably does because it will be the short end of the straw, and a short measure which the Labor Party gives this State and the Commonwealth. Every grain bag of his would be tied in the middle; it would be only half-full.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Did anybody declare you when they came through customs?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Is it not interesting? We know how useful is Hon. Peter Dowding; we have established that. We know what Mr Mick Young did; but is it not interesting that neither the Labor Party nor the Minister for Customs (Senator Button) will ask for an independent evaluation of Mr Young's goods? I will not dwell on it, because I can see the embarrassment on the faces of members on the Government benches—I can read it all over them—but we all heard the statements Mr Young made about Mr MacKellar and Mr Moore. We have Mr Hawke with his shiny grey hair—where are his guts? When will he stand up

and make his Ministers toe the line? Of course he will not do so. He is and will continue to be controlled by the "left" and he will continue to do exactly what they tell him to do. He is scared stiff to stand up as a man.

Let us go further on the matter of double standards. The Hon. Peter Dowding entered into a debate this afternoon and told us how precisely this Government did its planning. All members who were present heard the Minister tell us this. It is very interesting, is it not? I just wonder about the CEP funds spent on the Shannon River—and remember he is not only Minister for Planning, but also is in charge of CEP funds, this gentleman who tried to convince us this afternoon that he always insists on the utmost planning.

As members would expect, later I will deal with the Shannon River basin. I am glad the Minister for Budget Management is here because I hope he goes out and raps the Minister over the knuckles. I will tell members the story. Here we have a Minister who insists on everything being planned properly. This Minister decided to build barbecues in the Shannon basin for all the visitors, despite the fact he does not know if they will get those numbers because no surveys have been conducted on the visitor level to the Shannon River basin—good planning, that! The Minister does not even know if there will be sufficient people to use the barbecues.

Hon. Mark Nevill: They should build them after they know the number of visitors.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: They will build the barbecues even to put a roof over them. Hon. Mark Nevill might think it middling strange that they decided to cover the barbecue; and what did they use for a roof? Shingles; wooden shingles! Can members imagine barbecues burning beneath wooden shingles? I can see Hon. Mark Nevill turning white.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: He is trying to work out what you mean.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He is a reasonably intelligent chap and he should know what wooden shingles are. I am sure he understands the effect of a fire under wooden shingles or under any wooden structure. Is it not interesting that after those shingles were put on the roof the workman had to go away and design a chimney? That probably cost another \$2 000 or \$3 000. If it were not so serious it would be amusing; it is deadly serious. This junior Minister was sacked from one job for incompetence—and we all know that is true—because he could not get on with the unions in the area. He was put in charge of planning and, I point out to the Minister for Budget Manage-

ment, he allows money to be wasted in that way. Yet he was the one who castigated people and claimed his planning was superb.

I will talk later about the Shannon, but are they not magnificent examples of this Government's complete set of double standards? Let us look at Burke and Medicare. I have not heard the Labor Party say why Mr Burke did not go to a public hospital. That is only good for the workers—

Hon. Mark Nevill: He went to a Catholic hospital.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Surely as a staunch ALP member backing up Dr Blewitt, the bloke who made all the mess in Canberra and had the doctors out on strike—

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If it had not been for Bill Grayden in another place telling the Minister for Health (Mr Hodge) about the drastic reality of the Bill he brought in—so that the Minister had to scrap it and bring it in in another form—and if we had not straightened out the Government we would have been in the same shocking situation as is the New South Wales Labor Government under Mr Wran. Yet Mr Dowding said we are always knocking.

That is one example. I suppose one could call it a triple standard. We had to tell the Government what was wrong with the Bill, and the Premier went into a private hospital. I think it is a dashed good hospital—I might go there myself—but I am prepared to pay my medical fees. I do not want Medicare, it can be thrown out tomorrow; but here is the Premier who espouses the cause of Medicare going into a private hospital. The silence from the Government benches is fascinating.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Tell us about the shingles.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have done that.

Hon. Mark Nevill: If you had built them they would have had electric exhaust fans.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, but under consecutive Ministers for Conservation and Environment—the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. G. E. Masters) and Hon. Graham MacKinnon—there would have been more planning and an assessment of the need to put the barbecues there. There would have been time for people building the cover to think about it and realise one does not often put wood over barbecues unless one wants a bigger fire. Maybe there is little wood where Mark Nevill comes from and one can do that, but in the south-west there is no wood shortage, especially of dead wood—there is plenty of that in the Government, too—and there are stands of timber right through the basin.

Let us look again at the Premier's double standards. He believes in publicity at all costs and it is not always truthful. Let us talk about pornography and Mr Dans' answers in this House in which he said he was so worried about it. Surely the most uninformed person would see that the reason pornography is such a problem in this State is that Mr David Parker and his counterparts in other States voted to lift the top off censoring any material that came into Australia. He was known to be anti-censorship when he ran the department. The Federal and State Governments lifted the lid off pornography, and it is no good their going around and claiming they are against it or that a problem exists, or deciding whether to have "R", "X", or "Z"-rated movies sold in shops. It is another case of double standards.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Did you vote against the Bill when it was in the House?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is another case of double standards.

Hon. Garry Kelly: My point is taken.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The member can take all the points he wants. He is probably two wheatbags short of a silo. I do not need any more from him. Double standards are evident day by day.

Let us look at Mr Tonkin and the question of Parliament Week. The first the Opposition heard of this was when some members—not all, and not the Leader of the Opposition, just members picked out of the blue—got a letter from a person called Hunt telling us what we were going to do as members of Parliament for Parliament Week. At the same time the Government was setting up a Royal Commission into matters which were none of its business.

We heard and read in the Governor's Speech that something would be done about electoral reform. One Minister in this place was spoken to after the last electoral reform Bill was debated and he was told it would be a good idea to sit down and talk about these matters in a calm and rational way. He agreed wholeheartedly, but what happened? In the Governor's Speech electoral reform outranks unemployment and the Budget. It shows this Government's priorities and its complete cynicism for the whole political and parliamentary system. These people put those words into the Governor's mouth ahead of all the crises we have in this State.

It is interesting to see how they honour their words. On the second page of the Governor's Speech there is a little comment about the surplus and how great the Government was in balancing the Budget. We were told it was a magnificent effort. Is the Government really dinkum about

balancing the Budget? We were told it was estimated the tobacco tax would raise \$30 million. That has been increased to \$40.5 million in the Budget Estimates, and it is likely to exceed even that figure and reach about \$45 million. So the Government made a \$9 million or \$10 million mistake, and even with that mistake it finished with a \$996 869 surplus. Whichever way one looks at it, this Government made a mistake of at least \$9 million in the Budget. Can anybody call that good Budget management? I am afraid I cannot. I cannot see how the Government has the hide to mention it.

The Government forces service clubs to pay financial institutions duty. Every service club working for a charity and doing a job for the community—admittedly not a Government-paid job; it is voluntary work and the Labor Party hates volunteers because they think for themselves—came up against the Treasurer and the Minister for Budget Management who in their meanness wiped off the service clubs and made them pay FID.

On page three of the Governor's Speech there is a little garbage about the Small Business Development Corporation, and loans to small business. I do not know how long Cabinet met at Karratha; we saw Cabinet members opening prisons—or not opening them, because the responsible Minister would not let them do it properly—and parading around the north. The loans for small business were announced at that meeting, but as yet we have no details.

I turn now to a subject that is dear to my heart. The Governor's Speech goes on as follows—

The government will legislate to amalgamate the National Parks Authority, the Wildlife Section of the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Forests Department within a new Department of Conservation and Land Management.

Not only is the name of the department changed but it appears the Department of Conservation and Environment will be taken in as well. We do not know. The department that will be set up by legislation already has a house magazine called "INDAT". The department has 13 committees. Members will recall that when I asked the Minister what was happening about the new department he said a working party under the Public Service Commissioner was looking at its establishment. That man has gone on three months' holiday. It is probably the strain of those committees being foisted upon him by the Premier or a Forests Department adviser—a man the Premier calls his adviser.

Is that not interesting? Have we been truthful with the State? Is this Government telling the whole truth?

