

CORAL COAST MARINA DEVELOPMENT, GOVERNMENT DECISION

Motion

HON NORMAN MOORE (Mining and Pastoral - Leader of the Opposition) [2.00 pm]: I move without notice

That this House expresses its serious concern at the decision making processes used by the Gallop Government in its assessment, and ultimate rejection, of the Coral Coast Marina Development proposal for Maud's Landing.

This issue has caused me significant concern for a long time and was brought to a head when a decision was made in the following circumstances: on Wednesday, 2 July 2003 the Premier received the appeals convenor report on the Mauds Landing development; one day later, on 3 July 2003, he rejected the development proposal; and one day after that, on 4 July 2003, he was on an aeroplane with a bevy of journalists and spin doctors heading off to Coral Bay to announce the decision publicly. This three-day episode brought to an end 16 years of hard work by a lot of people who spent a lot of money. The Premier received a report from the convenor and spent one day - one single day - reading the report before making a decision to can a project that has been around for 16 years. For the first time in Western Australia's history the two words "sovereign risk" now form part of our vocabulary. In a period of two days, this Government, for the most blatant political reasons, jettisoned a project that was on the drawing board for 16 years and, I might add, which was initiated by a previous Labor Government. If that does not send a shiver down the spine of any potential investor, I do not know what will.

On the Government's desk at the moment is the Gorgon gas development project which involves Barrow Island. If the Government uses the same processes in respect of Barrow Island as it did for the Mauds Landing development, I suggest that the Gorgon project will be dumped as well, because if it is not, the word hypocrite will be able to be thrown at the Premier. There are some serious doubts about the Premier's capacity to make this decision at all, and I will come to that later in my comments. I want to go through the decision-making processes that led to this three-day extravaganza by the Premier to simply create green credentials for the Labor Party and to try to improve its prospects of winning the next election.

I will spend a few moments going through the decision-making processes since 1987 to the present day - the 16 years since this project was first mooted. In 1987, during the time of an ALP Government, the Department of Conservation and Land Management invited Mr Ken Ryan, the person who set up the company Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd, to make a submission for the development of a marina development at Mauds Landing. The reason was very simple: to protect and enhance the situation at Coral Bay, which in most people's opinion - even in 1987 - was an environmental and planning disaster. As is normal, in 1988 the Government called for expressions of interest for potential developers to develop a marina and a resort at Mauds Landing. In 1989 two companies made a submission to the Government for development of that proposal. I will read to the House a letter written to the Minister for Conservation and Land Management dated 30 March 1989, which describes the situation that came about after CALM had considered two submissions that were made to the Government for the Mauds Landing development. This letter from Dr Barry Wilson, director, nature conservation, to the Hon Minister for Conservation and Land Management, is headed "NINGALOO MARINE PARK - MAUD LANDING", and it states -

The previous Minister gave provisional approval in principle for development of a marina and support facilities at Maud Landing, providing that the proposal was subject to appropriate environmental conditions, and that the NPNCA also approved.

The NPNCA also gave provisional approval in principle.

Subsequently an inter-departmental working group met and has called for considered expressions of interest for the proposed development.

Two proposals were received. The attached report from the working group summarises the position reached.

CALM's view is that an effective marina and associated facilities at Maud Landing would greatly enhance public access to the marine park and contribute to the economic development (through tourism) of the region, while taking pressure off Coral Bay which is at present an "environmental disaster area" in the park.

Of the two received the Sicludes proposal does not provide the kind of marine facility which is necessary, and the joint-venture nature of the proposal is unlikely to be attractive to the Government.

On the other hand, the Coral Coast proposal, while providing a very exciting marine facility plus associated features, at no up-front cost to the Government, depends upon the development of 1000

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

residential lots in the vicinity. Although there is land capacity to achieve this, the question arises whether the State requires a new town of that size, in that location, with all the necessary attendant services.

From CALM's point of view, the Coral Coast proposal is desirable and the 1000 residential lots acceptable. However, it is acknowledged that the Shire of Carnarvon and the SPC have expressed legitimate concerns about the scale of the residential development.

Conclusion

Guidance from the Minister is needed on whether the Department should pursue the Coral Coast proposal as its preference. . . .

B R Wilson

DIRECTOR NATURE CONSERVATION

I will talk about Dr Barry Wilson's ongoing activities in a moment. I will highlight his letter to his minister which said that the first proposal by Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd, which involved 1 000 residential lots, was a good proposal. I ask members to remember the figure of 1 000 residential lots, because it is important. That letter resulted from a report of the Mauds Landing working group, which involved a group of government agencies in assessing the Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd proposal for Mauds Landing. The working group's report states -

The DOLA, CALM and DMH representatives all favoured Coral Coast Marina Development proposals as it provided a major new facility at no cost to the State and at the same time provided some revenue opportunities for the State to cater for ongoing management costs. CALM had some reservations about the size of the Caravan Park and the appropriateness of the residential development but conceded that it would be an ideal retirement village.

In May 1989, the same year, Cabinet approved the project subject to planning and environmental approval. For a variety of reasons, which are not well known to me because I was not in government, between 1989 and 1994 very little progress was made on this project. I suspect it was because of the economic circumstances and the difficulties experienced in the economy at that time. In 1993 the Government changed and in 1994 a heads of agreement was signed by the Court Government, which confirmed that Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd remained the preferred developer for Mauds Landing. In 1995 the Department of Conservation and Land Management Executive Director, Syd Shea, recommended to the Environmental Protection Authority that the project should proceed. In 1995 a Legislative Council select committee, which was appointed to look at development along the North West Cape coast, recommended no developments except the Mauds Landing development proposal. Some propaganda is being spread that the committee recommended that there should be no development at all. It recommended that the development at Mauds Landing could proceed. The EPA gave the project, which at that time involved 955 lots, its approval. This was all taking a long time, and I acknowledge that our Government was in power at the time this was happening. In 1997 the proposed rezoning of the Mauds Landing townsite was advertised and received no objections, and the rezoning was gazetted. It was at this time that Dr Judy Edwards, the opposition spokesperson on environmental matters, decided to appeal against the EPA's decision to give the go-ahead to the project. Appeals were heard and, in my view, it was regrettable that the then minister, Cheryl Edwardes, rejected the proposal on the grounds that it was too big. It was clearly too big; it involved 1 000 residential lots, an inland marina development and a golf course. However, the development had already been given approval by the EPA. Despite that, the minister decided to go along with those who were opposing the development by way of appeal.

As a result of the decision of Minister Cheryl Edwardes not to proceed with the project, the then Minister for Tourism, who happened to be me, approached Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd and said that the Government would like a development to occur in that part of Western Australia but that what CCMD had put forward was too big. I told the company that if it was prepared to remain in the business, the Government would give it a set of guidelines that reflected the Government's view and took into account the views of all government agencies, and that if it could meet those guidelines, the Government would consider, subject to environmental and planning approvals, the continuation of this project. A task force was set up to work its way through the Government's position on this project. It involved a number of different government agencies. One reason for that was that in my view the Department of Planning at that time was of the view that this matter should not proceed. The guidelines were drafted and made available to Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd. As a result, the company put forward the current proposal. That proposal, which has been rejected by this Government, was based upon the guidelines determined by the previous Government and the requirements of the government agencies that had an interest in the proposal. The new guidelines and proposal brought the

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

development down from 1 000 residential lots to 200. Remember that Dr Barry Wilson said back in 1990 that the proposal for 1 000 lots was okay. The proposal put forward in 2000 was for 200 residential lots, not 1 000, it eliminated the golf course, and the marina area was made a bit bigger so that it could take more boats and thus take some pressure off Coral Bay and Bills Bay. This proposal was put forward based upon the guidelines of government. In 2000 a native title agreement with the Gnulli people, who are very supportive of the project, was concluded.

Following the last election things started to go wrong. Up to that point the project would probably have proceeded on the basis that the proposal met the Government's requirements. After the new Government came to power, in February 2001 the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority advised the EPA that the development should not proceed. Who is the Chairman of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority? It is none other than Dr Barry Wilson, the same man who, as a CALM officer, said that the 1 000 residential lot development should go ahead. As Chairman of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority, he said that a 200 residential lot development without a golf course should not go ahead. Why had Dr Wilson changed his mind? I have referred to this issue in the past. Quite coincidentally, this was the time that Dr Wilson became involved in the Australian Wildlife Conservancy, an organisation which was heavily involved in funding the Save Ningaloo campaign and which has its own proposal before the Government for the development of an ecotourism resort at Ningaloo station. This is the organisation that Barry Wilson has become a director of. This organisation has put forward a submission to the Government arguing that its proposal should be an alternative to the development at Mauds Landing. A highly ranked government officer has gone from supporting a 1 000 residential lot development to becoming a director of the Australian Wildlife Conservancy, which has an alternative proposal to the one proposed by Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd, and he has now changed his mind and has said that a 200-lot development should not go ahead. I raised that issue at an earlier date and Dr Wilson was stood aside from any further negotiations on this matter. However, the views of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority as promoted by Dr Wilson remain the views of that organisation and are the views that have been taken into account by the EPA and the Government in its recent decision.

