

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Ordinary

HON M.J. CRIDDLE (Agricultural - Minister for Transport) [4.57 pm]: I move -

That the House do now adjourn.

Perth Convention Centre - Adjournment Debate

HON TOM STEPHENS (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [4.57 pm]: In question time today extraordinary developments highlighted the way in which this Government is handling the construction of the Perth convention centre. It is now becoming the Perth convention centre fiasco. It is increasingly incumbent on this Government to find the words to explain its handling of this project. Today I asked the Government to explain the nature of the relationship it proposes to have with the successful proponent for the Perth convention centre, which the Government described as an equity relationship.

Hon Peter Foss: No we did not.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: This Government has done that, Attorney General. It used those words in the other place, and they have come from the mouths of the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party, the Premier and the Minister for Tourism in this House. The word "equity" is regularly used by ministers talking about this project. When pressed as to the nature of that equity, and after the Government has thoroughly befuddled and bemused all the commercial and economic analysts who are trying to determine the nature of that relationship, the Government says it cannot quite put its finger on the term, and does not know what it is. It is no longer convinced it should use the word equity. It has discovered it cannot use that word because, as the Opposition has pointed out, the proposal for equity was specifically precluded by the nature of the submissions called for on this project. The three proponents still interested in the project were specifically told they could not ask for, and nor would they receive, government equity.

What will happen with this convention centre, which is likely to get equity from the Government, in the event of a clash of interests between this centre and the other major convention facility operating in this city at Burswood? What favoured treatment will be dished out by this Government to the people with whom it has a special relationship - an equity relationship?

Several government members: Tell us about Burswood.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: These interjections are illustrative. The Government is embarking upon a particular relationship with the proponents for the Perth convention centre, and the interjections from members opposite indicate it will use that relationship to badger the private developer on the other side of the river at Burswood.

The Government will use the favoured equity relationship it is developing, but cannot describe. I know a cover-up when I see one. I smell a cover-up. It smells like a cover-up; it feels like a cover-up; and it has all the nature of a cover-up.

Several members interjected.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I say to those opposite -

The PRESIDENT: Order! Do not say anything for the time being, Leader of the Opposition, until I quieten down a few members. Hon Ljiljana Ravlich and the Leader of the House will not interject. The Leader will get his chance in due course if he wishes to speak.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: During question time the Minister for Transport was asked the following very simple question on the proposed convention centre -

Is the minister satisfied that the proposed design adequately allows for the entering and exiting the road network of the pantechicon trucks that will be required for exhibitions and performances?

We await an answer. What is the nature of the relationship embarked upon by the Minister for Transport, the Government and this proponent with access arrangements for the convention centre? The minister referred to funds in the budget for the financial year - namely, \$2.9m of taxpayers' funds - identified in the Perth access program to be spent on this general area. All the pundits say that the project selected by the Government will face major access problems with roads and highways in this area. We ask legitimate questions: How much of the \$2.9m budgeted for next year, and how much the following year, will be directed to fix up the road system which is likely to be messed up by the Government's selecting a proponent who has not tackled the road access questions? No wonder the Minister for Transport did not answer the question in question time, and then scurried from the House at the first opportunity when under pressure on this issue.

Hon Murray Criddle; Mr Tom Stephens; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Derrick Tomlinson; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Norman Moore

The Premier talks about a number of options for the Perth convention centre. What relationship has been embarked upon by the Government with this project? The Government cannot put its finger on the word. This smells of an absolute disaster. We were told by the Government that somehow or other the probity audit was completed - it was ticked off. We find that the probity auditor is alive and well, and still considering these issues.

Hon N.F. Moore: The process is not finished yet.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The minister told us that the process had been ticked off and done. The probity auditor - someone called something like Gary Glitter; I did not quite catch the name - is alive and well and doing ongoing work on probity audit issues. I faxed a number of questions off yesterday to someone who introduced himself to me as the probity auditor. It was a Mr Jones. It was a different name from the one the minister gave to the House.

Hon N.F. Moore: Maybe he is the principal of the company.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Mr Jones rang me and said that he was the probity auditor.

Hon N.F. Moore: What was his first name?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I have no idea. I got Mr Jones

Hon N.F. Moore: Mr Gliddon works for Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, which has a number of people working for it.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Does the minister know what Mr Jones had to say?