Hon. Mark Nevill: Yes.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Good. I am glad to hear that. The first of the magazines states that it is the aim to have a new department operating in the early part of the new financial year. The Government has not even got legislation ready yet. It is very doubtful what will happen in the first place. I assure members that I will be working hard to see that the Forests Department of this State is not ruined. The name of the department depends on legislation yet to be passed. However, it will be known as the Department of Conservation and Land Management. Of course, as usual with Labor Party Governments, its initials will be used. It will be called CALM. I am anything but calm about that thought!

The Environmental Protection Act, according to this information, will allow for the renaming of the Department of Conservation and Environment. It will become the Department of the Environment. This will allow the other department to use the word "conservation" and help to emphasise its crucial involvement with conservation. It is interesting to see that not once in the name of the department is the word "forest" used. This Government has done its best to gut the Forests Department. Members should consider the names of the people who have been pulled out of it. There are such names as Bruce Beggs, the Conservator of Forests, and Frank Campbell.

Hon. Tom Stephens: He has been promoted and made more important.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: One wonders whether public servants feel that it is important. This Government has a rash of advisers who take precedence over the honest and true public servant. Public servants in this State are being downgraded day by day by this Government. That is why Hon. Peter Dowding and his friends are trying to get rid of all the top policemen so that they can do as they want.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You talk nonsense.

Hon. Graham Edwards: You supported the legislation for the early retirement of policemen.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That was to allow them to retire early to take off the pressure imposed by this Government. The Labor Party cannot talk to the police now. It blotted its copybook with the force so many times that it now cannot talk with the Police Force. The Police Force feels it cannot trust the Government. Government members know that. It is disgraceful that, because of the Government's meddling and interference in the

Police Force, the Police Force has not been allowed to get on with its job.

Hon. Tom Stephens: Our Government had them standing outside Parliament House for its opening as a guard of honour for the first time in history.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: This Government is prepared to belt them over the back of the neck because they are trying to do their duty. That guard of honour was a PR exercise.

Hon. Tom Stephens: It was not a PR exercise.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Of course it was and the member knows it was. The Government did not know a fortnight before the opening of Parliament whether it would use the Police Force or the Navy. The Hon. Tom Stephens knows nothing about it. The people in Parliament House who ought to be running Parliament Week knew about it. We heard about it from the people involved. It was like putting shingles over a barbecue; it was a typical waste of money.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Mr Berinson, we will have to rap the Minister for Planning over the knuckles again because he is getting more and more childish every day. This is public money. The Minister is a wasteful young man and should be taken out and given six of the best. He told the House this afternoon that he did all the planning. We have blown up that idea. He has misled the House as he usually does. We have heard him do that time after time.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Because you did not understand does not mean he was misleading you.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The honourable member is like the Minister. He is as useful as a wooden frying pan.

Hon. Tom Stephens: He is a very good member and you know it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He has never shown it in this House. The bloke he replaced was a superb member. However, he got knifed in the back by another member of the Labor Party machine. He did his job as a member of Parliament both inside the House and outside it.

I will not go on at length about that or about the task force on land management. Mr Mulcahy is retiring and Mr Halse has his promotion, and we wonder what is in store for Mr Shea.

Hon. C. J. Bell: He could not win a Council election.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am not worried about that, I am worried about the future of this State. I worry that this Government will not listen. Sub-

missions were still coming in for the preliminary report on land management and the final report had already been printed. I know that because I had one. Admittedly it dropped off the back of a truck. The report had been printed the day before the submissions were due.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Were you capable of understanding it? That is the question.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: "Frying pan" is too good a word to use for the member. It would have been better to have said "wooden saucepan". If Hon. Peter Dowding, or any of the Ministers or the Premier want to take me on in a discussion about forestry and land management, I will oblige them. Will Hon. Peter Dowding do that? Of course he will not. He is a man who could not even get on with a Labor union in Collie. Because of that he was demoted.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: That is rubbish.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Everybody knows that the Collie Coal Miners Union said that Dowding was useless and asked the Premier to get rid of him. The Premier got rid of him. If there are any more performances like the performance given this afternoon, he will be sitting on the back bench. He knows that pressure is on Caucus to get rid of him.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: That is the first I have heard of it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The Minister has always been a bit slow in catching up. We have heard today that the member attended only the last five minutes of a meeting. Hon. Joe Berinson probably attends Caucus meetings in the same way and that is why he does not know what is going on around the place. It is a very serious matter for Hon. Peter Dowding; we feel sorry for him. He will lead the Liberal Party back into Government with his mistakes and his misleading statements. All we will have to do is sit back and do nothing. With the Leader of this House and the Leader of the Legislative Assembly, the Government does not stand a chance. At least the Opposition has men of integrity leading it in this House and in the Legislative Assembly. We do not have double standards.

Hon. Tom Stephens: I have heard Sir Charles say your leader has got to go.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Sir Charles does not get a vote.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You had another change of leadership tonight.

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

Hon. Peter Dowding: You are not talking about the bloke who was sitting in that chair this afternoon.

Hon. Graham Edwards: It is a back-handed way to attack your own leaders.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Is it not interesting that Mr Dans is not here? Why do members opposite not get stuck into him and do their deals while he is out of the Chamber?

Hon. Tom Stephens: Our Premier is in hospital but that did not stop you from attacking him.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He is in a private hospital. There are those double standards again. The workers can use Medicare.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I consider I have been very lenient up till now. I think members have had decent conversations. We should address ourselves to the motion in the proper manner.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I would love to, Sir. As part of addressing myself to the motion, I will address myself to the double dealings of this Government. There have been complete double standards. How Hon. Mark Nevill can sit there and put up Yeelirrie—which I believe is in his electorate—as an example is beyond me.

Hon. N. F. Moore: It is not in his electorate. That is why they do not care about it.

Hon. Mark Nevill: It may as well be.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is interesting. It is no longer in a Labor-held electorate, so we can now throw away Yeelirrie for Roxby Downs! We can sell out Western Australia at the ALP Conference! Is it not interesting that we can sell out Western Australians so easily.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! I think the interjections have gone a little too far. I hope Hon. A. A. Lewis will continue his excellent speech in a less provocative manner. I would be grateful if Government members would desist from interjecting.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I could offer to help in another way by lifting my voice if you need it, Mr Deputy President.

I move on to railway problems. Railways have always been a pet subject of mine, as Hon. Fred McKenzie knows. What is the Government and Westrail doing? I wonder whether anybody can tell me. I wonder whether the Government knows. I certainly think the Minister does not know.

Members will recall the closure of the Boyup Brook-Katanning line. Hon. Fred McKenzie can tell them chapter and verse about the trial closure under the previous Government. It was closed in a genuine attempt to see whether road transport could provide an adequate service and whether money could be saved. When this Government came to power, it began removing the sleepers and

carting them to Collie. Eighty-five thousand sleepers disappeared. Just a few months ago when the Minister said that the Government had not yet decided to close the line, three bridges were taken down and reconstructed on another line. I asked again whether the Minister had made a decision about closing the railway line.

The Minister said that he had not made a decision; however, if we wanted we could put the sleepers and the bridges back. This kind of action from the Labor Government shows complete disregard for economics.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Which line were they upgrading?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Westrail was upgrading Nyabing with the bridges, and the sleepers went to be stacked in Collie. That is a good effort because Westrail has not made up its mind yet about Bowelling. That is the next subject I shall be discussing. The opening of this line was one of the few election promises kept by the Government. It promised to open the Boyup Brook-Katanning line. The Minister for Agriculture and the Acting Minister for Forests swore that the Northcliffe-Pemberton line would not be closed, but it has been. Four or five other lines will also be closed. Mr McKenzie has said that no freight was involved but when the Liberal Party was in Government he did not give a hoot about whether there was freight on those lines; they had to be opened. I do not blame him for that because he was doing his job. He was trying to con the then Government into keeping the lines open.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: It was your party's policies that took freight from those lines.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is not true and Mr McKenzie knows it is not true. He is getting a little like one of the frontbenchers and I do not like it. It is not good for him.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: We will have trains on the Northcliffe-Pemberton line.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Will the member guarantee that?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Yes.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Good. I will make a Press statement that Mr McKenzie has assured us that the freight will be carried on this line.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: I did not say it would carry freight.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Just 30 seconds ago the members said the lines had to close because they did not carry freight. He has now changed right over and said that the trains can run without freight.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Have you ever heard of passenger trains?

