

**METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME (BEELIAR WETLANDS) BILL 2018**

*Consideration in Detail*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

**Clause 2: Commencement** —

Debate was interrupted after the clause had been partly considered.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** I ask the question again: what are the minister's concrete plans for developing infrastructure for a container terminal in the outer harbour? I understand that the minister has Westport; I have the Westport study in front of me. Besides developing a plan to have a plan, what are the minister's concrete plans for the timing and the money invested in the outer harbour to move containers away from the Port of Fremantle to an outer harbour?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Again, I refer to my comments in the second reading speech, in which I outlined our short and longer term commitments. We outlined a plan at the election that we are now delivering. That plan includes infrastructure, freight on rail, intermodal development and the Westport plan for the outer harbour.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** The opposition will move an amendment to this clause. Before I move that amendment, I will articulate our reason for it.

The minister has been on the record many times both during and after the election campaign speaking about the Roe 8 and 9 projects, which this piece of legislation effectively kills by removing the road reservation forever and turning it into parks and recreation. The government's argument on the Roe 8 and 9 projects was that it is not required because it will be building an outer harbour. Roe 8 and 9 will take people, traffic and freight into Fremantle port and will facilitate that freight movement; however, the government's position is that it will not be required when the government builds an outer harbour, which is why we are raising these issues with the minister now. The minister said that Roe 8 and 9 will not be needed when the government builds the outer harbour. However, until that outer harbour is built, the opposition's view is that the road reservation should remain. It takes a long time to build a harbour. In the interim, there needs to be a solution for freight going into the Fremantle terminal. To that end, I move —

Page 2, before line 5 — To insert —

- (1) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, this Act comes into operation only if and when the Government of the day commits funding to the construction of the Outer Harbour.

As I said, the opposition is moving this amendment because we have a very firm view that the road reservation should remain in place until the outer harbour has been commenced and constructed. All the research and consultation that I have done as shadow Minister for Transport has indicated that these projects take a long time to get started. With environmental approvals, federal approvals, and all the work that needs to be done to build a new harbour, we are looking at possibly a 15 to 20-year process in the lead-up to building something of that size. If we are looking at a 15 to 20-year delivery time frame for the outer harbour, in my view one needs to keep options on the table for the facilitation of freight into the existing harbour. We know it is anticipated that the freight movements through the existing Fremantle port will increase; indeed, we know that Fremantle port has capacity for 30 to 50 years into the future. We believe that this road reservation should not be deleted and should not be forever removed from becoming a possibility before the outer harbour is commenced, constructed or even funded by this government. There could be a change of government in 2020–21. If the road reservation for Roe 8 and 9 is removed via this act, the opportunity for a different policy will be off the table forever. The opposition believes that we should keep this road reservation in our back pocket in the event that it might be needed at a future date. When the outer harbour has commenced and the government has put funding towards the development of an outer harbour, at that point perhaps the road reservation will not be required. Perhaps there will be an alternative route into the port that will not require the construction of the Roe 8 and 9 project. We believe it is very short-sighted of this government to remove road reservation of this nature because future generations may need that reservation.

**Ms L. METTAM:** I would like to hear more from the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** Thank you. Once again, we have seen what happens when road reservation is removed prematurely. Most of the smart thinkers in the community—the business strategists, and even the smart-thinking people in government agencies, particularly Main Roads, as I understand it—like to hang on to road reservations. Indeed, the member for Balcatta will be aware of the reluctance and reticence of Main Roads to sacrifice any of the road reservation around the Stephenson Avenue link to the Mitchell Freeway. It has good reasons for that: it knows that road reservations are an insurance policy for future generations in this state in case roads need to be built in the future. We often do not know what the future will bring with population growth, economic expansion and all those things. We understand that Fremantle port has lots of capacity. Regardless of whether an outer harbour

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 27 June 2019]

p4862b-4871a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Libby Mettam; Dr David Honey; Mr Tony Krsticevic;  
Mrs Alyssa Hayden

---

is built, we think there may well be a need for the Roe 8 and 9 project for commuter traffic. We keep saying that electric vehicles and driverless vehicles will change the way people get around our city. However, we are a long way from those options, and, in the interim, people will rely on motor vehicles to get to and from work. People rely on motor vehicles to travel east–west for employment, and that is where Roe 8 and 9 is needed—to get people across the freeway to travel east–west; to get them to access the freeway in a safe way and to get to and from work in a safe way. Regardless of the freight and port solution, we still have a population of commuters in the south metropolitan region who may need the road construction that this road reservation will provide for. That is hundreds of thousands of people going to work every day, going about their daily business—their daily grind—who may need this project, regardless of the government’s position on the outer harbour and Fremantle port.