Hon Peter Foss: They have more than one employee, you know.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Who is the probity auditor - Mr Jones or Mr Glitter? Mr Jones rang me on this issue. I asked Mr Jones a series of questions on this issue.

Hon N.F. Moore: When did you ask the questions of him?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: Yesterday.

Hon N.F. Moore: When did he ask you to ask questions? How long ago did you raise an issue, and I asked you to go to see him? You did not bother.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: It was a number of weeks ago.

Hon N.F. Moore: It was probably months ago. You have decided you now want to get on some bandwagon.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I am telling the minister that I have sent a fax to the person who contacted me and identified himself as the probity auditor for this project. I have a series of questions about this project that I want to have answered, because the minister has engaged in what I consider to be nothing short of a cover-up on this project. He has endeavoured to obfuscate -

Hon N.F. Moore: How?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: By refusing to answer questions about the future relationships that he is embarking upon, and by refusing to spell out the options that are being explored and the funding that will now be allocated to this project from the Perth access fund, to which the Minister for Transport referred in his answers, to fix up the road system that will need to be cleared of the pantechinon trucks. The minister has referred to the Perth access fund.

Hon N.F. Moore: That has nothing to do with this project.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: That is what the minister said. The minister indicated that moneys from the Perth access fund will be budgeted for in the next financial year to deal with questions of access in that same location.

Hon Peter Foss: Should we stop spending those moneys? Are we not allowed to spend them?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: The proposed convention centre will require a massive expenditure of funds to fix up the road access on Mounts Bay Road and Riverside Drive. All I say to the Government is that if it has its mind set on using those moneys -

Hon M.J. Criddle: When you point the finger at somebody, you should watch out for the other three fingers that are pointing back at you.

Hon TOM STEPHENS: I fear that this Government is now proposing to utilise those moneys in a surreptitious way. The minister was quick to identify that those moneys do exist within the budget papers and are to be used to sort out the Perth access issues.

Hon Murray Criddle; Mr Tom Stephens; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Derrick Tomlinson; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Norman Moore

Hon M.J. Criddle: How long ago were they in there?

Hon TOM STEPHENS: They are in the current budget - \$2.9m - and they run into the future. I fear that an unholy relationship has now developed between this Government and the preferred proponent in this process, and all I will say is that it is time the minister got it sorted out.

HON PETER FOSS (East Metropolitan - Attorney General) [5.07 pm]: I was very pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition defend Burswood International Resort Casino, because his words brought to mind how Burswood came about.

Hon Tom Stephens: Are you going to try to get even? Are you taking sides - picking winners? That is probably the nature of this equity relationship - picking winners.

Hon PETER FOSS: That is very interesting, because Mr Dallas Dempster became the beneficiary of some quite extraordinary amounts of money from the Labor Government, based purely on the debts that he had to pay off. Members may recall that out of the Petrochemical Industries Co Ltd project, Mr Dempster owed \$50m, so he was paid \$50m for his piece of worthless land; whereas Mr Connell, who they thought owed \$395m but as it turned out owed over half a billion dollars, got \$395m for his piece of worthless land at Kwinana. Those were persons with whom the Labor Government had a considerable interest. Of course, the reason that Mr Dallas Dempster first came into it was that he was part of that delightful organisation called the Curtin Foundation. I understand that the Labor Government said to Dallas Dempster, "You should get involved in the casino. This is the one that you are going to win because of your contribution to the Curtin Foundation."

Hon Tom Stephens: How many members of the 500 Club have got contracts from the Liberal Party?

Hon PETER FOSS: That reminds me of another one, Mr Terry Burke. Mr Terry Burke used to get a list of all the people who had won contracts from the Labor Government and would ask them whether they would like to make a donation to the "leader's fund", which was another interesting fund. I wonder whether it has occurred to the Labor Party yet that the Criminal Property Confiscation Bill will probably apply to the leader's fund. That is interesting. I am glad they are supporting it in the other House. Now that I have raised that point, I wonder whether they will continue to support it, because the Labor Party has used the leader's fund, and I suspect we can follow it up as substituted assets. The Leader of the Opposition should watch out, because he may find that the confiscation of profits Bill will dig up his little past.