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I admire Mr McKenzie because he always comes back; but he has not heard the latest news.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Does someone write your speeches for you?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, somebody a little brighter than the Minister. The wooden saucepan should keep quiet or put the saucepan over his head.

It is interesting to take up Mr McKenzie's point regarding one of the tourist trains in that area because Westrail, bless its little heart, has doubled the cost of hiring the train. There is no way the local community can make a buck out of it. I hope Mr McKenzie will be careful about making rash promises regarding that line because I do not think the community will be able to run a train on it, which is a great pity.

Will Mr McKenzie say that the Government will open the Boyup Brook-Katanning line?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: No.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I love dealing with Mr McKenzie because he is so honest. Why cannot the Minister tell the people that?

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Perhaps he has a different idea from mine.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Was the bridge ever replaced?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, Mr McKenzie made sure it was replaced and it was done at huge expense. It is one of those bridges now being pulled down without consultation with the local authority. Mr Nevill knows that the shire wanted it to get into the back of the flax mill but Westrail did not discuss it with the shire. Westrail had it out before the shire realised what was happening.

The tragedy is that Westrail and the Minister are not talking to the local people. Public relations are non-existent. It is happening all over this State. For example, in Narrogin 115 railway workers are losing their jobs. The cruel part is that the Government set up a working party to establish what could be done for these people. I have written to a number of Ministers on this subject. The working party went into a number of areas looking for employment opportunities for the redundant workers. When I returned and was given a copy of the working party's report, I found that not one of the Ministers had seen the working party paper. This should have been passed to the Ministers.

I was reminded of the plea I made to the Attorney General to keep a magistrate in Narrogin; that request was rejected out of hand. I know the Attorney General would have made a totally different decision if he had been briefed by the Minister for Transport on the problems in Narrogin. I know the Attorney is a fair and honourable person and the magistrate had said he would live there and travel to Perth to do his job. The community at Narrogin feels it has been kicked at every opportunity and it is going through a tough period.

The Minister organised a working party and its report did not reach any of the Ministers involved. Several private secretaries rang me and asked what I was talking about. This occurred two months after the working party had completed the report which should have gone to the department. It was a matter of extreme urgency, yet the Government did nothing about it. This reinforces my belief that the Government is not interested in people, particularly the workers. A double standard is again evident. The Opposition makes constructive suggestions all the time and finds the Government's attitude disheartening, and if Mr Kelly talks to the Ministers he will find I have made constructive suggestions to several of them.

Hon. Garry Kelly interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We will have another constructive Liberal Government in time and not the dead hand of socialism we now have which puts people out of work so that Mr Dowding can waste CEP funds putting shingles on barbecue roofs. We have to get up and go, and any time the Government wants to pull out it should just yell. We are ready and waiting to take it on.

Government members are not talking to people or living up to their promises to local government or anybody else. It is a disgraceful Government. It cannot budget properly or honour its agreements, even those made in this House. How then does it expect to govern?

Mr Dowding was in rare form this afternoon. He made probably one of his worst ever speeches.

Government members interjected.

Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Will his adviser be sacked over the roof business?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is the easy way out. Mick Young did not take too much responsibility recently and Mr Dowding is probably the same. He will blame an adviser and slip away from under the problem. Mr Dowding said that business people do not like the Liberal Party. In the light of those comments it is extremely interesting to note that the largest organisation of rural businessmen unanimously elected a Liberal Party member as its secretary last Thursday night.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Was this a personal favour?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Yes, because I am going on to the farm machinery situation shortly. Once again Mr Dowding has misled the House.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: How many Labor Party candidates were there for that position?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Those members who used to vote Labor have now ceased to do so.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Who was the keynote speaker at the meeting at which you were elected?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: There was no keynote speaker. A series of meetings were held. I suggest that before the member questions these matters he should know a little about the subject, because he will drop himself in it.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Surely it was not your politics that got you elected, but your personal charisma.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am sure it was; that is what gets me elected to do this job as well. However, despite what Mr Dowding said about business people having no truck with Liberals, he has misled the House and I am answering that point.

I am worried about some of the things the Government looks like doing. The Governor's Speech referred to occupational health and safety. Has the Government looked at what this will cost?

Hon. Garry Kelly: What has been the cost of industrial accidents and injuries?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is a serious matter and nobody wants to see death, disease, or people maimed in the workplace. However, some limit must be imposed on the cost of safety and freedom from disease. I will explain very briefly what is happening under a similar Act in Victoria at present. I use the example of a hay baler; it can be brought into the dealer's yard and fixed up and sent out to the paddock and everything is okay. However, if the dealer goes out to the paddock and mends the knotters on the baler and the flywheel does not have a cover he cannot test the knotters.

The owner is not allowed to start the baler, so the dealer must go to the trouble of building a flywheel cover, but then he runs into another hitch because the Department of Labour and Industry will not give a certificate saying that it is a safe cover. It will give a letter saying, "We think it looks safe", but until one runs into trouble, nobody knows. When one realises that in Victoria there are probably 25 000 balers without flywheel covers—

Hon. Garry Kelly: What happened to them? Did they just throw them away?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No. There was never a need for flywheel covers. As yet, I have heard of no accident in Australia caused by the flywheel. I know of accidents caused by the PTO, but not one by the flywheel. We would have about 80 000 balers in Australia, and this would affect them all because once legislation is passed in one State, it must be passed right around Australia. When one has 80 000 balers out in the field without flywheel covers and the conservative estimate of the cost of a cover is \$300, one is looking at a lot of money to meet the safety specifications.

Members should talk to Mr Gayfer about 585s and 7700s and such machinery; they would realise that many covers would be required. I admit to Mr Kelly that some fingers and arms have been pulled off in those things; but in this country, which is not competitive on the world markets, we cannot afford to pay huge amounts of money to cover everything.

Hon. Garry Kelly: What about the cost of disease and injury overall?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: As Mr Kelly would know, there are absolutely no figures on accidents relating to agricultural machinery in Australia, the United States, or the United Kingdom.

The trouble with the Labor Party is that everything is geared to big business—a union against the big businessman. I know that Jim Brown realises the difference because he has been in the business; but the Labor Party as a whole does not realise that a concession made by BHP to the Metal Workers Union has reverberations which are felt in the smallest machine shop and by every farm machinery dealer in Australia. The same thing will happen with the safety business. We are already in horrendous trouble in Victoria over it.

I turn to another item. Hon. Garry Kelly, as an expert on big machinery would know what a self-propelled combine header is. The Machinery Dealers Association did not go into this lightly; we had two of the Minister's advisers attending our State executive meeting on our invitation because we wanted to take a lead in this matter. It is not as if we were trying to opt out of the question. When the second adviser came, while discussing self-propelled headers she said, "You will have to have a spray booth for each self-propelled header". I can see Hon. Jim Brown shuddering, and well he may because the cheapest spray booth for a self-propelled header would cost \$120 000 to meet the regulations under the Victorian Act. With such a booth, a dealer may spray only one header a year. That thought was put to the charming lady, and she said "I don't mind. You will have one".

Unfortunately, that did not go down very well with the dealers assembled, and Hon. Jim Brown will understand why. It would be absolutely ridiculous if people had to lay out capital like that for one or two sprayings a year. There are other ways to protect people.

We must make sure that when this legislation comes into the House, it is not modelled on the Victorian legislation, otherwise the Government will be responsible for sending perhaps 10 000 people out of work. The only people who could afford to sell machinery would be the ones in the city. Not only would people in the country be put out of work, but because of the lead time for obtaining parts from the city, the Government would also destroy rural communities.

I have no hassle with sensible regulations for safety, but when Mr Gayfer gets on his tractor, he will have to have special boots, special overalls, special earmuffs, and probably a special head covering, if he follows all the things we are told about occupational safety.

Where will the Government obtain the army of inspectors to carry out the inspections? What will it cost? It is horrific.

Let us have a look at mining. As we know, Hon. Peter Dowding is an expert on mining. What will the mining unions say about the legislation? There is no answer, because obviously the Minister does not know, which is not unusual.