The Australian Wildlife Conservancy is a very interesting organisation. I would like to know more about it. What I do know about the Australian Wildlife Conservancy is that Mr Martin Copley basically runs it, Dr Wilson is a director of it, a number of other quite senior public servants from around the country are also directors of it, and it is an organisation that buys land ostensibly to preserve the wildlife and flora attributes of that land. It is the same organisation that put forward a proposal to the State Government of Western Australia - it has not been rejected to my knowledge - and wants to build an ecotourism resort at Ningaloo Station, of which it owns 25 per cent. The proposal put forward to the Government is that 14 000 hectares of that pastoral lease, namely the 14 000 hectares along the coast, be given to Australian Wildlife Conservancy to develop its ecotourism resort, which it describes as being an alternative to Mauds Landing. As I said before, the coastline along Ningaloo station is the jewel in the crown of real estate along that coast. Mauds Landing is probably the worst bit of coastline for a development. That site was chosen so that it would not get in the road of anybody's aesthetic views of the world. Directly opposite Mauds Landing is a big gap in the reef, a reef that extends for 250 kilometres. Down the track it was said that the scale of the project was too big. It is a development the same size as the one at Coral Bay and involves about one kilometre of the coastline out of 250 kilometres!

Hon John Fischer: Because of that gap in the reef there is no coral out from Mauds Landing.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Exactly right. It is the worst location to attract tourism, which is why they chose that spot to make sure that the project would get up and running. However, Mr Copley and his lot, which includes Dr Wilson, want their little development and research proposal to be located on the magnificent coastline of Ningaloo station, a place for well-connected greenies and other celebrities who might like to go to a pristine part of the world and have it to themselves. We must look at the so-called celebrities who supported the Save Ningaloo campaign and ask what they have in mind for the future of that particular part of the coast.

I told the House sometime ago that Senator Peter Cook - not one of my political comrades - said in the Senate that the AWC - Mr Copley - had given \$500 000 to the Save Ningaloo campaign. I repeated that in this House. Mr Copley wrote to me and said it was not true. However, he did not tell me how much he put into the campaign and said it was his business. I would like to know how much he has put in. I recently read a story in *The Bulletin* by Tim Winton about how these poor little people got together to stop this huge multinational company from despoiling the Ningaloo Reef. There are more car stickers around Western Australia with "Save Ningaloo Reef" on them than I can shake my fist at. At about \$1 each it amounts to \$100 000 worth just for openers -

Hon Simon O'Brien: Someone made a buck at any rate.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Exactly right. That campaign was not run by a minor, miserable, little group of people who scrimped and scrounged to make some money to save the reef. It was a well-funded and well-organised campaign with full-time employees working on it.

Hon Barry House: Of course, Tim Winton and Luc Longley are paupers too.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Exactly right. To be fair to Mr Copley, I do not know how much money he put into the Save Ningaloo campaign; I know only that he put some in. It would help us all out if he told us how much it was. It would also help us if we knew who funded these campaigns and if the money was spent in an accountable way. All a person has to do to set up a campaign to save something or other is start collecting money from all the people who think we should be saving something or other, and then spend that money. Nobody knows how or why it is spent or if it is used for paying people's salaries or what; nobody knows! I have asked the Government whether there are any constraints or any requirements for these organisations to be publicly accountable, just as other charities are required to be accountable under law. It is time we knew more about that as we go along.

As I said before, Dr Wilson was involved as a director of the Australian Wildlife Conservancy. He was later stood aside by Dr Edwards because we exposed his conflict of interest. I add that at the same time she also stood aside because we exposed her conflict of interest in this matter. Yet, regrettably, the advice of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority, which was chaired by Dr Wilson, remained with the Environmental Protection Authority and was in opposition to the Coral Coast development. Dr Wilson did not just leave it there.

In 2002 he voiced the same opinions to the federal EPA, which was also examining this project. I previously raised in this House the extraordinary similarities between a letter written by Dr Wilson as the chairman of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority and a letter written by the Save Ningaloo campaign operative, Donna Wheeler. I have two letters, one written by Dr Wilson in an official capacity and another written by Donna Wheeler as an opponent to the Mauds Landing development. Both letters have the same words in them; paragraph after paragraph is identical. This means that either Dr Wilson gave his letter to the Save Ningaloo campaign for information, they collaborated when writing the letter, or the Save Ningaloo people wrote the letter and Dr Wilson copied it. If anyone wants to see the two letters I will make them available. To save the time of the House I will not read them out. The fact remains that Dr Wilson was collaborating with the Save Ningaloo campaign in respect of submissions to the federal Government's environmental interpretation of this matter. If anybody wants those letters I am happy to provide them because they are very interesting reading indeed.

At this point in history, Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd put forward a submission to the Government based on the Government's guidelines. It was to be assessed by the EPA because the conditions we put on the project were that it could go ahead provided it got environmental planning approval. In October 2002, the EPA brought down its report on the Coral Coast Marina Development's revised proposal - a proposal based on the guidelines provided by government.

The recommendations are interesting to say the least, and I will run through them because it is very important that I do so. This is where the Premier has been extremely misleading with his comments.

Hon Kim Chance: Is this the EPA's advice on the appeals process?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: No, this is the EPA's original report on the current proposal. It states -

The thrust of the EPA's advice is fundamentally related to the challenge of sustainable use of the Ningaloo/Cape Range coastal area in the context of the Government's election commitment to seek World Heritage listing of the Ningaloo Marine Park.

How did that get into the equation? It has nothing to do with it but it is in the EPA report. Somehow or other, this development has something to do with World Heritage listing. A company is putting forward a proposal, World Heritage listing has never been part of the guidelines issued to it, and there has been a change of government. Suddenly the EPA has to take into account that the Government might be seeking World Heritage listing even though Shark Bay, which is already on the World Heritage List, has a town, a boat ramp, a jetty and a fishing industry - all parked in the middle of a World Heritage area. What that has to do with a development is beyond me. World Heritage is not just about pristine development. However, I will not read out all the recommendations and nor am seeking in any way to pick out the bits that suit my argument. The bits I will not read are the bits containing no contentious material. The third recommendation states -

That the Minister notes that the EPA has concluded that it is unlikely that the EPA's objectives for factors associated with the footprint of the proposal would be compromised, provided there is satisfactory implementation by the proponent of the recommended conditions set out in Appendix 4, and summarised in Section 5, including the proponent's commitments.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Then we get to the crux of the matter. The ninth recommendation states -

That the Minister notes that the EPA's overarching advice is that, while the impacts associated with the footprint of the proposal could be managed to meet the EPA's environmental objectives with satisfactory implementation of environmental management commitments and recommended conditions, and while the proponent has made commendable efforts to address issues of wider management, it is beyond the proponent's authority to undertake the management of people's activities outside of its development area, and such management is necessary to ensure that the values of the Ningaloo Marine Park and adjacent coastal areas are protected.

Recommendation 10 states -

That, noting the EPA's advice and recommendation 9 above, the proposal should not be approved for implementation unless the Government is able to: . . .

It then lists a range of things, which, to save time, I will not read out. It continues -

11. That the Minister notes that the EPA has provided a set of conditions and procedures pursuant to Section 44(i)(b) of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986*.
12. That, if the proposal is approved for implementation, following consideration of recommendations set out above, the Minister imposes the conditions and procedures recommended in Appendix 4 of this report.

In the simplest terms possible, the EPA does not think there is anything wrong with the footprint that covers the development itself. In other words, the proposal by Coral Coast Marina Development - the marina, the residential area and the tourism facilities - is not a cause of environmental concern. What is of environmental concern is that the proponents are unable to control what goes outside their footprint. Of course they cannot! The EPA tells the Government through the report that if it lets the project go ahead, it must manage what goes on outside the footprint - and so it should. I say here and now that it will have to do that anyway. This is an extraordinary situation. The EPA has said that the footprint that covers the development is okay but that the areas outside are of concern, which is the Government's problem. Based on that recommendation of the EPA, Dr Gallop said that the EPA rejected the proposal. It did not. It quite rightly and properly said that the Government had a responsibility to the coastline area outside the footprint of the development. The EPA quite rightly said that the developers should be required to meet the very stringent conditions that were to apply to their development. The developers gave every indication they were prepared to do that. That decision of the EPA was interpreted in a variety of ways. Some people said it was a conditional approval, some said it was a rejection and others said it was an approval. However, those who read the bulletin carefully will find that it says that it is okay for the development to go ahead if it is considered in isolation; that the rest of the area needs to be protected, which is the Government's problem; and that the Government needs to commit to that. That is what it said in the simplest possible way.

Since the bulletin was handed down, an interesting byplay has taken place. Save Ningaloo activists - if I can describe them as that - Paul Gamblin and Dennis Beros have been heading up the coast telling everyone who is prepared to listen that they have a wonderful new scheme called "Future Ningaloo". They are showing people a PowerPoint presentation describing what they have in mind for the Ningaloo coast as an alternative to the Mauds Landing development. Those who have seen the "Future Ningaloo" presentation put forward by those two gentlemen have found it interesting that the proposal is virtually identical to the proposition put to the Government by Mr Martin Copley and the Australian Wildlife Conservancy. Dr Barry Wilson is a director of Australian Wildlife Conservancy. He put forward a view on behalf of his statutory authority that Mauds Landing should not go ahead. It is very interesting to say the least.

As well as the things going on with the Australian Wildlife Conservancy and the Save Ningaloo campaign, this scenario has another sideline attached to it. In about 1995, when I first became interested in this matter, I received a briefing from the then Minister for Planning to see what was the problem with getting the project off the ground. I was Minister for Tourism at the time. After being involved in that briefing, there was no doubt in my mind that some officers in the Ministry for Planning did not want the project to proceed. I was given a long list of the most ridiculously unimportant reasons that the project should not proceed, such as sharks could not be kept out of the marina. The reasoning was that everybody could get eaten; therefore we could not go ahead with the project. Next, people will say that we cannot sail on boats in case someone falls off and gets eaten by a shark. It became very clear that the officers did not want it to go ahead. Without mentioning any names, I was told that a particular senior officer in that department had said that the project would go ahead over his dead body. There were all sorts of reasons for that.

Hon Ken Travers: Will you resurrect this project if you win government?

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I do not think anybody would have the faintest inclination to even contemplate putting forward a proposal for tourism development in Western Australia. The Government should be very concerned about that.