We believe this is a sensible amendment. It leaves the option open until the government has made its decision to build and fund an outer harbour and has been through all those processes. It keeps that road reservation in place in the event that a government of a different persuasion—a Liberal–National government—comes into power again in this state. We have made it clear to all people who live in south metro that we have heard their congestion concerns, and this government does not have a solution for those congestion concerns. We have listened to those commuters in south metro, and we understand their concerns about safety in their road network—not only the truck traffic, but also the sheer volume of motor vehicle traffic running through those roads as people travel east–west to get to their places of employment. We have listened to them and heard them, and they want us to keep that road reservation in place. The government does not have a solution for them, and it is saying that it is no longer needed because it is building an outer harbour; however, it has no solution for commuters. We think this is a very sensible amendment, because it keeps the road reservation in play in case it is required in the future. Who knows the future? There may be better options to deal with wetlands, there may be better options to deal with traffic around wetlands, and perhaps the government, even of a Labor persuasion, may look to use that Roe 8 and Roe 9 road reservation for another purpose, but if it is deleted it is gone forever, and all those options that it might provide for are forever no longer available. I stand in support of this amendment and every member of my team is very keen to stand up and speak to it.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I rise to support this amendment. It is a real worry for me that in this place we have a government that seems to be more concerned about gotcha moments and smart alec responses that may engage people for a few seconds, and are not concerned about the wellbeing of this state. Earlier today I had a genuine grievance on an energy matter in my area and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum came back with a diatribe on what the Barnett government did and the like. It was really disappointing that he did not answer the queries that were raised. We hear that the government is saying, “We’re not going to do this”. That is fair enough; it is the government’s choice to say that it will not progress with the extension of Roe 8 through the wetland because it does not believe that that is the correct thing to do. But it is not just saying, “We’re not going to do it”, it is also saying “No-one can ever do it”. As I pointed out in my contribution to the second reading debate, the government’s solution shows that, honestly, I do not think any members opposite could have had a serious look at what is going on. The bridge is built, and members will see where the traffic is going. It is going between Murdoch University and an enormous hospital precinct with thousands of people working in that area, and the government will put a major freight corridor into Fremantle harbour down that road. Someone will get killed at an intersection; it is inevitable. It will direct all that heavy traffic there, mixing with all the traffic going to hospitals. Honestly, The minister is sitting there with a frown on her face. I cannot believe that she has looked at it, because no-one in their right mind would put it there. That is the solution she has come up with. That is her right, she is the minister and the Labor Party had a great majority coming into the election, so that is its right to do it, but this bill is about no-one else being able to put in the well thought out proper solution, which is the extension of the Roe 8 Highway, as was planned by the previous government, connecting safely through to the port and taking traffic off the other roads.

We hear, “No, you don’t have to worry about doing that, because we have a plan for an outer harbour”. As the Leader of the Opposition has already pointed out, there is no plan for a harbour. There is a review looking at the concept, but there is no plan. I have some considerable knowledge about major capital projects and how long it takes to get them up. The outer harbour will take a minimum of 15 years, more likely 20 years, before it is a functioning port, if it is built at all. As was pointed out in the contributions from members on this side, there are some serious doubts about whether there would be environmental approval for a major port there. There are all sorts of issues around the loss of seagrass in that area, and I have recently had correspondence with my constituents and others on that matter. We have no certainty that that port will be built at all, and even if the government made a commitment to do that, the cost of it and the level of planning and approvals would be such that it is a very substantial time out. As I pointed out in my contribution to the second reading debate, if we look at something like three per cent compound growth over 10 years, we are talking about a 36 per cent expansion in container traffic through the port, and even if the government achieves world best practice in putting containers on rail, it will only get about another eight per cent of containers through the rail expansion if it goes to 30 per cent on rail. There will be 30 per cent more container freight going down the road, and knowing what we know about the restrictions there,