Hon. Garry Kelly: In the areas where the unions have that power, it has seldom been used.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Garry Kelly should talk to the unions involved because in mines the mine manager has always been acknowledged as the safety expert. The unions do not want that responsibility. They want to leave things as they are. I suggest that Hon. Garry Kelly talks to mining unions to find out what they want.

Mr Dowding said this afternoon that we do not give constructive suggestions to the Government. We are trying to be constructive, and I hope the Minister for Planning will go back to his colleagues with these thoughts, and not allow into this House occupational, health, welfare, and safety legislation encompassing any of the things about which I have spoken tonight. I have given Mr Dowding fair warning; he will be spattered around the ears. He asked for constructive suggestions, and I have spent 25 minutes responding to him, so let us not have the nonsense that he went on with this afternoon.

I would like to talk about a few other small matters, and for the sake of Mr Dowding I will return to the Shannon. I will not go into the question of the barbecue and the shingles; and the

extra \$4 000 or \$5 000 for a chimney is just part of the waste in Mr Dowding's department.

I asked questions of various Ministers in this House about the visitor level at Yanchep, John Forrest, and Shannon. The answer from the Premier was, "We do not know what is the visitor level at the Shannon". Despite that, the Government went quietly ahead and spent, it is alleged, some \$480 000. The job is not completed, and there are great gashes through the bush, across the old golf course, and across the timber. This Government, in the name of conservation, has made gashes, not knowing how many visitors will use them. The Government said that when the caravan park is built, the Forests Department will run it in competition with private enterprise and it will put the private enterprise caravan park out of business.

The Government has built the most magnificent gazebos you have ever seen, Sir. The project is incomplete, just like everything the honourable Minister for Planning does. It is at a dead end, and one falls into the goddamn river at the end of the walk. There is no gazebo at the river because the Government ran out of money.

Hon. W. N. Stretch: You fall in the river if the tiger snakes don't get you first.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: We were told that wheelchairs have access to the walks, but there is no access for the wheelchairs to get onto the tracks. The Government bituminised the whole track, which is reached after neck-breaking steps are negotiated. The track has been bituminised for wheelchairs, but they would become bogged the moment they hit the end of the bitumen where the Government ran out of money. They have very little chance of turning in one of the gorgeous gazebos in the greatest mosquito areas in the south-west. The Government built the gazebo in the middle of the swamp and brought the path down to it.

Hon. Bill Stretch and I have visited the area and seen these things, and we were thrilled! We will not worry about the \$480 000-odd spent on these things as long as the gazebo is in the middle of the swamp. Then one goes back to the main track, toddles across the bridge and down the main track again until one gets within cooee of the Shannon River, and then "squash!" into deep mud. The path is not finished—nothing.

One wonders what the Government had in mind with this project—whether it was trying to buy somebody off. There are two or three wooden bridges, and one tippytoes across the wooden bridges and then onto the wheelchair ride which is bituminised and covered with nice loose brown

gravel that one could do wheelies in rather well. I will get Hon. Graham Edwards down there to try it out for me one day.

A forester said to me, "Did you have a look at the sides of these bridges?" I said, "Yes, I thought it was a bit funny". The problem is that where this walk has been made, some severe conservation problems have been created. Members should remember that all the rest of the Shannon basin has cuts across it made by bulldozers. Trees have been knocked down. However, where the bush walk track has been built they were not allowed to put even a small blade through, so they have hacked away with axes and saws and then put all the trash beside the track. The forester said to me that he would hate to be a chap in a wheelchair were a bushfire to go through. Not only would a wheelchair get bogged at one end and be faced with a steep slope at the other, but also the person in it would be burned to death along the middle of the track.

This all shows a complete lack of planning, yet here we have a man in this House who says that the Government plans. Even a five-year-old child who had lived in the bush would know there had been absolutely no planning on the track. I am not against putting in tracks if there were a sufficient visitor level and if they were put in correctly and finished off properly by the Government. I am very afeared that the Government did not establish whether sufficient visitors came to the area and further that the track will not be finished and will be left like it is forever.

We must remember that none of this was done on the priorities of the National Parks Authority or the Forests Department—none of it. But the Labor Party, through its State executive, was completely conned. It has pulled the whole of the Shannon basin from our timber resource.

Furthermore, Mr McKenzie said that the railway between Northcliffe and Pemberton would be kept open and that the train would run on it. The train need not run on it; no-one will need it, because all along the scenic route we find that the Government has taken 65 per cent of the area for stream and road reserves. So the scenic route is destroyed; it goes out the window. How dinkum is the Government?

I remember that when we were in Government Hon. Graham MacKinnon had to come down just because one tree had to be moved and the Conservation Council had complained. Members will remember the fuss created by the Conservation Council when the Bunning Bros. boundary was off a bit and they took 200 yards outside the coupe. We nearly had a Federal court case over that one.

Yet now we are to have 65 per cent of the area taken up in road and stream reserves leaving just the remainder to be cut in order to give us our timber resource. That is an absolute disgrace. That same Conservation Council which is not talking about Burswood Island is not saying a thing about these road and stream reserves.

What is even more horrifying is that our forest management has always included fire buffer areas to protect the young, rejuvenated growth. Do members know what? This Government is going to cut those fire buffers. So millions of dollars worth of investment, both private and Government, could be destroyed, because we know the ALP's policy on protected burning in the bush. All these acres of rejuvenated forest will be destroyed because of a whim of this Government and because it does not have the guts to stand up against the conservation wing of its party that is going to bring this State's timber industry to its knees.

The foresters have not been consulted. Just the other day the Premier's words were quoted in an article in a local paper. Again it was an example of double standards by this Government. He had the hide to try to say the foresters were the same as those who advised the previous Government. The previous Government did not say the foresters could not have the Shannon and the northern jarrah forest, but this Government has different ground rules. Again, double standards.

The people who will suffer because of all this are the timber workers at Dean Mill, Walpole and Nannup. I will have more to say about Nannup a bit later because it involves another peculiar problem.

The Government member for this area, the Minister for Agriculture, could not give two hoots for his district. Of course he does not because he will be promoted out of the Parliament. He has just been to London to buy his house. The man has not entered the area. He will not enter the area, this man who promised that the Shannon would not be lost.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You would say anything just to denigrate someone. What you have said is utterly untrue on two counts.

Hon. G. E. Masters: Just listen to your speeches.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Here is hypocrisy at its greatest, coming from this Minister. He is a superb example of hypocrisy. The Minister for Agriculture made a promise to his electorate that the Shannon would not be taken as a national park, yet when I issued a pamphlet and made a radio broadcast to help my colleague, Hon. W. M. Stretch, the Minister took out a writ against me. I

inform Mr Dowding that he can bully his department and try to bully anyone else he likes, but he should not come to this place and try to bully me and tell me I am not speaking the truth. Is it not amazing how he quietens? How that man cowers when the truth overpowers him.

The Minister for Agriculture is scarcely game to go into his electorate. When he does he sneaks in in the dead of night. Everyone down there says so; I am saying only what my electors say. Mr Stretch and I are happy to walk down the street in the middle of the day because we stand up for our policies and are prepared to fight for them in this place.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is a pity you don't fight fair, then. You know he can't answer you because he doesn't sit in this place, yet you denigrate him unmercifully.

Hon. Tom Knight: That has never worried you before.

Hon. Peter Dowding: It is the sort of gutless thing we expect from you.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: The "Minister for Castigation".

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not know whether to laugh or weep.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon. John Williams): Order! I suggest the honourable member get on with his speech.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Through tears, Sir, I will—tears of laughter.

Well we remember this Minister's attacks on Sir Charles Court and Mr O'Connor. Now he has the hide to say that this poor man, the Minister for Agriculture, cannot talk back. He can talk back through his actions. But that is what this Labor Government does not have. It is full of rhetoric but no action.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: He is a most popular man in the south-west and you can't beat him.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Didn't he increase his majority?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, he did not. The member should not talk about things he knows nothing of.

Hon. Mark Nevill: He had a very healthy majority, then.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He had a reasonable result. If he were to stand against me he would be done like a dinner.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: You have been trying to beat him for 20 years.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: He would not have been here for that long if I had stood against him.