I discovered that bureaucrats put every conceivable obstacle in the way of this development. Yesterday I asked a question of the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries about the funding of an organisation called the Australian Marine Conservation Society, which is one of the joint sponsors of the Save Ningaloo campaign. It is in coalition, if I can put it in those terms, with the Conservation Council of Western Australia, The Wilderness Society, Australian Wildlife Conservancy and World Wide Fund for Nature. Those organisations' logos are on the Save Ningaloo campaign web page. Dr Nic Dunlop represents and works for the Australian Marine Conservation Society. I yesterday asked whether Dr Dunlop was funded by the Department of Fisheries. The answer was that the department funds not him but the Conservation Council. I was fascinated to learn that and am looking forward to knowing more about it. The advice was that Dr Dunlop is funded by the Department of Fisheries to carry out scientific work on behalf of the Conservation Council which might help the Department of Fisheries. Dr Dunlop's name is on the list of people who appealed against the decision of the EPA. Dr Dunlop could be a publicly funded person who is very actively engaged in trying to sabotage a proper development proposal. I would like to know more about that in due course. I also know that he has been involved in providing information and advice to various ministers on this issue.

When we start looking around, we learn about Dr Wilson, Dr Dunlop and the officers in the planning department. When we look further through the system, we find a very interesting thread; that is, a heap of public servants or people who benefit from the public purse working their little butts off to stop this development going ahead. We must ask why. They are not members of the EPA, which makes the decision. They are at various other agencies that have a particular view.

On 2 July 2003 Dr Gallop received the appeal committee report. As members would know, once the EPA releases a bulletin, people can appeal for or against its recommendations. The appeal committee's report is a fascinating document to say the least and raises some serious questions about how this process works and how it should work.

Hon Barry House: Is that the report Dr Gallop read in less than a day?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Yes. My copy of the report is 23 pages, but I am told that the appendices cover many more pages.

Hon Peter Foss: He does not have much else to do.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: He is Dr Dolittle.

Page 3 of the appeal committee's report states, under the heading "environmental assessment" -

The EPA reported via Bulletin 1073 and its overarching advice to the Minister for the Environment and Heritage was that:

"... while the biophysical and pollution impacts associated with the proposal's footprint could be managed to meet the EPA's environmental objectives with satisfactory implementation of environmental management commitments and recommended conditions, and while the proponent has made commendable efforts to address issues of wider management, it is beyond the proponent's authority to undertake the management of people's activities outside of its development area, which is necessary to ensure that the values of the Ningaloo Marine Park and adjacent coastal areas are protected.

This report repeats what the Environmental Protection Authority said in its report. It recognised, at least in the first part of this report, that the footprint covering the development was okay as far as the EPA was concerned, but the Government needed to act on what was outside that footprint.

I was interested to see who had made submissions, and those organisations and individuals are listed on page 6 of the report, where it states that meetings, discussions or e-mail communications were held with, among others, the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority. It was having another go. Not only had Dr Wilson made his views known to both the EPA and the federal environmental authority, but also he was now having another go in this case. To be fair, Barry Wilson was not in attendance during this item. That is good; he was stood aside because of a serious conflict of interest. I have not seen the submission made by the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority to the appeal committee. I do not have a copy of it, but I am hoping to get one. The list on page 6 of the report includes the Conservation Council of Western Australia/Save Ningaloo Campaign representatives. They are all there - Rachel Siewert, Nic Dunlop, Tim Winton, Susie Bedford, Paul Gamblin, Dennis Beros; the

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

list goes on and on. It also included Hon Robin Chapple and Hon Giz Watson, and all the people who usually make submissions on this sort of thing. When the committee says it received 79 submissions, or whatever the figure was, most of them were from the same lot; the same collective, if I can use that expression in the context of their political activity.

I was interested that Tim Winton was included. As a quick aside, I was fascinated to read his *Bulletin* article, and Liam Bartlett's response to it. I do not always agree with Liam Bartlett, but on this occasion I agree 100 per cent. I have the utmost regard for Tim Winton and Luc Longley as individuals, but how could they possibly describe themselves as poor little people? Luc Longley has more money than the State Government of Western Australia, and that is just his spending money. Tim is not exactly poverty stricken either. Who is paying the salaries of Paul Gamblin, Dennis Beros and all the other people who work full time on these campaigns? It does not come from poor little people who have given up their day jobs. Look at the people who are listed on the web site for the Save Ningaloo Campaign: Claudia Kervan - I do not know her - David Wenham the actor, Di Morrissey, Greta Scacchi, Helen Garner, H.G. Nelson, Hugo Weaving, Jane Campion, John Marsden, Kate Grenville, Luc Longley, Pat Rafter - another poverty stricken character - Roger Swainston, Stan Waterman, Thomas Kenneally - another poor man - Taj Burrow, the John Butler Trio, Toni Collette and I have already mentioned Tim. These are the people that Tim Winton describes as being just poor little citizens who got together to knock off this big multinational company that would have desecrated the Ningaloo Reef. The company they took on consists of a number of Western Australian investors who want to do something for Western Australia. It is not a big multinational company at all, and members probably know the people involved personally.

Hon Peter Foss: Tim Winton is a fiction writer, after all.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: That is what Liam Bartlett said - he should stick to fiction. He has obviously done so in this case.

Importantly, the appeals committee report, on page 7, states -

The EPA Chairman provided detailed advice on the appeals pursuant to section 106(1) (a) of the *Environmental Protection Act (1986)*. The EPA advised that when considering the appeal grounds and its advice that it was important to note the EPA Chairman's summary of the EPA's overarching advice to the Minister for the Environment and Heritage that:

'... the proposal as it stands should not be approved for implementation, even with the conditions set out in Appendix 4 of the EPA report. Making the proposal environmentally acceptable would require significant involvement and investment by Government into the management of the Ningaloo Marine Park.' The area requiring intensive management would include coastal lands adjacent to the Ningaloo Marine Park (NMP) - areas that are beyond the proponent's authority to manage. The overarching advice is a summary of Recommendations 10, 11 and 12 in EPA Bulletin 1073.

The fascinating thing about that statement is that the chairman is now saying that the project should not go ahead even if the requirements in appendix 4 are met. That is not what the EPA report said. The EPA report said it could go ahead if the requirements of appendix 4 were met. The chairman of the EPA is telling the minister a story that is slightly but very importantly different from the report of his authority. That is significant, because Dr Gallop has hung his whole argument on the rejection of this proposal by the EPA, when in fact the EPA did not reject the proposal, although its chairman may well have. I would like to know more about that, and if the EPA members ever come before the Parliament at the Estimates Committee I might start asking them some questions about it. The statement referring to the chairman's position, contained in the appeals committee report, is different from that of the EPA in a fundamental and important way, which should not be missed. I am sure it was missed by the Premier when he speed-read this report and came to the final conclusion, which is on page 23, and reads -

Recommendations

After reviewing all the issues, it is considered that the critical issues relating to the proposal arise from its scale and form, and its location in a sensitive environment. The environmental risks and management needs for the proposal have not been demonstrated to be environmentally acceptable. There are doubts about the EPA's recommended mechanism to achieve adequate long term management in relation to the proposal.

It is recommended that appeals be determined such that the proposal should not proceed.

Fiona Keating

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

APPEALS COMMITTEE

I do not know who Fiona Keating is. My understanding of the process of the EPA, when it heard appeals, was that the appeals were collated by the appeals committee and provided in a readable form to the minister, who would then make the decisions. However, here a recommendation is being made by a particular person that this project should not go ahead. I repeat her words -

The environmental risks and management needs for the proposal -

That is, the proposal of Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd, not the Ningaloo coast from top to bottom -
have not been demonstrated to be environmentally acceptable.

They have, according to the EPA, which is set up by statute to provide these decisions. The EPA said, and I will read it again if anyone does not understand it, that the proposal itself was environmentally acceptable.

Hon Kim Chance: Within the impact area on the footprint of the proposal.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Exactly right. One thing the minister needs to understand is that, having knocked back this proposal, the Government must meet all the other issues surrounding the protection of that environment anyway. Getting rid of this marina will not stop people going to that area. In fact, they will still go there, and they will do massively more damage than they would have done if a marina development were in place. The Government has got to do what -

Hon Robin Chapple interjected.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Hon Robin Chapple can have his say after.

Hon Robin Chapple: How do you quantify that? How do you know they will do more damage?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Hon Robin Chapple and I both know that they are all over the blasted north-west cape from one end to the other doing interminable damage. If Hon Robin Chapple has not noticed that, his eyes have been shut. Those people will go there. As I have said to Hon Robin Chapple and this House on a number of occasions, if the development went ahead, we would be able to control where people go and what they do. Now the Government will have to try to control 250 kilometres of coastline and reef. It has no hope in the world. However, it might have a little camp for Hon Robin Chapple. He can camp with Tim Winton and his mates at Ningaloo Station and enjoy the most wonderful part of the world. It is a pity nobody else can go there.

I refer to the conclusion of the recommendation on which Dr Gallop based his decision. It states -

The environmental risks and management needs for the proposal have not been demonstrated to be environmentally acceptable.