Having briefly passed over the delightful things that happened with PICL, where \$395m went to Mr Connell and \$50m went to Mr Dempster, for nothing, having passed over the Burswood casino, which was given to Mr Dempster for his contribution to the Curtin Foundation, and having passed over the brilliant efforts of Mr Terry Burke in raising money by indicating to contractors to the Government that their continued ability to benefit from those contracts might have something to do with their ability to donate to the leader's fund, I will deal with the convention centre.

The Government made it obvious that it would put \$100m into the convention centre. That sum was increased to \$110m. We put no conditions on that money.

Hon Tom Stephens: Yes, you did! One of the conditions was that there would be no government equity. It says here that the Government will hold no equity.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the Leader of the Opposition calm down? I have a duty of care in respect of members' health. I look at him sometimes and I think to myself that someone will sue me for not telling him to take it easy.

Hon Tom Stephens: I feel good, thank you, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the Opposition should have some regard for my health, too.

Hon PETER FOSS: We asked for nothing back for that \$110m. It has been suggested that it may be in the interests of all parties that that contribution be represented in the property of the project, not in our taking any equity. How it is to happen is still to be worked out.

Hon Tom Stephens: If they sell it, will you get some money back?

Hon PETER FOSS: As the Leader of the Opposition knows, the State has the reversion of this property in 35 years. That is a fairly important benefit to the State. To recognise the Government's present contribution to the cost of the project, it is suggested that there be some form of property interest. People have used the word "equity". The reason the word keeps cropping up in this House is because the Leader of the Opposition keeps asking what it means. It is a word that he is using.

Hon Tom Stephens: It came from the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party.

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL - Thursday, 7 September 2000]
p887b-894a

Hon Murray Criddle; Mr Tom Stephens; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Derrick Tomlinson; Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich; Hon Norman Moore

Hon PETER FOSS: So what?

Hon Tom Stephens: That is where all your policy seems to come from these days, whether it be tidal power, the convention centre or whatever.

Hon PETER FOSS: The Leader of the Opposition said that Hon Norman Moore had used the term.

Hon Tom Stephens: He did.

Hon PETER FOSS: He used the term only because the Leader of the Opposition used the term. I am using the word "equity" at the moment only to show that the Leader of the Opposition is using it.

Hon E.R.J. Dermer: Do you know what it means?

Hon PETER FOSS: I know what "equity" means. I also know what reflecting the Government's contribution of \$110m in some property interest in the land means.

Hon E.R.J. Dermer: Have you spoken to the Leader of the House?

Hon PETER FOSS: Perhaps it is helpful for me to speak on this matter because I happen to be a lawyer. It may be easier for me to explain such concepts than it is for the Leader of the House.

Hon Tom Stephens: Don't put the schoolteacher down.

Hon N.F. Moore: I would prefer to be a schoolteacher than a failed priest.

Hon PETER FOSS: I would never presume to take over and tell the Leader of the House about teaching. I bow to his experience and knowledge. He is not a lawyer and nor does he pretend to be a lawyer.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Just as well.

Hon PETER FOSS: I do not know what Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich pretends to be but it always worries me.

It is quite simple. The Government is looking to represent that \$110m in some form of property interest. It is not taking equity in the running of the convention centre any more than the reversion in the land is taking equity. It has always been understood that we would have a reversion. It has also been suggested that the \$110m should be represented in the property. I suppose in the strict sense of the word that is also equity in the land but no-one would say it was equity in the running of the convention centre. If the Opposition had paid the slightest attention it would know that the Government has always intended to have a reversion, which is also describable as equity. However, we made it clear from the beginning, and it remains the situation to date, that we will not take part in the running of the convention centre.

Hon Tom Stephens: How will you protect your equity?

Hon PETER FOSS: I know Hon Tom Stephens ducked out of the Chamber for a while.

Hon Derrick Tomlinson: He scuttled out.

Hon PETER FOSS: It was probably to get some more red cordial; he was calming down too much.

Hon Tom Stephens: It was to get more *Hansards*.

Hon PETER FOSS: Sorry, I thought it was to get more red cordial! I have already indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that the Government has a reversion in the land after 35 years. That is the principal way in which its interest in the project will be protected. However, we can protect the Government's property interest in other ways, and they are currently being explored. If I am not able to tell members opposite the property interest at this stage, it is because it has not been agreed. Is it unusual that one cannot tell people what the agreement is before it is reached? We are dealing with the issue of the probity audit. The Leader of the House has made clear that the process to date has been ticked off. Evidently, the future process has not. How extraordinary! The probity auditor is not ticking off things before they happen! He has ticked off everything that has happened to date. That is what the Leader of the House said, and what he meant. Deloitte's, which is large multinational firm, has a managing director by the name of Jones and a director by the name of Gliddon. I am sure it has more directors and partners all over the world. There would be many, many people, all of whom belong to Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, the firm that is the probity auditor. The man who is the director and is directly involved is Mr Gliddon, and the managing partner is Mr Jones. I trust that is adequate.