However, I do not want to create records. I quite like this place. I came here from the other place and I have no wish to create a record by being the first man to go from one House to the other and then back again.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You didn't last.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: My seat was abolished.

Hon. Peter Dowding: Your judgment in this is about as good as your judgment in buying shares in Bunbury Foods Ltd.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: At least I paid for mine.

Hon. Peter Dowding: You were happy to get the previous Government to fund it.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I will have to conduct a little lesson here because a while ago Hon. Peter Dowding was talking about the truth. Let us follow the story of Bunbury Foods Ltd.

Hon. Peter Dowding: That hit a sensitive nerve.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Sure, but I would like the Minister to tell the truth, which he has not done. Come on, let us see the Minister sit up and listen. He should not turn his back just because he does not like the truth. He is prepared to make any sort of statement, but when he hears the truth, all we get is silence. The truth is that I happen to be the person who was successful in getting a business off the ground which employed 60 or 70 people. I still believe that if it had not been for profit under the Crown and if my management had still been behind the project, it would not have had to go into the hands of the receiver.

Hon. Peter Dowding: What did it cost the Government?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Just let us have the Minister sit there and not walk out because he cannot take the truth. I got some people together to put money into the project. I put in my own money as well. It was nothing like the Government's Ashton diamond deal where we saw it using other people's money. We hear about the approach to the Government for a Government guarantee, but what we do not hear is what Dr Oskar lost.

Hon. Peter Dowding: One of the greatest fiddles of all time. You were happy to throw \$5 million of public money down the tube. That is the truth—and he was found to be a liar in open court.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Would the Minister go outside and make that statement? Of course not. He is a gilgie. Dr Oskar and others lost money. But we remember the Yunderup Canals, and we remember Curtin House. What a nice shady deal that was.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: There was no money lost there.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No, the Labor Party made a huge profit. The Government does not believe in private enterprise!

That is the story in quick form. I am proud to have an employment record behind me which shows that I did go out and create things—okay, some money may have been lost—that provided permanent jobs. I am not like the CEP merchant who gives them a job for a couple of weeks only. I believe in jobs which continue.

For Mr Dowding even to have made that comment shows how low he is; it shows the nature of the man. We expect that from him, because we have seen it day after day, year after year since he has been in this place. He has lowered every standard in this House and has never been prepared to take the consequences. He makes statements which he is not prepared to make outside this place. He should be dismissed. He has been demoted. The unions will not have a bar of him, yet he attacks people who try to give people jobs. It is very interesting to note when he gets a hiding the more he sulks.

We read all the time about the working plan for the Shannon which states that the previous Government committed this State to overcutting. Again, a deliberate untruth. The Minister who signed the first working plan—I do not blame him for doing so because it was the only way he could have gone—had great pleasure in doing so because he kept some of his timber workers in jobs.

So, let us have no more of this Government blaming the previous Government for overcutting. A conscious decision was made by Mr Evans, and subsequently by Mr Ridge, Mrs Craig, Mr Wordsworth, and Mr Laurance because the Forests Department had planned for the future. Of course now that plan has been ruined, because of the Shannon—65 per cent of the stream and road reserves, and most of the fire buffers have gone down the gurgler because one section of the Labor Party has been taken over by so-called conservationists. These so-called conservationists could not care less; they won their way with the Shannon which will be a disgrace in 30 years' time; because no burning will be allowed there will be no regeneration.

The Acting Minister for Forests said to the Shire of Manjimup that when that area gets into a rough condition the Government will take the Forests Department's regeneration areas as a national park. Can members follow that sort of mentality? Why not let the Forests Department go on doing what it was doing so successfully? The Government has admitted that the Forests Department has done a good job, but it is trying to rip hell out

the department by taking away its people. The Government has pulled many people out of the Forests Department, all the way down to divisional managers. The people there now are in acting positions and people are coming up from Bunbury and Manjimup to head office for one week and returning for two weeks.

The morale in the Forests Department has never been as low as it is at the moment. The conservator and the acting conservator have been taken. Dr Shea has gone to the Premier—maybe that is a good thing—Dr Underwood is on one of the committees, and Mr Williamson has been placed on another. I could go on and on about the people who have been pulled out of the department. It is devastating to anybody who really believes in conservation. It is one of those things which should not be allowed, but it is allowed because the Parliamentary Labor Party cannot stand up and run the State, it cannot stand up to that executive which instructs its members that they cannot cross the floor; and they are not allowed to fight for their electorates.

We have seen Mr Pandal castigated and abused for standing up for his electorate. We know we can do that, whether it be singularly or in a group. Members of the Labor Party cannot do that; consensus has not worked for them.

Here we have the second Minister for Minerals and Energy but still no Western Collieries contract in Collie. We cannot get any truth out of the Government on coal or Collie. I do not know what the SEC is doing. If it has boxed up its figures, why does it not admit it? That is disgraceful, but this, of course, is the problem of the SEC—it is being destroyed by this Government, too. The SEC does not hold the position it did under the previous Government, because maybe it is another area for the axe.

I have had another visit to my electorate by a Minister, again with absolutely no notification to Mr Stretch or myself. The continual visits by Ministers to my area, without any notification, do not worry me because I am not worried that the Ministers are so discourteous and rude. However, I will not let them come back after 1986, when we are back in Government, and complain about one of our Ministers. They should not even utter a word because they have been warned. Of course it is a matter of double standards again. Questions have been asked of the Premier about this.

Another matter I wish to deal with relates to the Harris River dam. The previous Federal Government promised the previous State Government that funds would be available for a dam for salinity control. However, the present Governments,

both State and Federal, have shelved that plan. The Federal Government gave away the bicentennial plan for water which the Fraser Government had. We know the funds have gone into propping up Medicare. With the danger of the level of salt in the Wellington dam, one wonders whether it would have been better for the funds to go to the Harris River dam instead of Medicare, because the salt will probably produce more health hazards than Medicare can fix. It is time this Government took up this responsibility.

I commend Rebecca Le Tourneau for her story in the *Daily News* on Monday, 18 June in which she said—

The dedication of the Shannon River Basin as a national park was a major win for the conservationists, but they have not yet won the war.

The fight will go on and the mill workers will cling to their livelihood as long as possible.

That is the attitude which came out of the Warren district, and that is the reason Mr Evans will lose his seat. The mill workers, the people who have been traditionally Labor supporters are the people who will dump him.

The following headline appeared in the *Warren-Blackwood Times* of 2 May: "Map reveals land for pine plunder". I read the article quickly, and thought it should have been "blunder". That is what the Government has done; it has not realised the importance of pine planting to the State.

Let us consider the history of the Donnybrook sunklands. When the environmental impact statement came out it contained not one comment from the public. When this Government came into power it stopped clearing land and did not realise that planting should continue. Pine planting in Western Australia is now a year behind.

We have heard statements from the Government that it would lease land, buy land, use Crown land, and do all sorts of things. An inquiry was held on this matter and a man called Mr Treloar—who I am sure is an extremely intelligent man in the business studies unit at UWA—made an input. However, he did not take into account the effect of taxation.

This Government is quite slow at times and it does not realise that pine trees do not grow like sheep, apricots, cows or anything else. It is a long time before they can be harvested.

Do not let me denigrate Mr Hawke more than I have to—he has done most of that himself—but this situation has occurred because the Federal Government would not look at an acceptable pol-

icy. However, when Mr Treloar brought out a report the Government asked him to take out one page—I think it was page 31. Taxation was not taken into consideration. The report was ready before Christmas and Mr Treloar suggested that more work be carried out. The Government is just getting around to doing that work and it is interesting that it purchased a few properties in Manjimup. It bought a property by the side of the South West Highway and because it was purchased in the name of the Forests Department it came under the control of the Conservator of Forests. As a result, the land which is not Crown land was able to be cleared and, in fact, that is what has occurred. The land was in the middle of a karri forest and it was cleared in order that pines could be planted. It shows the lengths to which this Government will go in order to get its own way. It has stretched its tentacles out to Boyup Brook, Boyanup, and to other places because of its decision.

Hon. Bill Stretch attended an agro-forestry seminar which proved that agro-forestry was not on in the south-west. The Government sponsored the seminar and it cannot appreciate that point.