They have according to the Environmental Protection Authority. Who is Fiona Keating to make a decision that is contrary to the decision of the Environmental Protection Authority when she is not the Environmental Protection Authority? She was appointed as an appeals committee by the minister; she is not a statutory authority that has been given the responsibility and role of assessing the environmental issues that affect Western Australia. There are significant contradictions. There is a contradiction between the EPA and its report and between the attitude and views of the chairman. Further, the Appeals Convener has drawn a conclusion that she was not entitled to draw. Based on this recommendation, and based on one day's consideration of the 23-page document, Dr Gallop has effectively dumped 16 years of hard work, \$100 million or more of potential investment in Western Australia, 700 jobs for Western Australians, holiday accommodation for Australians in north-west Western Australia and the first decentralised township in the north for decades. He has dumped all those in the garbage can after one day's deliberation! Was there only one day's deliberation? I asked when work started on the advertising campaign. The contract was let on 20 June. Dr Gallop's decision was made on 2 July. Perhaps the Government had already made up its mind; perhaps Dr Gallop did not even need a day. Maybe he needed only 30 seconds after which time he could say that he had received the report and agreed with it.

Hon Barry House: The spin doctors had already written the schedule.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Exactly right.

All those things were dumped in the garbage can by this Government on top of the \$7 million that had been spent by good, true and honest Western Australian citizens who sought to develop a project in Western Australia and who had met the requirements of government all the way through, from beginning to end.

Hon Peter Foss: If it were a multinational, it would have been sued by now.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Yes, the Government would have been. We will see whether the Government has a different approach to multinationals in due course compared with Western Australian companies. To add insult to all of this injury, the company had to dump \$7 million after it had done everything the Government asked it do and after the minister gave it only one day's consideration. To add further insult to this injury, the Government has now spent \$350 000 of our money on the most extraordinarily outrageously political advertising that I have seen in my life. Nobody could suggest that it is anything other than that. It is absolutely outrageous. The advertising includes wonderful photos. The Tourism Commission should take those advertisements, get rid of the words that read that the Government is looking after the environment, and use them around the world - this would be fantastic - to attract people to Ningaloo Reef, which the Government clearly does not want to happen. As I said, the advertising campaign that we are still being subjected to technically asks people to make a submission about what should happen to the Ningaloo coast. That is what it technically asks for; however, what it does in a blatant political sense is say that the Government has saved Ningaloo Reef. That is a political statement if ever I have heard one. Interestingly, however, and as I said a moment ago, the decision to run the advertisements was made on 20 June, two weeks before the Premier received the report from the Appeals Convener. We have to ask ourselves, is it, or is it not, spin?

Hon Peter Foss: Is it an incorrect process?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I will talk about due process in a moment, because that is another fascinating situation that we will face in a short period. All this has come down to a simple statement. A company was encouraged by a Labor Government to develop a marina resort in the north west of Western Australia. It went through all the processes that the Government put in its way. It met all the requirements, had its proposal assessed by the Environmental Protection Authority - the EPA approved it twice - and then after one mean, miserable day of the Premier's time, the project was jettisoned and rejected. Why? For the most blatant of political reasons; that is, the Labor Party wants to maintain its green credentials because it believes that the Greens (WA) will not support it at the next election unless it does something like this. Members may recall that when the EPA's report first came down, Hon Giz Watson said that if the Government went ahead with the proposal, it would not get the Greens' preferences. I thought that was interesting, because I did not expect the Greens to give their preferences to us either and they would have had to have gone somewhere. However, this decision has been made to make sure that the Labor Party gets its green credentials.

Let us look at the environmental issue. It is the native forest of the first and only term of the Gallop Government. It is the equivalent to its native forest position before the last election. However, the Labor Party has a bit of a problem called Gorgon. As members know, there are vast quantities of gas in the North West Shelf. Chevron Texaco wants to develop the Gorgon project. Part of that proposal is to develop a plant on Barrow Island and to use 300 hectares of Barrow Island for the development of the liquefied natural gas. It wants to strip the carbon dioxide out of the gas and pump it into an aquifer under Barrow Island. Fortunately, it has now stated that it will have a pipeline to put the gas on the shore, which is fundamental. However, the Environmental Protection Authority, which has assessed this, has said no in far more unequivocal terms than it did when it said no to the Mauds Landing project. If the Government is to be consistent, there is no way in the world that Barrow Island can get off the ground. However, Dr Gallop will have to forgo \$13 billion worth of investment to Chevron Texaco. Can he afford not to back a multinational company that wants to set up a gas processing plant on Barrow Island? Can he afford not to get the royalties that would go to Western Australia as a result of that plant? He has already ignored the fact that 700 jobs in the Gascoyne do not count for anything. The Gorgon proposal does not involve 700 people at all - there are fewer than that. It is a far more capital intensive project than Mauds Landing. I support the proposal of Gorgon at Barrow Island - any suggestion that I do not is nonsense. The Government has a problem. I hope it makes the decision to allow the project to go ahead on Barrow Island. However, I cannot for the life of me work out how it will do it without being regarded as monumental political hypocrite. Dr Gallop keeps telling us that he has gone down the path of due process. Due process means that when the Government receives a proposal, the Environmental Protection Authority assesses it, the Appeals Convener considers appeals and makes a recommendation to the Government, and the Government then makes a decision. The EPA knocked back the Mauds Landing project and the Government said it would go along with that decision. The Government agreed to knock it back because the convener recommended that it be knocked back. We are told that that is due process. Let us see what due process means with the Gorgon project. At the first stage of the due process, the EPA does not think it should go ahead. It is more emphatic about that than it ever was about Mauds Landing.

Hon Robin Chapple: I agree.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: As Hon Robin Chapple will attest. I will ask a rhetorical question: where are the Save Ningaloo people now? Where have they all gone? I thought that the day after the announcement about Mauds Landing was made on 4 July, they would all get into whatever conveyances they used to get to Coral Bay

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

and travel to Karratha and then to Barrow Island with their placards and car stickers. I have not seen one car sticker insisting that Barrow Island be saved.

Hon Robin Chapple: I will bring them in.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Does the member have some?

Hon Robin Chapple: Yes, I have a lot of them.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: This is a cynical view, but maybe the Save Ningaloo people will let the Government off the hook over the Gorgon project.

Hon Ken Travers: This is an outrageous speech. For a bloke who said he wanted the project to go ahead, you are doing whatever you can to undermine it. You are amazing.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I am talking about one of the most fundamental issues in politics - hypocrisy. The Government is very good when it comes to that. It is extraordinarily hypocritical. As I said a while ago, I hope the Government is hypocritical on this matter. I wanted both of those projects to go ahead contrary to the views of the EPA. I supported both projects. I have no problem with being accused of being a hypocrite. They are both good projects for Western Australia. I look forward with great interest to hearing the Premier tell us why the Barrow Island project is okay but the Mauds Landing project was not. I hope that he does a good job of it. At least one out of two projects will go ahead.

I have been giving some serious thought to whether the Premier had the right to hear the appeal and make the determination. As members know, the Minister for the Environment was caught out with a conflict of interest. She had been involved in the appeals against the Mauds Landing proposal and therefore was seen to have a particular interest in the matter, which precluded her from hearing the appeals as the relevant minister and making a good decision.

Hon Kim Chance: She withdrew to avoid the perception of prejudice.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: That is right. We have discussed this matter in the House and Hon Peter Foss made an interesting and sensible speech. The minister stood aside and, as a result, Dr Gallop announced he would make a decision about Mauds Landing. I did some research and had legal work conducted on his capacity to do that, subsequent to him making the decision. The advice I received was that unless Dr Gallop had gone to Executive Council and had been made the Minister for the Environment in respect of certain issues, there was a serious legal issue for an acting minister or a minister acting on behalf of another minister to hear appeals. It is easy enough to have an acting minister carry out activities on behalf of another minister. However, if part of those acting responsibilities involve making decisions on appeals, the question must be asked whether it is a fair and reasonable way of doing business and whether it gives the prospect of natural justice. If an acting minister is appointed the day before an appeal is made on environmental grounds and he says he does not know anything about it but makes a decision anyway, people could claim that they did not get natural justice. I have seen a legal argument that an acting minister cannot take a semijudicial role in hearing and determining appeals.

Based on that information, I tried to find out what the Government had done to transfer the powers that the Premier needed to make the determination on these appeals. At about 12.30 pm I came across a *Government Gazette*. Members would not believe the date of it - it is dated 24 December 2002. I do not usually read the *Government Gazette* on Christmas Eve. In that *Government Gazette* was the transfer of authority from Dr Judy Edwards to Dr Geoff Gallop with regard to certain aspects of the Environmental Protection Act using the delegation power under section 18 of the Act. I have read that section of the Act and for the life of me I do not think that it actually means delegating power from one minister to another. I think delegation under that power, which is found in many Acts, is for a minister to delegate certain actions required under an Act to, for example, the chief executive officer of a department. That happens all the time. I do not think the Act provides for a delegation of ministerial responsibility from one minister to another.

The process the Government must follow if it wants an acting minister or a minister to do something different is to go to the Executive Council and have the Governor tick it off. The Governor has a role in deciding what ministerial responsibility a minister has. Whenever a minister changes portfolios, he goes to Government House and gets sworn in again. The appointment of ministerial roles and which legislation is the responsibility of each minister is recorded in the *Government Gazette*. In Western Australia, the Environmental Protection Act is assigned to the Minister for the Environment. Dr Judy Edwards is the Minister for the Environment, not Dr Geoff Gallop. The Environmental Protection Act states that the Minister for the Environment will make decisions with regard to appeals. To overcome that, the Government has used the delegation authority under section 18 of the Act, which I think is a bit wonky. I will research the matter further.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

I would not have had this problem if the Leader of the House had answered a question on behalf of the Premier on Tuesday when I asked whether the Premier would advise the House what authority he had to make the decision. The Leader of the House said I should put the question on notice. I have been here long enough to know that when a government member asks for a question to be put on notice, it means the Government does not have an answer and that putting the question on notice gives the Government time to think of an answer that meets the Government's required spin. I have been known to do it myself on occasion.

Hon Kim Chance: It could mean that the Premier wanted to receive legal advice.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I thought he would know why he made the decision. I think the interjection by the Leader of the House is extraordinary.