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Libby Mettam; Dr David Honey; Mr Tony Krsticevic;  
Mrs Alyssa Hayden

---

that will restrict trade into and out of this state. We are not just looking at some simple thing here about retaining a nice piece of bush. The bill as it stands will fundamentally put a constraint on the economic development of this state going forward. The government did not have to do this; the government has the opportunity, it has plenty of time, two more years in office, to go through —

**Ms L. METTAM:** Can I hear more from the member for Cottesloe?

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** Thank you. We are looking at a fundamental constraint on the trade of the state going into the future. No matter the best intentions, and I understand entirely that the government feels that it does not want to do this and that it thinks there is a bit of a solution with rail, as I have said, simple arithmetic tells us that that rail solution is not the answer. We see such as a massive increase on the roads that will take this heavy container traffic, already with serious accidents, rear-end collisions and the like, multiples of the rate of the rest of Perth, and multiples of the rate of heavy vehicle traffic in the rest of Perth. We have a government saying, “No, not only won’t we do this, but we’re going to stop anyone else having the possibility of doing it because we are going to make this a park.” We have not heard any good reasons whatsoever from the government about how it will make it better environmentally. As has already been pointed out, numerous roads bisect the whole Beeliar parkland. If this goes ahead, in the next 10 years also, we will see, on top of all the issues we have with heavy freight, a 30 per cent increase in heavy freight and if that cannot be achieved, we will see a constraint on the ability of our economy to expand.

The Minister for Mines and Petroleum is in the chamber. He knows that a lithium refinery is starting up on the Kwinana strip, and we have also heard talk of other refineries and talk that perhaps there will be cobalt sulphate production on top of the nickel sulphate production at BHP’s Kwinana refinery. All that product will have to come out through Fremantle harbour on container freight as well.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** You used to be president of the Kwinana Industries Council?

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** Yes.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** The Kwinana Industries Council, of course, while you were president, supported the construction of the outer harbour.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** Yes, absolutely.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** So why are you now changing your position?

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I will answer the minister’s query, thank you. I will send the minister a copy of my contribution to the second reading. As I said, I think that it makes sense in the longer term because it will enable a range of economic development.

**Mr W.J. Johnston** interjected.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** Minister, let me finish. I have always said that I do not believe that those two things are mutually exclusive. As I have pointed out, the taxpayers of Western Australia, the broader Western Australian community, has a multibillion-dollar investment in the existing harbour. Any responsible government would be looking to maximise the utilisation of that port, and then as the economy grows further and we develop port-related businesses and develop that outer harbour as well, they will not be mutually exclusive. Money that is invested in proper transport into the existing harbour will always deliver a return to the people of this state. As I said, I do know quite a bit about large capital projects, and the outer harbour is a substantial time away. I saw the minister shaking her head. I will be intrigued to hear about her experience with major capital projects. The truth is that the environmental approvals will take a substantial time before we see that harbour going ahead.

This is what worries me about the gotcha moment. I see that the minister did a dorothy dixer yesterday so that she could get her five-second grab for Facebook or whatever. We will have a fundamental constraint on the economic development of the state of Western Australia by constraining container traffic through our port, so that the minister can have a five-second gotcha grab on her Facebook, Twitter or whatever mechanism is used to get it out there in the hope to re-engage a few of the greenie groups that were originally involved in the protest against Roe 8. I find it dumbfounding. To be honest, it is childish that the minister is going to do something as profound as constrain the development of the state, simply so that she can have a little bit of fun engaging green groups or getting a five-second or 10-second grab on Facebook or Twitter.

**Mrs L.M. HARVEY:** I would like to continue hearing from the member.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, Leader of the Opposition. Member for Cottesloe, do you have some more to say?

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I could go on, but I do not think it would be fair to other members.

Several members interjected.

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Libby Mettam; Dr David Honey; Mr Tony Krsticevic;  
Mrs Alyssa Hayden

---

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I will finish up soon. The only argument that we have been given is not that there is a fundamental safety issue or economic problem with the extension of Roe 8 and the building of Roe 9, as was planned by the previous government and the previous Minister for Transport. We have been told that this is an environmental debate and that somehow or other the environment will be improved by progressing with the government's plan. Members would have seen the protests during and before the last election campaign when crowds rolled up in buses to protest, tying themselves to trees and so on.