How many years do we have to go through this bumbling? It makes one wonder what can be done.

I would like to quote as follows from the Labor Party's election advertisement—

A State Labor Government will introduce new methods in financial management. Practical, sensible business like methods that will result in better government housekeeping . . . Balancing the budget without increasing taxation, without plunging the State into debt. Expenditure control to keep taxes down. Efficiency control to keep taxes down. Efficiency audits to eliminate waste.

Our programme budgeting will ensure that new Labor policies are undertaken within our States available financial resources.

We were told that during the wages freeze there would not be any increases in charges. However, water rates have increased by 16 per cent, electricity charges by 15 per cent, bus and train charges have increased by 30 per cent, hospital charges by 19 per cent and gas charges by 15 per cent plus. These increases have been on top of other increases. A record was established in the first year of the Burke Government because it just about doubled previous increases, and that was on top of the tobacco tax which resulted in \$9 million to \$10 million over budget being included in the State's coffers. The Government made a mistake with that tax.

I would like to return to the extremely successful conference of the farm machinery dealers which was held last week. I do not want to keep the Attorney General out of his bed.

Hon. Fred McKenzie: Who is the new secretary?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: If Hon. Fred McKenzie is so slow that he cannot find out that information, I am unable to help him.

This State decided to bring in consumer rules and did away with the agriculture inquiry committee which usually sorted out problems. This State, in its wisdom, decided to bring in consumer laws which cost the consumer at least 10 per cent. It does not seem to matter to the Government what cost it puts on the consumer. The State and national dealer group will continue as an industry, even though the Government will not give it its backing. It is interesting that even the national farmers federation, in its statement on the Trade Practices Act, has asked for no consumerism to apply to farm machinery. However, this Government wants to go it alone and it is totally different from the rest of Australia. It cannot be told and it has double standards.

One wonders why small business in this State is turning the wheel on this Government. The Federal Government is doing the same thing. The thing that will destroy the ALP is the division in its centre-left and centre-right factions. The Labor Party conned small business before the last election and it is now kicking small business slowly to death. The problem is that the ALP does not understand matters such as superannuation for builders and the loadings on holiday pay. They may be small things to the Government, but to the individual they are important.

I wonder whether Hon. Mark Nevill could tell me the average cost of FID to a farm machinery dealer?

Hon. Mark Nevill: How much did workers' compensation go up?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It could be brought down if sensible methods were used and I think members would find that workers' compensation could be cut in half. I do not think the Labor Party would bring that in, but who knows?

We have a situation in which all the rural industries in Australia are uncompetitive industries on world markets. Mining and farming are uncompetitive industries in Australia and until they are made competitive on world markets, Australia will never get out of the mess which it is in.

Hon. Mark Nevill: You will reduce domestic inflation and that is just what we have done.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: It is interesting to hear Mark Nevill's comment on inflation because in the last three days five people have asked me what all the burble is about in respect of the Government's reducing inflation. Hon. Mark Nevill is an intelligent young man and he knows that the books are fiddled. What has been pulled out of the CPI to fiddle the books will create unemployment.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: You do not accept the integrity of the Australian Bureau of Statistics?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Joe Berinson is a reasonably intelligent man—I will not say he is young—and he knows that the figures can be fiddled to alter the Australian Bureau of Statistics' figure.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Are you referring to Medicare?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Hon. Joe Berinson is using the sort of tactics used by the Premier; that is, to go on to another question and try to blame the ABS for it.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I am defending the ABS to the hilt.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The ABS can use only the figures that it is told to use.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I am inviting you to add the Medicare component and you will find a marked drop in inflation. I do not want it ignored. It is important that it not be ignored.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to stick to the subject.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am sticking to the subject, Mr President. It is like the Shannon basin; the Government changed the ground rules and is blaming the ABS.

Several members interjected.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am not blaming the ABS because it is dealing with the figures it receives. However, figures are taken out of certain calculations and by doing this the inflation rate can be altered. The Government can do anything it likes.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Apart from Medicare, what influence on ABS figures has the Government?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I do not have a clue.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: The answer is, none.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I have not followed it through because I am not the Minister for Budget Management, but do not give me the bull-dust that the inflation rate is not affecting the people in this State.

Never, since the Whitlam days—the Minister for Budget Management was involved in that—have I had so many people tell me that inflation is increasing. Shoppers, housewives, farmers, and builders have never seen rises in prices as large since the Whitlam days.

The problem with the Attorney General is that he is so busy that he cannot talk to the real people of the world. I sympathise with him, as I sympathise with Mick Young.

The Attorney will probably end up the same way. He is not getting a chance because he is so busy following Labor Party philosophy and not listening to the people who are buying the goods that he will run into trouble.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: You have read the latest review of the Confederation of Western Australian Industry (Inc.)?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: No.

Hon. J. M. Berinson: I commend it to you. It has rather a different view of the Australian economy from yours.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: I am all for it having its view, but let me have mine.

Hon. Garry Kelly: Do not be confused by the facts.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: The facts are very interesting, because most of the time I have been proved right. Any time the confederation wants to make a statement it can do so. I am only telling members what is happening out there in a portion of Western Australia.

Unless this Government and the Federal Government take seriously the plight of rural industries, this country is in for a shocking period which will equal the Depression. We will not be able to afford to keep anyone going.

I do not find this amusing. The Minister might but I do not. I find it tragic that nobody seems to take any notice of the producers in this world.

Could I say finally—

Hon. J. M. Berinson: Yes.

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: That is very sweet of the Attorney. I am just going through my speech quietly. The performance of businesses servicing the rural areas is dropping rapidly to the extent that the high point of margin against turnover is dropping to about 0.8 per cent. The break-even point is meant to be about 6½ to seven per cent. This is the high point. The low point in America today is minus one per cent. We are basing all our hopes for recovery on the United States. I just want to warn that the United States may not be the best place on which to base our recovery. I am

extremely worried that any recovery in the United States is fragile. I guess that the first Tuesday in November may have something to do with it. It is not because it is Melbourne Cup Day.

Mr Dowding has been pointing out how my investments are not too good.

Hon. Mark Nevill: Has he been giving you some good advice?

Hon. A. A. LEWIS: Not really, because I am not a lawyer and I cannot rob people. We in this State are in a situation where, if the Government does not start honouring a few of its promises, does not start cutting charges to country areas, and removing payroll tax from apprentices in the bush, it will be in trouble. At the farm machinery dealers' conference everybody wanted apprentices, but apprentices cannot be taken on unless there is money to pay them. The number of farm machinery apprentices country-wide has fallen to under half what it was two years ago. Surely this is doing the Government no good! Surely those small businesses have to be able to make the buck to pass it on! It is up to the Minister to have a look at the schemes.

I believe in removing payroll tax from apprentices' wages, or perhaps basing payroll tax on the amount less the loadings rather than on the gross amount. I would not know what this will cost, but those things could help small businesses.

I am not sure that a business more than 70 miles from the city should not be exempt from payroll tax. This would encourage that wonderful word, decentralisation, and help people in country areas. But I am very afraid we are running into a situation where we will have a series of ghost towns in the bush because there will not be enough people with enough capital to sustain rural towns.

I support the motion.

HON. GARRY KELLY (South Metropolitan) [9.52 p.m.]: I support the motion moved by Hon. Mark Nevill last Wednesday, and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Professor Gordon Reid on his appointment as Governor of Western Australia.

I would like to address a few remarks to what I call the "populist" tendency which seems to have taken hold of the Liberal Party. It is of great concern to anyone in this State who has the welfare of society at heart. This "populist" tendency reached alarming proportions at the Liberal Party State Conference last weekend when the Liberal Party agreed to hold a referendum on the question of immigration.

If one goes back to the post-war immigration programme initiated by Arthur Calwell, what

price would one give that programme if it were subject to a referendum? It would appeal to the prejudices of the Australian native born, and that programme would have been stillborn. There would have been no programme at all.

If this call by the State Liberal Party is taken up nationally—the only reason I am raising it in this House is that I think there is some real fear that the National Liberal Party may well take it up—the implications are horrendous. I would ask members opposite, members of the Liberal Party nationally outside Parliament, to imagine the atmosphere which would be generated by such a campaign.