Hon Kim Chance: It could have meant a lot of things.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: It would have saved a lot of trouble. Regrettably, that question has been placed on notice. The Leader of the House might be able to help me by telling me what authority the Premier used to make the decision.

Hon Kim Chance: I do not know the answer now.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I think it is very important to know the answer as soon as the Leader of the House can deliver it to us. I would appreciate it if the Leader of the House gave us an answer by way of ministerial statement or whatever. It is very important not only from the point of view of the Government, but also from the point of view of the State of Western Australia. The State of Western Australia may find itself in some trouble if the processes of decision making were incorrect. The State may have to use taxpayers' money to pay for compensation if compensation is deemed payable as a result of an action by the Government that is improper or invalid. It is an important issue. I would like to know the answer some time down the track.

I will conclude on the following terms. This issue has been very murky from the time the government agencies decided to put obstacles in the way until the time of the decision of the Premier. A smell is emanating from some of the processes. A minister has stood aside from deliberations on this issue and a public servant has been stood aside because of a conflict of interest. That has already been proved. Public servants have changed their minds. Dr Wilson owes it to this Parliament to tell us why he changed his mind on the project; why he said it was good with 1 000 lots and no good with 200. We need to know how close the Australian Wildlife Conservancy is to the Government and how close it is to those people who make decisions on behalf of the Government. We want to know why the Premier gave such scant regard to the proposal and why it took him only one day to make a decision. Why did he refuse to meet the proponents? He was quite happy to meet people from the Save Ningaloo campaign and to swim with the whale sharks and Tim Winton. He was not prepared to meet the people who wanted to spend \$100 million in Western Australia. Why was that the case?

The Government's decision is the worst environmental decision that it could have made. The Leader of the House knows that. The area needs a development like this so the environment can be preserved. If it does not have a development, people will continue to crawl all over the land and the reef and have little regard for any environmental considerations. The Government has got rid of the best environmental solution. On top of all that, the Government will spend \$10 million of taxpayers' money on sewerage works and a boat launching facility for Coral Bay. Coral Bay is an unmitigated planning disaster. The Government will give taxpayers' money to the people who own land at Coral Bay to fix up the mess they have created and then leave them with a monopoly over the area people use when visiting Ningaloo Reef. If I were a Coral Bay landowner - I know one person who owns a fair bit of it - I would be laughing my head off. The Government is going to spend taxpayers' money to fix up the sewerage at Coral Bay when, if it had gone along with the Coral Coast Marina Development proposal, it would have got a sewerage system, a proper water supply, electricity, bitumen roads, accommodation and every conceivable aspect of public infrastructure for nothing. It would not have cost taxpayers one bleeding cent! The Government is now going to spend \$10 million to fix up Coral Bay, which most people say cannot be fixed up anyway. It is an appalling decision made for the worst of all reasons, which is blatant political spin doctoring and what goes with that. It is all about the Government trying to get itself re-elected with green support. Regrettably, the Government has made the wrong decision.

Hon Robin Chapple: If Coral Bay is not sustainable, would you suggest it be closed?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: If this does not go ahead and no other resort goes ahead, Coral Bay must be fixed up. There must be somewhere for people to go. People must be able to buy petrol, bread, milk and newspapers.

Hon Robin Chapple: As minister, would you have closed Coral Bay?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I would have thought about it. I do not know. It has got to be fixed because it is a mess and the member knows it.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Hon Ken Travers: What is your policy for the next election?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I am not going to tell the member what is our policy for the next election.

Hon Ken Travers: You are going to build a resort. The plan will be resurrected. Be honest; that is what you want.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: One thing I can give -

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Adele Farina): Order, members!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I can give an absolute assurance that the next Liberal Government - after the next election - will not build a resort at Mauds Landing. Whether someone else does is pure conjecture.

Hon Ken Travers: Why not?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Because Governments do not build them.

Hon Ken Travers: You have just told us it is the best thing for the reef. Why will you not build it?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Because the Government I belong to is not in the business of building resorts near reefs. We do not do that. I told the member it is pure conjecture. As I said earlier, who in his right mind - who has more than one and sixpence to put together - would come to Western Australia and say that he wanted to get into the tourism business by doing something along the coast? A person would not be so stupid. This is the point on which I started my speech. We now have an element of sovereign risk in Western Australia, which we have never had before. That is not just my view but also the view of the Western Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and other industry organisations that are very concerned about the consequences of this decision. The Government is telling those people that it does not care what they do or how much money they spend because it will make a decision on the most blatant of political grounds. That is what has happened in Western Australia. Members opposite know it and I know it. The investors of the world will now start saying that investing in Western Australian tourism is just too hard. They know the State is being run by Hon Robin Chapple and his colleagues who, instead of wanting young people to work in a fantastic resort at Mauds Landing, want them to sit under a tree and smoke pot while contemplating the meaning of life and not worry about their short-term memory. That is what came out of yesterday's speech. What a serious worry it is to this State. The people who run this Government occupy five seats on the other side of the House in association with a number of small activist organisations in environmental land. They are making decisions, and when one listens to what they have to say about all sorts of issues, one just despairs. I hope the Labor Party extracts the digit, works out what is good for Western Australia, jettisons the extreme green side of its policies, and allows good, true and honest Western Australians to invest in this State and create jobs for our children.

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural - Leader of the House) [3.17 pm]: I accept at least one of the observations made by the Leader of the Opposition. I am referring to the observation he made about the length of this process. He spoke accurately about the 16-year time frame of the Mauds Landing proposal. We must ask ourselves, in the genre of the way in which the Leader of the Opposition finished his contribution, how badly it reflects on Western Australia that a proponent can be left hanging for 16 years. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon Norman Moore: I do not feel proud of our Government.

Hon KIM CHANCE: No. I do not think any of us should. When a proponent comes up with a request to help the Government with a policy situation and finds himself 16 years down the track before receiving a decision, it is not the most confidence-inspiring thing for investors. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition on that. We must have sympathy for the proponent in that case.

During the past eight to 10 years, particularly during the term of the coalition Government, there was report after report on the possibility of the Mauds Landing development and development of the south Ningaloo coast. No action was taken. In itself, that is bad enough.

Hon Murray Criddle: We built a few roads up there.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Sure. What was happening in that location on the south Ningaloo coast during that time is of greater concern to me. Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition touched on that. There was uncontrolled, uncoordinated development at Coral Bay. That is a greater tragedy than the question of the delay, because Coral Bay had no services and an overflow of human activity polluting the coast itself and affecting the reef. I will touch on that later.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

I will now look at what the Gallop Government has done. The Leader of the Opposition has been critical of our position, but what did we do? Almost immediately upon our election we made a financial commitment to the sewerage scheme for the area. The single most challenging aspect of the uncontrolled development at Coral Bay was the lack of sewerage facilities. We made the financial commitment of \$7 million to resolve that issue. We later tackled the second challenge, and that was the uncontrolled vessel access to the reef. We have made a financial commitment of between \$2 million and \$2.5 million for a boat ramp facility. Therefore, we did act, but the most important action that the Gallop Government has taken for the southern Ningaloo coast has been the commitment to a long-term vision for its sustainable development.

Hon Murray Criddle: What has actually happened?

Hon KIM CHANCE: The finance has been put aside and, as I understand it, the physical construction of the sewerage facility is due to start very soon, but the first action was the setting aside of that \$7 million.

Hon Peter Foss: I think the boat ramp is a disaster.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The honourable member may, but the absence of a boat ramp is an even greater disaster. Hon Peter Foss's interjection actually draws attention to the line of division between the coalition and the Government. The cornerstone of what the Gallop Government is doing is a comprehensive engagement of community consultation, to actually ask the people of Western Australia what they want to happen on the southern Ningaloo coast.

Hon Norman Moore: Do you not have a view on this already?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I certainly have a view, and the Government has a view. We are not interested in the top-down approach. We want to know what the people of Western Australia want to happen on the southern Ningaloo coast.

Hon Peter Foss: The people in the city?

Hon KIM CHANCE: Hon Peter Foss interjects that it concerns only those in the city. We see the same polemic occurring within the Gascoyne region itself, but this is not an issue about the Gascoyne and the city. The points of view from Exmouth and Carnarvon are different; the point of view expressed on one side of the street in Exmouth is different from that expressed on the other side; and members of the Carnarvon council express different points of view. This is not a cut and dried issue of the Gascoyne versus the metropolitan area, as much as I would like to sometimes see things as clear-cut as that. If they were, at least we would know where we are coming from, but it is not as black and white as that. I wish it were, but that is not the way it is. The Gallop Government made a commitment to ask the people of Western Australia what they thought should happen on the southern Ningaloo coast. The people of Western Australia want to be asked; they want to be engaged. They are not interested in this top-down, arrogant approach that they have been used to.

Hon Norman Moore: They have been asked about 15 times. There have been more reports into this coast than any other part of the world.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question.

Hon Norman Moore: It was not a question; it was a statement.

Hon KIM CHANCE: A gauge of the interest in the process is that in the limited time that the discussion paper and the draft action plan have been on the Internet, some 15 700 hits have accessed that part of the site. This is not simply a count of the number of hits. The number of hits - I do not think that is relevant - is more than 400 000. Some 15 716 people have gone to the site and have sought that data.

Hon Norman Moore: Would you be able to organise for those 15 000 people to go and have a look at Coral Bay? You could put them on the Premier's aeroplane, because he goes backwards and forwards often.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I would love to. I will make inquiries about that, but I do not think it would be proper.