**Mr A. Krsticevic** interjected.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** We may suspect that they were not locals, because we know that the local members realise that this project is critically important. Most of that bush is gone. It has had to be cleared because, even with the government's own solution, that bush has been cleared down to the crossing over Farrington Road and down through Murdoch Drive. We have already heard excellent presentations from this side of the house that the solution the previous government came up with would have seen a significant improvement in the environmental value of that area.

The minister may find this very funny and humorous, but her side of Parliament is the government. It is not in opposition anymore. It seems obsessed with gotchas and smart replies, referring to the previous government and the like, but it is the government. It has a responsibility to the future of the state. Its best plan presented in Parliament will see a maximum eight per cent or nine per cent increase in freight on rail.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** Condescending and disrespectful!

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I will tell the minister what is disrespectful. It is disrespectful to the people of Western Australia to constrain the economy of the state just so that the minister can have a little gotcha moment in the media.

**Ms R. Saffioti:** You are condescending and disrespectful!

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I will tell the minister what is disrespectful. It is her constant interruptions of my speech. That is disrespectful.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister and members, I think it is a better plan that we let the member for Cottesloe finish his two minutes and then respond.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I will tell the minister what is disrespectful. It is constantly interrupting my speech. It is disrespectful to the people of Western Australia, just for a bit of politics, to get the green lobby engaged again and get little grabs on Facebook or whatever while fundamentally constraining this state. I repeat: the best plan the government has, which is the rail increase, will increase rail freight by a maximum of —

**Ms R. Saffioti** interjected.

**Mr S.J. Price:** He sat down!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, you should stay on your feet unless I call you.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** As I said, the government's best plan will give it an eight or nine per cent increase in freight by train —

Several members interjected.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** Deputy Speaker, I am looking for your protection.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members and minister, we need to keep the chamber in a bit more order and keep to the topic of the amendment.

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** I am, absolutely.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I know you have. I am encouraging you.

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members!

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** The best plan the government has will give an eight or nine per cent increase in container freight through this port and we are going to need an increase of 30 per cent or more, based on some estimates, over the next 10 years. That cannot happen with the plan the government has. That is why this amendment has been put. The government does not want to go ahead with the original plan and it is not. That is its business.

**Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Wanneroo!

**Dr D.J. HONEY:** This bill is aimed at stopping forever the sensible solution that was arrived at by the previous government. That is the only proper solution that gives a proper container connection all the way through to the

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Libby Mettam; Dr David Honey; Mr Tony Krsticevic;  
Mrs Alyssa Hayden

---

north west, the goldfields, Welshpool and the industrial areas where those containers are taken. I strongly urge members to support this amendment.

**Ms L. METTAM:** I would like to contribute to the debate on this amendment, which reads —

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, this Act comes into operation only if and when the Government of the day commits funding to the construction of the Outer Harbour.

It is one thing, after a change in government, to support an election commitment, but it is quite another to move an act of Parliament to ensure that a project such as Roe 8 does not proceed in the future. In fact, it is an extraordinary move for a government to skip a process —

**Mr M. Hughes** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Kalamunda, I call you for the first time. That is not helpful.

**Ms L. METTAM:** It is an extraordinary step to not follow proper process through the Western Australian Planning Commission to change what has long been a road reserve —

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Kalamunda, I call you for the second time. Member for Wanneroo, I remind you that you are on two calls already.

**Ms L. METTAM:** As many members in this place have already acknowledged, the Roe 8 project was not a surprise to anyone. It has been part of the metropolitan region scheme for at least 50 years. It is the logical extension of Roe 7. It will be part of the transport corridor that links Muchea to Fremantle port. It is a logical extension. It is for more than just freight. Front and centre, it is about the community of the south west metropolitan region, which is set to expand significantly in the future. The community has been challenged by the significant congestion of Leach Highway in particular. Over 5 000 students go to schools along that stretch of road every day, such as Melville Senior High School and other high schools and primary schools. It is certainly of interest to see not only industry supported, but also, importantly, those communities that are challenged by congestion. In 2016, when the proposal to extend Roe 8 and Roe 9, the Perth Freight Link, was presented to Infrastructure Australia, it acknowledged that it was the most important project of its kind yet to commence and it was recognised nationally as an important infrastructure project. For that reason it is important that such a project progresses.

**Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Wanneroo, I have warned you. You are now on two.

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** It's three.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sorry, I got it wrong a minute ago; she is on two now.

**Ms L. METTAM:** As I stated, this project is the logical next step after the Roe 7 extension, or the extension that connects Muchea to Fremantle port. It is about supporting local motorists and communities. It is about road safety; we know that 72 per cent of crashes on Leach Highway are rear-end collisions.

*Point of Order*

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** It is lovely to hear the debate the member for Vasse is putting forward but it is completely irrelevant to the proposed amendment to insert some words in front of the commencement date of the act in the bill.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Forrestfield. Member, you are quite broad in your discussion at the moment; could you narrow it to focus a bit more on the amendment.

**Ms S. Winton** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Wanneroo, I do not need your interjections when I am giving advice. If you want to stay in this chamber, that is enough! Go ahead, member for Vasse.

*Debate Resumed*

**Ms L. METTAM:** I am being quite clear in supporting this amendment. This amendment will ensure that this legislation will not proceed until the government meets its election commitment to develop Cockburn Sound and the outer harbour. It is only fair to the people of Western Australia that we see transparency in that respect as well.

**Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP:** I would like to hear more from the member for Vasse.

**Ms L. METTAM:** What this —

*Point of Order*

**Mr S.J. PRICE:** The member for Vasse was misleading the house when she said that we made an election commitment to build the outer harbour. We never did that. We made a commitment plan for the outer harbour.

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Libby Mettam; Dr David Honey; Mr Tony Krsticevic;  
Mrs Alyssa Hayden

---

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members! That is not a point of order, but it is a good reminder.

*Debate Resumed*

**Ms L. METTAM:** It is important to ask the question: what is the urgency of moving this bill in the first place? That is the case particularly when we have a road reserve that has been set in stone and established for the last 50 years. It is logical that this legislation proceeds only if there is the development in Cockburn Sound. It is sensible that this legislation proceeds only if the government is serious about committing to what has been promised. We heard the Treasurer say in this place that he would resign if there were not a firm commitment on the table for Cockburn Sound. We are aware of a desktop report undertaken by the Environmental Protection Authority that outlines some serious environmental concerns with the development of Cockburn Sound. There is an understanding that Fremantle port is projected to be able to cater for freight for the next 20 years.

*Point of Order*

**Mr M. HUGHES:** I refer to standing order 97, which states —

A member who persists in irrelevance or tedious repetition, either of the member's own arguments or of the arguments used by other members, may be directed by the Speaker to discontinue the speech.

For my sanity, I hope that Madam Deputy Speaker would agree with the point of order and direct the member.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Kalamunda. I think I have already had that conversation on your point of order. I have no problem with the argument that is being given; it is about the outer harbour. It can continue.

*Debate Resumed*

**Ms L. METTAM:** I think it is in the interests of not only the members of this Parliament but also the people of Western Australia that we see a commitment to remove the road reserve only when we see a firm commitment on what the government is setting out to achieve with its bolder, greater plans for the outer harbour. There is, obviously, some legitimate concern about how urgent that infrastructure is, given the projections for freight use at Fremantle port and the outstanding, but not insurmountable, issues pointed out in the EPA report.

These issues are so important to the people of Western Australia because there is a significant road safety issue in the south west metropolitan area. That issue has been well-versed and well covered by the independent report undertaken by Greg Martin for the South West Group of Councils. The report illustrates that if the Roe 8 and Roe 9 projects do not proceed, there will be ongoing and growing issues along that east-west corridor. Along Leach Highway, a stretch of road that caters for over 5 000 students every day, the crash rate of incidents involving heavy-haulage vehicles is two to six times the average. The communities of the south west metropolitan area deserve better; they deserve a road safety answer to these important concerns, as do the small businesses that would be interrupted and challenged by any alternative to this important strategic freight corridor. That is why members in this place and over 70 per cent of people polled on the Perth Freight Link and the Roe 8 and Roe 9 projects overwhelmingly support its progress. For the government to ensure by an act of Parliament that this important project does not proceed is economic vandalism and the government turning its back on the road safety needs of the south west metropolitan community, including the small businesses and freight interests in that area.