Hon Tom Stephens: Hon Norman Moore told the House on 17 August: "It is correct that the Government is considering taking an equity position in the convention and exhibition centre."

Hon N.F. Moore: Based on my explanation in this House of what equity is.

Several members interjected.

Hon Murray Criddle; Mr Tom Stephens; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Derrick Tomlinson; Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich; Hon Norman Moore

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Derrick Tomlinson): Order! It would give me great pleasure to exercise for the first time the power to expel someone.

Hon PETER FOSS: The taking of a property interest in land is equity in the land. It is not taking equity in the convention centre, which is a business enterprise. Equity in the land has always been part of the proposal.

Hon Tom Stephens: That is not what the Leader of the House said.

Hon PETER FOSS: I understand that. I have adequately put all those terms in the context in which they were put. I trust that now the Leader of the Opposition understands, he will not jump up and down and refer to all those terrible things that occurred in the Labor days with Burswood, Terry Burke and Laurie Connell. I am sure members opposite do not want to go back to those days any more than we do.

Building and Construction Industry Training Council - Adjournment Debate

HON LJILJANNA RAVLICH (East Metropolitan) [5.17 pm]: I bring to the attention of the House the concern I have about an issue that I raised in question time and that also presented itself in the "Public Notices" columns of *The West Australian*. The notice reads -

This is to confirm that the Building and Construction Industry Training Council (Inc) will no longer be located at 614 Newcastle Street, Leederville from Friday, 8 September, 2000 at 5.00pm and that the Chief Executive Officer and all present TCITC staff cease all responsibilities for any actions or contractual obligations of the Building and Construction Industry Training Council (Inc) from that time and date.

I remember a legislative amendment to the Building and Construction Industry Training Fund passing through this place not that long ago. I remember undertakings given by the Minister for Labour Relations in the other place and the minister in this place representing that minister. There was no doubt that the BCITC would continue to be funded. Some members might be aware that the BCITF was separated from the BCITC. Lawyers prepared a formal separation document. That separation document was clear about the ongoing funding obligations of the BCITF to the BCITC. Since then policy changes have been made about the funding of the BCITC. The Government introduced a model which deals with core and non-core funding. The BCITC was forced into a situation in which it must compete for the bulk of its funding.

Some industry training councils have fared better than others under this arrangement. It seems obvious to me that those industry training councils that have any union involvement have fared particularly poorly. The Building and Construction Industry Training Council is no exception. For members who are not aware, the BCITC approached the Government approximately 12 months ago and requested an ex gratia payment of \$150 000 to enable it to continue its operations and to fund the administrative component of its activities. The \$150 000 dried up and the BCITC was quickly advised by the Building and Construction Industry Training Fund that it would not fund any administrative component of its programs. That is why the ex gratia payment was requested in the first place. The BCITC was advised by the BCITF that it could apply for program funding but under no circumstances could it be the recipient of any administrative funding. Debate ensued between the minister's office, the BCITF and the BCITC. At the end of the day it appears that the matter cannot be resolved. There was an undertaking by Mr Le May, the director of the BCITF, that a number of programs would be funded by the BCITF and they would be run by the BCITC. The money was never advanced. The simple fact is that there is no point in having program funds if, at the end of the day, there are no funds to pay the people who work in administration.