Hon Norman Moore: Most of them would not have set foot in the place and would not have the faintest clue what the area is about. You know that and I know that.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I am aware of that. People ought to make judgments after visiting the site, but this is not a perfect world. However, it is clear that Western Australians are attempting to engage in this matter in a fairly complete way. It is not simply a matter of 15 000-odd hits on the Internet site. I think these papers are mailed out on request only, but I need to check that. Some 1 850 copies of the future directions paper have been mailed out, and another 1 000 are currently being printed.

Let us talk about the commitment in terms of people. I have touched on the commitment the Gallop Government has shown in its budgetary allocations. During the term of the coalition Government, the commitment of people

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

to service the area was one-half of a ranger's time. The situation now is that there is one full-time marine reserve officer and another full-time marine park ranger; until very recently there was a full-time, although temporary, specialist engaged on turtle preservation in the area; and a large number of people are based in Perth but are in the area for specific purposes from time to time -

Hon Norman Moore: Have you read what the company would have provided for CALM as part of this development?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I have seen some of that, yes.

Hon Norman Moore: A significant contribution to the environment.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The bottom line is that the Gallop Government's contribution to this region is real in terms of people, it is real in terms of policy and it is real in terms of financial commitment.

I will now touch on the advice of the Environmental Protection Authority and the way that it has been presented. I listened very carefully to what the Leader of the Opposition said. I do not have any difficulty accepting that he spoke the truth, but I will tease through it a little. I would be the last to suggest that the Leader of the Opposition would put a spin on an argument, but I will go through it.

Hon Ken Travers: That is only because you are a very generous man, leader.

Hon KIM CHANCE: This is the way I see the EPA's advice. I think the EPA's advice was that the development should not be approved, but in the event that the Government made another decision, then a set of conditions ought to be followed.

Hon Norman Moore: We will read it again.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Just a minute. The Leader of the Opposition made the finer point that, in respect of the impact on the footprint of the development itself, the EPA did not have a particular problem. The problems it could see were off the footprint, and I do not disagree with what the Leader of the Opposition said. I want to tease out what those environmental impacts off the footprint were, and I will try to analyse the relationship between what happens on the footprint and what happens off the footprint. Those external factors, I will call them, included fishing pressure. I know the EPA had an opinion about fishing pressure, because I actually signed off Department of Fisheries' advice that went to the EPA, and it was very clear.

Hon Norman Moore: Who wrote that?

Hon KIM CHANCE: It was written by Fisheries, but it came to me for -

Hon Norman Moore: Who in Fisheries wrote it?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I am not going to name individual Fisheries officers.

Hon Peter Foss: You probably should, in view of the matter having been raised here.

Hon KIM CHANCE: But they would have been specialists in recreational fishing management.

Hon Peter Foss: The point that has been raised is that somebody appears to be wearing a couple of hats. He is advising the Government on fisheries and he is also advising some of the people who are against it.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Who is the honourable member talking about?

Hon Norman Moore: Dr Dunlop.

Hon KIM CHANCE: No. My advice came from the Department of Fisheries. I believe Dr Dunlop carries out work for the Conservation Council of Western Australia.

Hon Norman Moore: And provides advice to the Department of Fisheries.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes. The specific work that Dr Dunlop does is to advise government generally, but the Department of Fisheries in particular, on conservation aspects of the way in which that department is run. The advice I provided after getting advice from the Department of Fisheries came from the Department of Fisheries -

Hon Peter Foss: Do you understand the theory that once a stream is polluted it remains polluted? Somebody down the line may provide advice that is polluted. He may have an axe to grind. He may tell X, and X may use that to tell Y, and Y may use that to tell Z. It is all based on the fact that somebody started off with an axe to grind.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I can assure Hon Peter Foss that as much as we value and in some cases rely upon Dr Dunlop's advice as an expert, our decisions on stock management in the Gascoyne area derive entirely from within the Department of Fisheries' resources.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Hon Norman Moore: Would you be kind enough to find out whether he had any input into Department of Fisheries advice to you on this matter?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I would be happy to. I will look now at the external factors. Fishing pressure is one of those factors. As I said, I have had personal involvement in the advice that the Department of Fisheries sent, which advice I might say was not all that opposed to the idea of development at Mauds Landing. However, we pointed out that there would be fisheries resource pressures as a result of a positive decision on the development of Mauds Landing. Other factors include boat strikes on the reef, wildlife disturbance, pollution and habitat degradation. I understand that they are the key offsite, external factors cited by the Environmental Protection Authority as issues that would require management.

Hon Norman Moore: And which require management now.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Certainly, they require management now.

Hon Norman Moore: And they will have to be managed.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I will get to that. It is one step further along. I will first deal with this issue. The advice from the Environmental Protection Authority was that the footprint issues would be manageable but that there would be offsite impacts. I have cited what I believe are the offsite impacts that concern the EPA. Each one of those factors, and certainly the one I understand best in terms of fisheries pressure, would be exacerbated by a rise in the number of people living in that area as a result of the development. It is easy to talk about the on-site or footprint issues being controllable in terms of environmental impact and to say that everything outside that is a problem for government. That is true but only in part, because each of those offsite issues would be exacerbated by a decision to develop at Mauds Landing. To go to the point the Leader of the Opposition raised, I agree that there are current problems that already require management. That is what the consultative process is all about. The Government is telling the people of Western Australia that there are all kinds of problems on the southern Ningaloo coast, and asking for their views on how to sort them out. The Government has provided a discussion paper and an action plan. It is asking people to read through them and provide their views on how to fix these problems. What the Government has taken off the agenda is the Mauds Landing development proposal.

Hon Norman Moore: It doesn't include a marina development.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That is correct.

Hon Norman Moore: Many people would argue, including me, that that is the best way to solve the problems you are talking about.

Hon Ken Travers: I can't wait to see your election policy.

Hon Norman Moore: I have already told you what I think about that.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I will move along to what the Leader of the Opposition referred to as the extraordinarily, outrageously political ads.

Hon Norman Moore: I couldn't think of another way to describe them.

Hon KIM CHANCE: He ran out of superlatives at that stage!

Hon Norman Moore: I can think of a few more now.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The Government is now openly engaging with the people of Western Australia, essentially on what they think should take place in terms of the development of the Ningaloo coast. It is clearly an effective process to the extent that it is winning the engagement of Western Australians. As I have said, almost 16 000 people have already accessed that site in detail. The Leader of the Opposition was able to describe the advertisements as extraordinarily outrageous political ads. I admire him for that. I give him credit where it is due; he did not blush, despite knowing all the time that he was a member of a Government that was responsible for, amongst others, the infill sewerage campaign. Do members remember the advertisement with Premier Court in the helicopter? There was the Mabo campaign. Do members remember the slogan for that campaign? It was "Land under siege; they're coming to get your backyard". This was all done with taxpayer dollars.

Hon Ken Travers: Just a month before the election the Liberal Party trotted Elle Macpherson around to promote Elle Racing, which went belly up. Do you remember that one? That was a beauty.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I do remember that one. It is not on my list. Do members remember the campaigns on the workers compensation changes? People were getting piggyback rides around the place. The industrial relations changes went on and on and on.

Hon Norman Moore: What you ignore is that people are entitled to be provided with information.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Hon KIM CHANCE: Yes.

Hon Norman Moore: Your ads are not providing information at all. They are sending a political message.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Finally, there was the “Fix Australia, Fix the Roads” campaign, which at last count cost us about \$60 million in federal road funding. I have missed out a number of the campaigns. They were taxpayer-funded political campaigns that were designed around either a state election or, in the case of the “Fix Australia, Fix the Roads” campaign, a federal election campaign. The Leader of the Opposition did not blush.

Hon Norman Moore: I am not blushing because I know what they were about. They were providing information, which is more than this thing does.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Oh. “Fix Australia, Fix the Roads”.

Hon Norman Moore: Why won't you ask people whether they want a marina? Why have you taken that off the agenda? You have said that they can have anything they like provided they don't have this project. Why not ask them? If you are into consultation, why not ask the people whether they would like this development at Mauds Landing?

Hon KIM CHANCE: The Government has made the decision that a marina is not an appropriate device.

Hon Norman Moore: Don't talk about asking people for their opinion, because you have taken away one significant option.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I guess if people really want a marina, they will use this process to tell the Government that. They will say that they do not want any of the things in the action plan or discussion paper, but what they want is a marina.

Hon Ken Travers: The Government has spent \$2.8 million on a land-backed wharf at Carnarvon, \$14 million on the Exmouth boat harbour and \$16.2 million on the Exmouth marina village. We are giving it to them.

Hon Norman Moore: Don't you know who built the Exmouth boat harbour? You promised it for 10 years and didn't deliver. They got the harbour from us. You know it and I know it. That came after 10 years of procrastination by your Government. Why aren't you prepared to let the people have a say on this matter?

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Adele Farina): Order, members! The Leader of the House has the call.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Thank you, Madam Deputy President. The only answer I can give the Leader of the Opposition is that if every Western Australian chose to respond through this consultative process by saying that they really want a marina, I guess the Government would have to think about that.

Hon Norman Moore: They have to make a submission based on your proposals, and nothing else.

Hon KIM CHANCE: We will see what comes out of the process. I feel sure that Western Australians are sufficiently assertive that if they want the development at Mauds Landing or something of that nature, they will tell us. So far, as a local member whose electorate is not too far from that area, I have not received a single letter or any other kind of communication that actually says that anyone thinks that the development of Mauds Landing or anything like that is a good idea.

Hon John Fischer interjected.

Hon KIM CHANCE: The Shire of Carnarvon is somewhat divided on it. It has not chosen to inform me of that.

Hon Ken Travers: Question 10 of the “Future Directions: Sustainable Tourism and Land Use Scenarios for the Carnarvon-Ningaloo Coast” paper asks -

Do you believe there are sufficient boat access points along the coast (formal boat ramps and identified beach launching areas)?