**Mrs A.K. HAYDEN:** I would like to hear some more from the member for Vasse.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Vasse, when you are on your feet, I remind you to try not to repeat too much. If you can come up with arguments to support this amendment, that is good. Try not to repeat too much. It is my job as Deputy Speaker to try to keep you on that track.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Madam Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Carine, you are on your feet. You have the call—a fresh new argument.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I would like to build on the great contributions from the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Vasse. They put some very compelling arguments on the record for why this bill does not need to go through Parliament when there are more important things we could be doing, and why the amendment needs to be put into this part of the bill.

To answer the member for Vasse's question about the urgency of this bill, the Minister for Transport's urgency to pass this bill is because she does not believe they will be in government after the next election. The government needs to get the legislation through by March 2021. If the government does not get the legislation through now, it will not get an opportunity to do it, and that is why it is urgent. That is the only reason I can see why the government is panicking to get this legislation through on the last day before the winter recess—in the dying stages of the government process.

Interestingly, the Leader of the Opposition's amendment is for the government to commit to funding the construction of the outer harbour. I think that the Leader of the Opposition's amendment is very generous because I would have made the amendment say "start construction". We know the smoke and mirrors of this government's budgetary process; it leaves out many things from the budget and the figures are very rubbery at best. It usually waits around until the federal government or someone else saves it and puts the money on the table and then it backs out of its own funding. Obviously, it will not be part of the budgetary process any time soon because we know that the outer harbour is not needed at this time. Fremantle port has many, many years of productivity and growth within its own facilities. The Roe 8 and Roe 9 road would obviously go a long way to making sure that that is a very safe and efficient process. The minister does not seem to realise that the opposition is here to help. We are here to help her make good decisions and get good legislation through Parliament. We have seen plenty of examples of bad legislation leaving this house, going to the upper house, being referred to a committee to be fixed, and then coming back here. I am not sure why the minister is so keen for that to happen with this bill as well. We have already picked it to bits in the debate on clause 1, the short title of the bill, because it has nothing to do with the Beeliar wetlands. It has to do with the Roe 8 road reserve deletion. We know what the bill is about but the minister does not want to listen.

We are trying to make this amendment because the whole issue is about the outer harbour. The government has another solution that it thinks is the right solution. Therefore, it wants to get this bill through because it says it no longer needs the Roe 8 road reserve because it has another solution on the table. That other solution may be 50 or 100 years away, or it may never come. At the moment, all we know is that the minister has a plan for a plan. The workers and the unions at Fremantle port are totally opposed to this. They have put on record that the government has no idea what it is talking about. Members need to come down to the port, see how it operates and talk to the people who know how it all works and take some advice from them. The minister and the government do not want to talk to the unions. It just wants to bag them and call them out as people who do not know what they are talking about when they have something useful to contribute to this debate. They have put on the record that Roe 8 and Roe 9 is a good thing and we do not need the outer harbour.

**Mrs A.K. HAYDEN:** Deputy Speaker, I would like to hear more from the member for Carine.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** I thank the member for Darling Range. We have obviously seen it. The member for Darling Range is a perfect example of why this government is panicking. The election result in Darling Range is what the future holds for this government. That is why the urgency of this bill is reinforced and many signals are coming from that direction. Only last night I was driving down Leach Highway. It was amazing; I heard people talking about the signs along the way saying "Build Roe 8" and I saw them myself. I was amazed. They are there and I have seen them firsthand. As I was driving towards Fremantle, I could see all the young girls playing netball. There were hundreds and hundreds of girls playing netball.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** Thousands.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Last night it was only hundreds. I can also tell members that the rain was coming down. I can only imagine the trucks driving down Leach Highway to Fremantle all going to the outer harbour when it is built one day. The roads are tricky to navigate. If we are driving in the left-hand lane, before we know it we can only turn left; we cannot keep going straight.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, I encourage you to stick to the amendment.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** It is about committing funds to the outer harbour. Leach Highway and the Roe 8 and Roe 9 road reserve are an integral part of the amendment. The minister in her second reading speech talked about the government's election commitment. We know that election commitments are like confetti for this government; it just throws it around and if it lands, it lands, and if it does not, it does not matter. The government says that it is doing this because it is an election commitment. Its election commitment was not to build the Perth Freight Link project. It does not have to build it. No-one is forcing it to build it. The money is there. The federal government has \$1.2 billion to build the Perth Freight Link. However, there is no money for the outer harbour—none at all. Where will this government find \$5 billion or \$10 billion or whatever it might cost?