If a campaign like this were held on the question of immigration, first of all the question to be put to the people would raise all sorts of problems in itself. During the campaign we would have on centre stage all the extremist groups, like the League of Rights, the National Front, the Immigration Control Association—

Hon. N. F. Moore: The Communist Party.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: These groups would use their extremist rhetoric to force the mainstream political parties—and I even include the Liberal Party in that description, although it is fast losing its claim to being called part of the mainstream—

Several members interjected.

Hon. N. F. Moore: Look at the history of the Liberal Party and see how many years it has been in existence. It is certainly a mainstream party.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: The mainstream political parties—which include the Liberal Party—would be forced to declare their position on the immigration policy. In asking for a referendum, the Liberal Party has not declared where it stands. It is abdicating its responsibility by saying the people should decide in a referendum.

The Liberal Party must face the question of the appropriateness of a referendum to decide questions as complex as immigration. "Yes" and "No" answers are not satisfactory on an issue which has as many shades of grey as the immigration question.

I am not given to quoting *The West Australian*, least of all the editorials. It has given the Labor Party a hard time.

Hon. A. A. Lewis: You must quote selectively.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: I was going to quote only a few paragraphs from the editorial, but I think I will read the whole thing, because it gives the Liberal Party something to think about. I refer to the editorial of Tuesday, 31 July 1984 and it is headed, "Poll or Policy?". It states—

Unfortunately the WA Liberal Party, in calling for a referendum on immigration, failed to suggest how the question should be framed.

But the arguments in favour of the poll proposal indicated that the question, at least between the lines, would read like this: Do you want non-European migration to Australia to continue?

Such a proposition would achieve nothing except to exacerbate divisions already evident in the community. Work-force requirements, regional responsibilities, compassion for the oppressed and other complicating factors would be swept aside. The lowest common denominator—the relative merit of particular skin tones—would triumph.

Referendums were designed to decide constitutional questions or issues of an important but essentially non-political nature, such as choosing a new flag. They are not meant to be substitutes for policies or to be used as ammunition at the political ground level.

Australia's immigration policies, like every other point of difference between the Government and the Opposition, will be voted on at the next election. There is little point in the Liberals demanding an extra poll for a single issue—unless, of course, they are convinced that winning the next election is beyond them.

The Liberal Party has moved away from the bipartisanship of the past to the point where it has no recognisable immigration policy at all. It thus exposes itself to the charge of seeking to reap electoral benefit from controversy over immigration without declaring where it stands.

That is the point I made earlier: If a referendum on immigration were held, neither the Liberal Party nor any other party which sought to occupy the mainstream could stand back from the rhetoric generated by such a campaign. The party would have to come out and declare where it stood on the question of non-European immigration, which is really what the policy adopted by the conference in the weekend addressed, although it was not spelt out expressly.

Several members interjected.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: The Liberal Party Conference adopted that motion. I think the Op-

position may find it relatively easy to uncork the genie of racial and community intolerance, but it will find it takes more than three wishes to get that genie back in the bottle. This is an issue which can unleash all sorts of community tensions, and it is something which, once let loose in the community, will be very hard to bring under control.

In Monday's paper the Leader of the Opposition sought to defend the policy. I would have thought that the implications of such an outrageous decision of the conference would have been appreciated by the Leader of the Opposition.

If the Leader of the Opposition is not a prisoner of the right-wing ideologues of the Liberal Party, he would repudiate such a policy—

Several members interjected.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: —which was decided by the conference at the weekend.

Hon. N. F. Moore: They have just called for a referendum on the issue.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Mr Hassell agreed with that decision. If he is not a prisoner of the right wing ideologues of the party, he will repudiate that, because referendums are not the appropriate means to decide such matters.

Mr Wordsworth gives me some cause for hope that the President of the Liberal Party will announce a different policy in a week or so. I hope the Liberal Party thinks deeply about this matter before it supports a motion for a referendum on such a divisive issue. It would do enormous damage to the social fabric of this State and nation if a referendum on such an issue were held, and it is something to be deprecated. I hope the Liberal Party refuses to go along with it. Indeed, it really cannot afford to do so. Even if the Liberal Party went to an election saying that it would have a referendum on immigration, in the final analysis I do not think it would go ahead with that policy, because it would be too damaging.

Hon. V. J. Ferry: Who said that a decision was made at the conference on this matter?

Hon. GARRY KELLY: There has been nothing to deny the decision of the conference. It was a Liberal Party conference which passed the motion.

Hon. C. J. Bell: There has been nothing about what the Liberal Party decided.

Hon. GARRY KELLY: Then I must be seeing or imagining things, because on the front page of the paper on the Monday morning after the conference was held it was stated that the party had

decided to call for a referendum on the question of immigration.

Do Liberal Party members want to disown their party's policy arrived at at the State Conference? If so, I applaud them, and I hope the leadership of the Liberal Party, both State and Federal, will repudiate that decision, because it is an outrage-

ous one and could only do harm to this State and the nation.

I support the motion.

Debate adjourned, on motion by Hon. V. J. Ferry.

House adjourned at 10.03 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Standover Tactics

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

(1) How many complaints of standover tactics in the workplace has the Minister received since 30 May 1984—

(a) verbally; and

(b) in writing?

(2) Does the Minister take any action where reports of standover intimidation and damage to property come to his notice?

(3) What is the Minister's role in such instances?

(4) If the Minister has taken any action on complaints to him or his department would he give details of each case?

(5) How many new industrial inspectors has the Government appointed since gaining government?

(6) How many industrial inspectors has the Government appointed in the last six months?

(7) Would the Minister give the names and experience of those people appointed?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) to (3) Where complaints relating to allegations of standover, intimidation and damage to property are made, those complainants are requested to seek legal advice or are referred to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

(4) No complaints have been referred.

(5) Five.

(6) Three.

(7) L. Burns—previously a clerk in the industrial inspectorate.

P. Arnautovic—previously a clerk in the industrial inspectorate and acted as assistant inspector.

A. Davies—3 years' service in the industrial inspectorate and was an assistant inspector.

GAMBLING: RAFFLES

Lotteries Commission Approval

11. Hon. H. W. GAYFER, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

Does a raffle ticket for a motor car, with the cost of the ticket marked as a donation followed by an identification number, need to carry the printed approval of the Lotteries Commission on the face of that ticket before such a ticket can be sold in Western Australia?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

Yes.

PLANNING

South-east District Planning Committee

12. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Planning:

(1) Has the south-east district planning committee, whose member local authorities are directly affected by the proposed Spencer-Chapman road link been invited to participate in the environmental review and management programme currently being prepared?

(2) If not, why not?

Hon. J. M. Berinson (on behalf of Hon. PETER DOWDING) replied:

(1) No. However, the local authorities directly affected by the proposal have received the environmental review and management programme guidelines and have commented.

These were forwarded to the proponents as input to the formulation of the report.

When the draft is completed the proponents have offered to discuss it with the district planning committee.

(2) See answer to (1).

ROAD

Great Eastern Highway

13. Hon. LYLA ELLIOTT, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) Does the Main Roads Department have any plans to widen Great Eastern Highway in Greenmount?

(2) If so—

(a) what are those plans;

(b) when is it anticipated the work would commence; and

- (c) has the matter been discussed with the local shire council?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) and (2) The Main Roads Department has no plans to widen Great Eastern Highway in Greenmount. It has been suggested that the Metropolitan Region Planning Authority and the MRD combine with the Mundaring Council to study the future needs of this road. At this stage no formal study has commenced.

14. *Postponed.*

EDUCATION: HIGH SCHOOL

Como

15. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Education:

- (1) Is the Como Senior High School listed for facilities to accommodate—
- drama/music/media studies;
 - physical education;
 - classrooms; or
 - covered and sheltered areas,
- as per the list produced by the school at a meeting between departmental and school officials and members of Parliament on 18 July?
- (2) If so, are all or any of these facilities listed to be done in—
- the 1984-85 financial year;
 - the 1985-86 financial year;
 - the 1986-87 financial year; or
 - beyond these years?
- (3) If so, what facilities listed above are to be carried out in which financial year?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) (a) and (b) The Como Senior High School is having additions provided in three stages—

Stage 1, which incorporated staff and administration facilities, was completed in 1983-84 at a cost of \$430 000.