People can respond with a yes, no or details of where they are required. There is an opportunity for people to comment. They could write “in a marina”. Hon Norman Moore could launch the campaign today; he could write under question 10 “in a marina in Mauds Landing.”

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon KIM CHANCE: I am enjoying the contributions from the other side.

This was clearly an effective consultation process. I will go over a couple of the things that led to the decision, because they go towards answering some of the questions put by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

The Premier wrote an open letter to the people of Western Australia in which he stated -

The EPA's Bulletin 1073 was considered by many to recommend some form of conditional approval for the proposal and the EPA provided a set of conditions that would need to be fulfilled by the proponent if a decision was made to allow the proposal to be implemented. Subsequently, after considering the appeals, the EPA Chairman advised that the proposal should not be approved for implementation.

That gives some clarity to what has happened -

Hon Norman Moore: Except it's not true.

Hon KIM CHANCE: I think it is. That statement was based on advice from the Environmental Protection Authority to the Premier concerning appeals against the EPA's bulletin. The EPA then stated -

Although the thrust of the EPA's advice was that the proposal should not be approved for implementation -

That is pretty clear -

the EP Act sets out that the EPA should provide a set of conditions that would need to be fulfilled by the proponent if a decision is made by Government to allow the proposal to be implemented.

Several appellants misinterpreted the EPA's overarching advice, considering that the EPA had recommended conditional approval be granted to the proposal. I trust that the summary provided above clarifies and articulates the EPA's position in relation to the CCR proposal.

Clearly, the Government's actions in this matter have properly followed due process. At a personal or a joint level, people can disagree with what the Government ultimately decided to do; obviously, people are free to do that - a decision like this is not going to be popular with everyone. However, I do not think we can disagree with the fact that the Government has followed due process. Members might not like the decision but it is pointless and certainly inaccurate to argue that the Government has failed to follow due process.

Hon Norman Moore: Do you reckon you have gone through due process?

Hon KIM CHANCE: I believe we have.

Hon Norman Moore: We look forward to you doing it in the future.

Hon KIM CHANCE: That takes me to the question of the future. There is one other question that I will briefly touch on again because the Leader of the Opposition mentioned it; that is, the matter of the Government's future decisions on the Gorgon project. Although I do not intend to give any indication whatever as to what the Government's decision on Gorgon might be, I can assure members that the Government will make its decision in exactly the same way as it made its decision on the Ningaloo coast; that is, by following due process to the letter. Members can be guaranteed of that.

In closing, it is time we stopped looking backwards on this issue -

Hon Norman Moore: I bet you'd like to do that.

Hon KIM CHANCE: Hang on, I do not know that any of us has a lot to be proud of in the way this issue has gone ahead; 16 years is a long time. It is an issue that has raised powerful emotions in the community and, clearly, division amongst decision makers. However, the important thing at the end of the day is the way in which the people who live in the Gascoyne, the people of Western Australia more generally and everything that makes up the ecology of the Ningaloo coast will benefit from the decisions that we make for the future. That is the important issue. The process that has been put in place by the Government and the decisions that have been made to improve facilities at Coral Bay are the important things. As we move forward into the future, I hope we can be more focused and more directed in the way we go about putting together solutions for the southern Ningaloo coast.

HON ROBIN CHAPPLE (Mining and Pastoral) [3.45 pm]: How many people have had the privilege of diving either on Ningaloo Reef or along the Mauds Landing area? I have been lucky enough to do so and I am sure those who have would say that significant damage has already occurred to not only the Coral Bay area but also the reef. Significant damage has already occurred on the reef through boat access, because the boats are too large -

Hon Murray Criddle: The damage there has resulted from a lack of management.

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I agree with the member and, to a degree, that is what I will focus on. Too many boats are accessing that reef at the moment. Unfortunately, the boats allowed access to the reef by the current Government are too big. Their turning circle is too great and they are breaking off parts of the reef and damaging it. If a person goes out to the reef in a small boat and does a dive or whatever else, he can hear the clunking sound of larger boats as they bang into the reef.

In respect of management, we have to consider how people access the reef. The problem with Mauds Landing was that nothing was done to diminish the number of boats accessing the area or to control access to the reef. I agree that the channel that was to be utilised would have been an easier channel than the current set up at Coral Bay. Notwithstanding that, the number of boats that were going to impact upon the reef would have been significantly greater -

Hon Norman Moore: Hang on, you could require them to go into the marina and not go anywhere else.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: So they will just sail around in the marina! If they go out to access the reef -

Hon Norman Moore: You can control them when you have somewhere to put them.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: The boats cannot be controlled in the marina. Once they are out of the marina gates, they are off and away. At the moment, four stations in that area have unbridled access to the reef: Gnaraloo, Cardabia, Ningaloo and Warroora. The Ningaloo Reef Outback Coast Association has been trying, with the help of funding, to do something about this situation. However, it is a dog's breakfast at the moment. To put further pressure on the reef system by increasing the number of boats or people accessing will not do anything to help the situation at all; it is still out of control. We need to put in place a proper management plan that outlines the size of boats that can access the reef, sets protocols for getting onto the reef, and appoints the Department of Conservation and Land Management as the managing agent to look after the area. The number of people using the beach front all along the coast also needs to be brought under control.

Hon Norman Moore: How are you going to control that? It covers 250 kilometres of beach.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: My understanding is that CALM has some proposal to take away -

Hon John Fischer: CALM has not done a thing.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I agree with the member. Just because it is a dog's breakfast now - it was going to continue to be one - a marina would not have assisted the problem one iota.

Hon John Fischer: If it were not for the pastoralists looking after the country, it would be a total mess. They are the only people who have put money into and looked after the area right from the word go.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: In response to the honourable member, the leaseholders of those pastoral stations took action when they were recently threatened with the removal of the coastal strip. They have used some money, along with federal funding, to put in place management plans, which were bloody well long overdue.

I return to the Mauds Landing proposal. There were some comments earlier that this decision will set an extremely bad precedent for business confidence in Western Australia. As Hon Norman Moore mentioned, the fundamental proponent was a Mr Ryan, whom I understand got himself into significant financial difficulties over the building of the original Coral Bay development. Although Mr Ryan is not one of the primary shareholders in Coral Coast Marina Development Pty Ltd, he is certainly associated with a number of the companies involved in the process. It is also interesting to note that we could not find out anything about Gamut Development Ltd, a shareholder of 44 per cent of Coral Coast Marina Development. It was originally registered incorrectly on the Australian Securities and Investments Commission database. After much searching, ASIC eventually found the company, which has its registered office at 11 Pedder Street, Central, Hong Kong. The only contact person for that company is an Annie Tang, who knows nothing whatsoever about the company other than she occasionally sees some South African pilots. That was the extent of what we could find out about what was a 44 per cent shareholding in Coral Coast Marina Development.

Hon Nick Griffiths: Who is "we"?

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: Myself. It was research that my office did.

Hon Norman Moore: I understand that pilots were involved, but not any more.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I understand that their shareholding has reduced significantly, but they are still involved.

Hon Norman Moore: You are talking about history. What is wrong with South African pilots?

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: Nothing, but there was no disclosure and we were unable to find out anything about the company. Its information is not on any statutory record. It is not held in any company records in London, South Africa or Hong Kong, and it was certainly not available to ASIC. That gave us a bit of concern. That was not the only company. Cobyne Ltd and Byrneco Management Services Ltd were based at the same Hong Kong office.

Hon Norman Moore: Is this the current situation?

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: Its shareholding has diminished but it is still involved. We looked at the structure of Coral Coast Marina Development. It is a very limited company. Most of the holdings are merely family holdings held in and around the Karratha or Wickham areas, and they are mainly \$2 companies. The idea is that Coral Coast Marina Development has been a major player and has invested millions of dollars. I really would love to see the figures.

I refer to what Hon Norman Moore addressed. I liked his comments about the possible duplicity of the current Government in its stance on Ningaloo Reef and what will be its stance on Barrow Island. Hon Norman Moore wondered whether there were any Barrow Island stickers. For people's information, I show the stickers that are produced on behalf of the Conservation Council of Western Australia.

Hon Norman Moore: How much do they cost?

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I do not know, but I think a sticker like that would cost around 50c.

Hon Norman Moore: Who paid for them?

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I paid for these. They are produced on a cost-recovery basis.

Hon Nick Griffiths: Who paid for the others?

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I think about 1 000 were printed. I purchased about 400, and the rest will be sold in stalls, as is the usual practice.

I refer to Dr Nic Dunlop. I congratulate the former Government, as it was during its term of office that Dr Dunlop was employed under the Government's funding arrangement with the Conservation Council. Norman, that was a really good move.

Hon Norman Moore: We sure made some mistakes. That is why we are sitting over here. I assure you it will not happen again.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: That arrangement started on 4 December 2000.

We heard some fairly selective statements about what the EPA said in bulletin 1073. For the edification of this Chamber, I will read to it the actual words of the two elements of the report that deal with the crux of the matter: recommendations 9 and 10, which are the final two recommendations -

9. That the Minister notes that the EPA's overarching advice is that, while the impacts associated with the footprint of the proposal could be managed to meet the EPA's environmental objectives with satisfactory implementation of environmental management commitments and recommended conditions, and while the proponent has made commendable efforts to address issues of wider management, it is beyond the proponent's authority to undertake the management of people's activities outside of its development area, and such management is necessary to ensure that the values of the Ningaloo Marine Park and adjacent coastal areas are protected.