We have a sad ending to the BCITC. It is also the start of the death of the ITC network. I believe this is the first ITC to come down. The Government has made no secret of the fact that it is not a great supporter of the ITC network and this is the first one to be reduced in funding to the point where it is non-operational. No doubt others will follow. It is ironic that the reason given by the minister for not funding the BCITC is that he does not have the power under the Act to direct the board of the BCITF to provide funding to the ITC. I cannot believe that there is a fund to the value of \$8m and the Government has no control of it. It is money that belongs to Western Australian taxpayers. It is collected by local government authorities and the minister claims that he has no authority over how the money is expended and he cannot provide any direction to the board. That is a very sad state of affairs. I am sure that Western Australian consumers who contribute to the fund would want to know, if the minister and the Government have no control over the fund, who does have control over it. This is the sort of nonsense that this Government gets into. At the end of the day it says that it is all too hard. It abrogates its responsibility. We have seen what happens when that responsibility is abrogated. One has only to look at what has happened in the finance broking industry where the minister has wiped his hands and said that he does not want to accept any responsibility. We have the same situation here. There is \$8m in a fund and the minister does not have the authority to direct how the money will be spent. The BCITC needed approximately

Hon Murray Criddle; Mr Tom Stephens; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Derrick Tomlinson; Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich; Hon Norman Moore

\$150 000 in order to remain operational, but this minister could not find the money to keep that council afloat. There have been absolute disasters and a large wastage of money in the TAFE sector. The minister has condoned massive losses extending to millions of dollars through botched-up computing programs and bad deals with business. While condoning those losses, the minister could not find \$150 000 to save a council. I am very angry, and it takes a lot to get me genuinely angry. I am passionate about this issue because I have been told lies by people in this place and I will not cop that.

Hon N.F. Moore: Who told you lies?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: I was told that there would be ongoing funding to the Building and Construction Industry Training Council and that it was not at risk. It has been closed down.

Hon N.F. Moore: Who introduced the legislation?

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: The Government should have been honest in the process. The bottom line is that it promised to protect the council and it has not done that. I put on public record that I work quite hard; however, I will work doubly hard on this matter because what has happened is an absolute disgrace. It is a matter of principle. The Minister for Employment and Training has not done the right thing, and the members who debated the legislation were given false expectations. The chief executive officer of the BCITC told me the other day that she had been told by the minister's office that it was still negotiating and the problem could be resolved. She was told that Mr Ian Hill would meet with members of the BCITC board and that the Government was hoping to find a resolution to the matter. I telephoned the acting chief executive officer of the Department of Training and Employment - I knew Mr Hill would not be around towards the end of the week. I spoke to Mr Larry Davies and asked if Mr Ian Hill had met with the board to discuss a resolution of the matter. Mr Davies replied, "Well, he could not have met with the board because he has been overseas all week." That is the sort of nonsense that has gone on. The minister has done an appalling job. I will work very hard - and I work pretty hard at the moment - to expose the rorts and the nonsense that has gone on in the technical and further education sector because this minister's actions in relation to the \$150 000 are inexcusable. They are politically driven. The only reason the BCITC has been shot down is that it has a union representative.

HON N.F. MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the House) [5.27 pm]: I say two things before I leave. I am going to a function - which started 15 minutes ago - and I asked members to take that into account when reflecting on what they might say during this afternoon's adjournment debate.

First, if Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich is to do all this hard work in exposing rorts, I suggest she look at the history of the Building and Construction Industry Training Council and where the money went from the time the fund was set up until her party lost Government. If she is looking for a rort, she should look at that, because I suspect she will find some significant rorts. Her party used its numbers to stop this Government fixing the legislation governing that fund. The Minister for Employment and Training must work with legislation passed by this Parliament when the Labor Party was in government. I suspect that is why he is having some difficulty in working out how to spend the money.

Perth Convention Centre, Probity Auditor Reports - Adjournment Debate

Hon N.F. MOORE: Second, so that there can be no dispute, I will read to the House two probity auditor reports on the convention centre tender. One is dated 30 June and is addressed to Mr Shane Crockett, project director.

Hon Tom Stephens: Will you table them?

Hon N.F. MOORE: I have already tabled them. I will now read them to the House, because that has not yet happened. The first one states -

Dear Mr Crockett

In our capacity as probity auditors to the Perth Convention & Exhibition Centre Project, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu have completed a review of the evaluation process adopted and followed during the final stage of the procurement. This report details our work performed and findings.

BACKGROUND

Following the first stage of the procurement, the three selected consortiums were invited to submit a proposal outlining their intentions and ability to meet the Governments specific project criteria. The evaluation process and probity rules to be followed by the project team were developed in advance of information being provided by the respondents.