Stage 2, to provide additional teaching areas, is under construction at a cost of \$510 000 of which \$442 000 is for works-in-progress during 1984-85.

Stage 3, is planned to contain a hall-gymnasium and to convert an existing small hall and other facilities for music-drama and for other activities as required by the school.

- (c) As the school enrolments are falling no additional classrooms are planned.
- (d) The covered area is a minor works project and the school should make a submission to the south-east regional education minor works committee for funding.

- (2) and (3) Priorities for new building projects in the 1984-85 financial year will be announced when the capital works budget is presented to Parliament. For subsequent years there have been no decisions as yet about the commencement of new works.

16 and 17. *Postponed.*

EMERGENCY SERVICES

State Emergency Service: Members

18. Hon. P. H. WELLS, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for Police and Emergency Services:

- (1) What is the membership numbers for each group associated with the State Emergency Service?
- (2) In each group, how many personnel during the last 12 months—
- joined;
 - retired, resigned, or ceased to be active members?
- (3) Has any new State emergency group been formed in the State during the last 12 months?
- (4) If so, who are they, and what are their membership numbers?
- (5) How many personnel in State emergency groups are without protective clothing, and what items are they without?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

- (1) to (5) It will take some time to collate the detail requested. The Minister for Police and Emergency Services will arrange for this to be done and conveyed to the member by letter in due course.

TRAFFIC

Burswood Island: Study

19. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister for Transport:

- (1) What steps have been taken to fulfil the Premier's April announcement that a full traffic study relating to the Burswood Island area would be carried out?
- (2) Who is carrying out this study?
- (3) Have neighbouring local authorities been consulted on it?
- (4) Will the Minister table the results of this study?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) to (4) This is a matter for the casino control committee to resolve in consultation with the Main Roads Department after a decision is made on the successful applicant to develop a casino complex on Burswood Island.

20 and 21. *Postponed.*

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Land Rights: Seaman Inquiry

22. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Minister with special responsibility for Aboriginal Affairs:

- (1) What was the official closing date for written submissions to the Seaman inquiry?
- (2) Which late submissions were—
 - (a) accepted;
 - (b) rejected?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) Friday 2 September 1983.
- (2) (a) See information provided in answer to question 3205 asked in the Legislative Assembly on 4 May 1984 and additional information given to the House on 29 May 1984.
 Since that date no submission, where notice of intention to lodge a submission was not given prior to the closing date, has been accepted.
- (b) A submission from the Morawa Shire Council received by the Aboriginal land inquiry on 22 June 1984 was rejected.

23 to 25. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES

Accommodation: Kalgoorlie

26. Hon. N. F. MOORE, to the Minister for Planning representing the Premier:

Is it the Government's intention to build an office block in Kalgoorlie for use by State Government departments?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

Yes.

27. *Postponed.*

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES

Accommodation: Superannuation Building

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

Will the Premier provide a list showing the Government departments or agencies which occupy each floor of the Superannuation Building at 32 St. George's Terrace, Perth?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The answer is as follows—

ALLOCATION OF SPACE— SUPERANNUATION BUILDING AS AT 1/8/84

Ground Floor—Womens Information and Referral Service Centre

First Floor—Womens Information Centre—Trans Australian Airlines—Lunch and Recreation Room

Second Floor—To be established for use by Department of Computing and Information Technology

Third Floor—Department of Computing and Information Technology

Fourth Floor—Department of Computing and Information Technology

Fifth Floor—Department of Computing and Information Technology

Sixth Floor—Hon. Minister for Minerals and Energy

Seventh Floor—Hon. Minister for Planning—Town Planning Appeal Committee

Eighth Floor—Hon. Acting Premier

Ninth Floor—Department of Employment and Training

Tenth Floor—Department of Employment and Training

Eleventh Floor—Department of Employment and Training

Twelfth Floor—West Australian Technology Directorate

Thirteenth Floor—Local Government Department

Fourteenth Floor—Hon. Minister for Police and Emergency Services

Fifteenth Floor—Local Government Department

Sixteenth Floor—Amenities.

(3) Yes.

(4) This matter will be covered in future legislation presented to Parliament to ratify any agreement entered into by the Minister.

(5) Yes, although the secrecy provisions provide for a penalty of \$2 500.

(6) Answered by (4) above.

GAMBLING: CASINO

Burswood Island: Environmental Study

32. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Attorney General representing the Minister for the Environment:

I refer to the Premier's public announcement in April that Burswood Island was to be the site for the proposed casino, and ask—

(1) What action has been taken to fulfill the promise that a complete environmental study of the area would be carried out?

(2) When was this action taken?

(3) By whom is the environmental study, if there is one, being carried out?

Hon. J. M. BERINSON replied:

(1) The Environmental Protection Authority requested that notices of intent be prepared on the separate proposals of Swan River Park Ltd. and Tileska Pty. Ltd. These were forwarded to the authority on 27 July 1984.

(2) The Environmental Protection Authority request was made on 12 July 1984.

(3) Notices of intent have been received by the Environmental Protection Authority and are in the process of being assessed by that authority.

33. *Postponed.*

MINERAL: ASBESTOS

Dump: Burswood Island

34. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

Will the Minister table a plan showing the precise location on Burswood Island of the asbestos material?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

The precise location of asbestos material on Burswood Island is not known to me.

29 and 30. *Postponed.*

GAMBLING: CASINO

Applicant: Genting Berhad

31. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

(1) Has the WA Government checked with the Queensland Government to determine why the Malaysian casino operator, Genting Berhad, withdrew from two casino ventures in Queensland recently?

(2) If not, why not?

(3) Is the Minister aware of remarks by a Queensland Government officer, Noel Hall, in *The West Australian* on 11 July, suggesting that Genting Berhad may have withdrawn from the Queensland projects because the Government of that State ultimately had the right to cancel a casino licence?

(4) Why does no such penalty apply in the WA legislation?

(5) Is the Minister aware that penalties of only \$2 000 apply under the WA law?

(6) Is he prepared to consider asking Parliament to amend the WA Casino Control Act to give the Government the power to revoke a licence where corruption against a licensee has been proved in a court of law?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Answered by (1) above.

NATURAL DISASTERS: FLOODS

Floodplains: Perth

35. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Leader of the House representing the Minister for Works:

- (1) Does the Public Works Department have a list or a map of floodplain areas for the Perth metropolitan area?
- (2) Is Burswood Island considered to be in a floodplain?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) and (2) As this matter does not come within the ambit of my portfolio, the member should refer this question to my colleague, the Minister for Water Resources.

GAMBLING: CASINO

Burswood Island: MRPA Attitude

36. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Planning:

- (1) Has the Minister discussed with the MRPA the authority's attitude to the siting of a casino on Burswood Island?
- (2) If so, what is the MRPA's attitude?
- (3) If not, when does he propose to discuss the matter with the authority?

Hon. PETER DOWDING replied:

- (1) A number of informal discussions have been held with the Chairman of the MRPA.
- (2) and (3) Formal procedures will be followed when the plans are further advanced.

GAMBLING: CASINO

Applicant: Genting Berhad

37. Hon. P. G. PENDAL, to the Minister for Administrative Services:

- (1) What is the dollar value of the casino project proposed by Mr Genting Berhad?
- (2) How much of the capital is to be—
 - (a) Australian;
 - (b) overseas?
- (3) Have any discussions on this point been held with the Foreign Investment Review Board?
- (4) If not, when will this occur to ensure foreign investment guidelines are adhered to?
- (5) If discussions have been held what was the result?
- (6) Does this project contravene the present Government's policy on foreign investment in Australia?

Hon. D. K. DANS replied:

- (1) There is no such person as Mr Genting Berhad. The Genting Berhad Group is a partner in Tileska Pty. Ltd. with Mr D. Dempster. The first stage project is estimated at \$200 million.
- (2) (a) and (b) The Casino Control Committee is examining the financial aspects of the proposals and it is not appropriate that this information be disclosed.
- (3) to (6) The financial submissions of casino applicants are in the hands of the Casino Control Committee for examination and all aspects, including the Foreign Investment Review Board's requirements, will be considered by the committee.