That is the very issue I raised at the start of my speech. Currently there is no management. I continue -

10. That, noting the EPA's advice in recommendation 9 above, the proposal should not be approved for implementation unless the Government is able to:
 - identify and confirm the environmental management resources required across the natural resource management sectors to adequately protect all values of the Ningaloo Marine Park and its adjacent coastline, as well as having regard for potential World Heritage values from the impacts of additional people pressure;
 - confirm that any commitments by CCMD to support environmental management are legally and financially sound in terms of their capacity to deliver the necessary environmental management in the long-term;
 - make a whole-of-Government commitment to any environmental management arrangement with CCMD; and

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

- commit to prepare and implement an effective environmental management system, including the preparation of management plans and the provision of resources commensurate with the level of human-use pressures on the Ningaloo Marine Park, to ensure that the environmental values of the region are adequately protected in the long-term.

That is the crux of the issue. The area is a disaster and needs to be better managed. I commend the Government for its sewerage proposals and for attempting to put moorings into the Coral Bay area to move the larger boats out of Ningaloo. However, we also need to realise - and I would almost support Hon Norman Moore in this - that the style of the final announcement and the plethora of advertisements on the television and in the press comprise a significant political exercise. To fly up there on the day, do the huge public relations exercise and then return the same day was a little bit over the top. It could quite easily have been done in Perth.

I also commend the former Minister for the Environment, Cheryl Edwardes. In *The West Australian* of 4 July 1997, she is quoted as saying of the previous proposal -

“I am not confident that there are adequate monitoring and management systems in place to ensure that impacts on both the terrestrial and marine environment can be managed,”

Interestingly, these are virtually the same words used in the current Environmental Protection Authority report. The former minister, in her rejection of the Mauds Landing proposal, notwithstanding the size issue, identified the very same issues that the EPA did in its rejection of this current proposal.

In conclusion, one of the things that I hope will come out of this is that the current Government will be able to provide a financial commitment to managing the impacts on the Ningaloo Reef system, Yardie Creek and Cape Range, and get the affairs of Coral Bay in order. I do not support the motion of Hon Norman Moore.

HON KEN TRAVERS (North Metropolitan - Parliamentary Secretary) [4.02 pm]: Some of the comments I will make follow very closely on those already made by the Leader of the House. One thing that seems to be generally agreed around the Chamber is that the whole of the Ningaloo coast is under threat. Some 150 000 people visit the area annually, and there are 340 camp sites up and down the coast.

Hon Norman Moore: Have you ever been up there and had a look?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I have, actually. I took a bit of a busman's holiday last year. I took a few days off. I will come to it a bit later.

Hon Murray Criddle: Can we have a bit of background?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Okay. I actually stayed at Carnarvon, because I could not get into Coral Bay. It was during the July school holidays. I went up there with my nephew, and unfortunately we had to stay in Carnarvon. It was actually beneficial, because I got to see the whole of the coastline, and then later on I was able to go to Exmouth and come back from there. I have had the opportunity to look at the whole area.

There is no doubt that the area is under significant pressure. One of the things that came home to me - Hon Norman Moore is correct to raise the issue about whether I have been there - is that it is clear that the people who are visiting that area and putting it under the kind of pressure that people are talking about here use areas much wider than that proposed for the Mauds Landing development. It was clear to me that we needed more than a solution that relied on building the Mauds Landing project to fix everything. That was one of the problems the Government faced when it came into office. Only one solution was being proposed, and that was to go ahead with the Mauds Landing proposal, and somehow that would fix all the problems. However, the people already using that area are not the sorts of people who would necessarily go to a Mauds Landing-style development.

Hon Norman Moore: What do you mean by style?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: I am referring to people who want very simple camp sites and natural environments. I doubt that they would want to go to a town-site development. Brighter minds than mine in the Government picked that up a good deal earlier than I did, and put in place a planning process for the whole coast. It became clear to me that we really needed to look at the area from Carnarvon right through to Exmouth, and have the two anchors - one at the bottom and one at the top - and to make sure that Carnarvon was very much connected. When I visited the area I stayed in Carnarvon and went up to look at the coast from there. The Government planning commenced while the process of evaluating the Mauds Landing proposal continued. As a result of this process, the Government developed five planning scenarios, one of which included the Mauds Landing proposal. I encourage members who are interested to read the Government's report entitled "Future Directions: Sustainable Tourism and Land Use Scenarios for the Carnarvon-Ningaloo Coast". I will also ask the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure to send a copy of the document to all the members of this House, if that has not

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

already been done. This document outlines the five scenarios developed for managing the tourist use of the area. Members can compare it with the all-eggs-in-one-basket approach being put forward by the Opposition. Mauds Landing would not have solved all the problems.

Hon Norman Moore tried to argue earlier that all of the Government's focus was on Coral Bay. That made me realise that he had not read this document, because if he had done so, he would see very clearly that all the scenarios attempt to accommodate the demand in the area through a range of different options. Scenario C probably provides for the greatest use of Coral Bay. As I understand, the current licensed occupancy limit for Coral Bay is in the order of 2 500 people. In reality, some 4 500 people visit it at peak times. When I was there during July of last year I witnessed that first hand. I was amazed to see people camping in the car park and alongside the airstrip. Scenario C suggests providing accommodation at Coral Bay for 4 500 people, the number that presently visits at peak times. If the existing licensed amount were added to what was proposed for Mauds Landing, it would total 4 500.

Hon John Fischer: How do you propose to limit the numbers to 4 500?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: We will put in place the statutory planning that should have occurred, and make sure we enforce it, which is what should have been done. We will make sure that alternative options are available for people.

Hon Norman Moore: Where will people stay?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: The Opposition's answer would be that Mauds Landing would accommodate about 2 500 people, and Coral Bay would remain as it currently exists, accommodating only 2 500. However the Opposition does not care if numbers go beyond that. It would have no control over numbers. How would Hon Norman Moore control it? The statutory planning processes must be put in place and enforced. That is what the Government will do. We will make sure that proper controls are in place. This has been left for too long.

Hon Norman Moore: Where will people stay?

Hon KEN TRAVERS: Hon Norman Moore, I want to finish my contribution because I believe Hon Murray Criddle wants to say a few words. I urge Hon Norman Moore to read the document and the minister's speech that was given yesterday in the other place - we are doing a bit of a repeat today - to understand what the Government is on about. We cannot look at this as an isolated area. Exmouth and Carnarvon have to be the two major hubs that provide for it. I accept that Hon Norman Moore's Government put some of the infrastructure in Exmouth in place; however, we are continuing to develop that infrastructure and the infrastructure in Carnarvon. Rather than create yet another community in that area, we are trying to ensure that the benefits of that region go to the two existing communities. The Government is about achieving a coordinated strategy, which should have been done earlier by the Liberal Government. We have now reached the stage at which we have developed different scenarios for the way it can be managed, and we have gone to the people to find out what scenario they want the Government to adopt. We will then put the proper statutory plans in place to make sure that they are enforced and we will use proper statutory planning instruments.

Hon John Fischer interjected.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: We are doing that in a range of ways. As the Leader of the House has already mentioned, we are spending money to ensure that there are sufficient Department of Conservation and Land Management people - rangers and the like. I accept that in the past that was not done.

Hon John Fischer interjected.

Hon KEN TRAVERS: It is better than half - that is what was there previously.

Hon Norman Moore says that our proposals do not allow for a marina. I challenge Hon Norman Moore, because the feedback column provides the option for people to indicate whether they want more boating access and, if so, how they want that provided. If Hon Norman Moore is genuine, I challenge him to launch a campaign to the effect that when people respond to question 10 - 15 000 people have already been to the web site - which asks whether there are sufficient boat access points along the coast - they should say no and that they want a marina at Mauds Landing. If he thinks it is such a good idea, when he gets back into Government I challenge Hon Norman Moore to reignite the development at Mauds Landing and to get the project approved within four years - judging by his Government's performance last time, it might not be able to do it - but if he does there is no sovereign risk and no chance of Labor getting back into Government and stopping it. If Hon Norman Moore is not a hypocrite, he will make that his election commitment. However, he is dancing all over the place, because he knows this Government has got it right. He wants to have two bob each way. If he were serious, he would make building the resort at Mauds Landing and getting all the environmental and planning approvals through in the four years

Hon Norman Moore; Hon Kim Chance; Deputy President; Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Ken Travers; Hon Murray Criddle

part of the Liberal Party's strategy for the next election. That is the challenge that goes out to Hon Norman Moore today.

In conclusion, Hon Norman Moore said that the advertisements were political but then went on to say that people were entitled to know. The 400 000 hits to the web site - with a further 15 000 going onto it - is more than the total number of people who were impacted by the statewide advertising campaign about the infill sewerage project under Hon Norman Moore's Government. We have consulted people and we are providing information. That is working, because people are asking about and looking for that information. I cannot remember an advertising campaign that the Liberal Government held in which it had 400 000 hits to a web site. Unfortunately, I do not have the time to discuss the other things I wanted to talk about. I would love to know Hon Norman Moore's view about the Ningaloo Reef Outback Coast Association's proposals for the area. However, that will have to wait for another day.

HON MURRAY CRIDDLE (Agricultural) [4.14 pm]: I have had the opportunity to look at the Cape Range National Park and the Ningaloo Reef because I was a member of the committee that reported on it in December 1995. I had the opportunity to travel up and down the reef and along the coast in a vessel. We stayed at the Ningaloo shearing quarters and got back on the beach at Tantabiddi ramp. I have some understanding of what has been put in place. Nothing I have heard today from the Government will fix the problems. This issue must be addressed quickly. People are overgrazing in that area, which is becoming serious. I was talking to a young fellow from that area just the other day and he said the average stay in the area up the coast is 42 days. Imagine the damage that those people are doing to that area while they stay with an organisation. North of Yardie Creek, there are a number of nodes for people to stay and they are being reasonably well handled. Milyering has a special toilet system that should be put in a number of nodes.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to sessional orders.

Sitting suspended from 4.15 to 4.30 pm