Upon evaluation of the proposals, each was found to provide inadequate offers in certain areas of the mandatory selection criteria. It was then determined that all proposals were unacceptable in the form

Hon Murray Criddle; Mr Tom Stephens; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Derrick Tomlinson; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Norman Moore

presented and the Government had the right to abandon or reconsider the process of procurement. The Taskforce agreed to the continuation of the process in the manner previously approved as it believed it comprised of sound probity procedures and was still capable of obtaining an acceptable result.

After evaluation, one respondent, Leighton, was placed in Reserve and negotiations commenced with the two remaining respondents, Nexus and Multiplex. The negotiation process was aimed at independently encouraging each of the tenderers to improve their offers towards the Governments stated requirements.

Following the period of independent negotiation, the Taskforce accepted the recommendation of the Project Team that the Multiplex offer was ultimately the closest to the Governments requirements.

SCOPE

Our review had as its primary objective to determine whether the process has been conducted in a fair and equitable manner with due regard to probity. In accordance with probity principles outlined in the NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption's *Practical Guide to Corruption Prevention* and having regard for Western Australian State Government procurement policy, we have focussed on the following:

- Confidentiality
- Conflict of Interest
- Transparency
- Accountability
- Value for Money

OPINION

On the basis of our observations, detailed reviews, attendance at meetings, correspondence with proponents and from discussions with members of the Selection Panel and Advisory Panels to the process, we are not aware of any issues which would lead us to conclude that the evaluation of applicants was not concluded in a fair and equitable manner and that the outcome of the process could not be independently validated.

yours sincerely

DELOITTE TOUCHE TOHMATSU

GARY GLIDDON

Director

Enterprise Risk Services WA

A letter, dated 26 July, was written to me and signed by Mr Gliddon on behalf of Mr Keith Jones, who is the managing partner of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, an international company. The first paragraph of the letter states -

I would like to confirm with you that at the time of writing this letter, our probity opinion on the above project, issued on 30 June to the Project Director remains unchanged.

That is the position of the probity auditor at the conclusion of the process of determining the preferred provider. We are now negotiating a contract with the preferred provider and the probity auditor is monitoring that process, and will do so until such time as a contract has been signed.

Hon Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon N.F. MOORE: If the probity auditor says at any point that something was done improperly, it will be fixed. That is why he is there.

Today in the other House the Premier was asked whether the Government would be spending any additional money on roads in the area in which the convention centre is to be built. The answer is no, and that is correct. The situation is simply as the Minister for Transport explained: A new road is required for the convention centre and it will be built at the cost of the consortium. However, quite coincidental to this project going ahead, the Government has been working on a new access to the city program. Funds have been set aside for that. It may or may not proceed depending on what the Minister for Transport seeks to do.

Hon Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon Murray Criddle; Mr Tom Stephens; Hon Peter Foss; Hon Derrick Tomlinson; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Norman Moore

Hon N.F. MOORE: That is right. They are working on how the roads will go. There is some argument about whether some off-ramps should continue to be off-ramps. The Leader of the Opposition is aware of that, I presume. If the Minister for Transport decides to go ahead with that project, it will be independent of the convention project. There is no relationship with it at all. Had we chosen to build the convention centre in Wellington Street, the access to the city project may have continued as originally planned. They are independent projects. However, it is quite fortuitous that they may come together at the same time, in which case we will get a better outcome for everyone concerned. The convention centre has no effect whatsoever on the access to the city.

Hon Tom Stephens: Why did you say that the Government is considering taking equity -

Hon N.F. MOORE: I have explained that to the Leader of the Opposition, and the Attorney General explained it better than I did. I am simply a schoolteacher, as Hon Ljiljana Ravlich so quaintly put it. I do not mind being put down by that individual.

Hon Tom Stephens interjected.

Hon N.F. MOORE: However, I am quite happy to accept that I am not perfect. If my explanation of what this means does not meet the leader's requirements, he has had an explanation from the Attorney General. In due course, the Government will sign that contract with Multiplex and it will create thousands of jobs for Western Australians.

I will conclude with this question: Why has the Labor Party supported the Burswood Resort Casino's proposals without exception? What is the relationship?

Hon Tom Stephens: It did not ask for taxpayers' funds.

Hon N.F. MOORE: It did ask for taxpayers' funds. It was a proponent and it asked for taxpayers' funds just like everyone else. The Leader of the Opposition does not know what he is talking about. Why does the Labor Party continue to slavishly support Burswood Resort Casino? What is the connection? We heard some of the history. Is that still true? One of these days we will find out.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.35 pm