Environmental groups—my God! If they bust in to try to save some denigrated bushland and a lot of sand—not the Beeliar wetlands, but just some land that could be productively used—imagine the hordes that will come out to try to save Cockburn Sound and how they will fight against the outer harbour. The government probably told them that it would not build the outer harbour so it is all good: "Just protest on this one. We'll never get to the other one." Therefore, I think this amendment is a good amendment from that perspective, but, like I said, it would be useful if it were a bit tighter about starting construction, rather than committing funds. We know from the way the government does its books that it can very easily commit funds, but that does not mean anything. In the forward estimates the figures are dodgy at best on most occasions, and the financial records cannot be trusted.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 27 June 2019]

p4862b-4871a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Libby Mettam; Dr David Honey; Mr Tony Krsticevic;  
Mrs Alyssa Hayden

---

Let us talk about the number of jobs that this is hurting. Jobs could be created by building the outer harbour, but that will not happen. No jobs will be created there. A massive number of jobs could be created by building Roe 8 and Roe 9, but again that will not happen so jobs will not be created there either. We talked about the jobs plan that the Labor Party had going into the election, and I am sure that the outer harbour was one of the areas that it had in mind for getting more jobs, but that is obviously not happening.

[Quorum formed.]

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** As I was saying, the government is relying on this thing called an election commitment. We know that those election commitments have already proven to be worthless, not to mention the number of backflips that this government continues to do. In this case, it does not even need to do a backflip. It needs to stick to its election commitment of not building the Perth Freight Link project. It does not have to build it, but why does it have to stop future generations from doing what needs to be done? Why does it have to discriminate against the people of the southern suburbs?

**Mr D.C. NALDER:** I would like to hear some more from the member for Carine.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Absolutely. I encourage members, before you start, member for Carine, that we should be trying to introduce arguments that are not exactly the same as the other ones. I cannot direct what you say but I encourage you.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Of course, Madam Deputy Speaker. If government members really supported this legislation, they would speak on it. Every single opposition member made a contribution to the second reading debate and put an argument forward for why the outer harbour was not the right solution and for the need to build Roe 8 I think the arguments were overwhelming. But who on the government benches stood up? No-one, other than the members for Bicton and Southern River and, obviously, the minister. If they are the voice of the people of Western Australia representing a huge amount of —

**Ms R. Saffioti:** He is not talking to the amendment. This is ridiculous.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Carine, you need to bring it back to the government committing funding.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Yes, to the outer harbour; that is right. Why is the government not saying that this needs to happen, and the outer harbour will be built? The Treasurer has indicated that if the outer harbour is not committed to—I assume that means funding in the budget—he will resign. Does that mean the Minister for Transport wants the Treasurer to resign? The minister does not want to commit funds in the budget. She does not want to say, “Let’s put the outer harbour in next year’s budget. Let’s cost that out. Let’s get the project started, because I want the Treasurer to keep his job. I want him to keep his word and not have to resign because the outer harbour has not been committed to by the government.” That is a very serious issue.

One of the big concerns if we do not build Roe 8 and Roe 9, and if we do not go for the outer harbour option, is the environmental impacts. The second reading speech is very strong about the significance of the Beelihar wetlands. We are not talking about the significance of the road reserve. We are talking about the wetlands. No-one will dispute that the wetlands are significant and the road reserve is not so significant. The Minister for Transport is very happy to allow bulldozers to go around the state, clearing land and knocking down trees, whether that be for property development or roads. The minister has no problem with that. In a lot of cases, quality bushland is being knocked over. The minister can contribute and add to the quality of the wetlands by building a bridge or trying other techniques. There are many different ways of doing that.

The minister needs to take on board this very generous amendment that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I would have gone much harder. I would have said “starts construction” rather than “commits funding”. The opposition is happy to support this amendment, even though it could be much stronger. The minister should accept this amendment in the bipartisan approach in which it has been put, as opposed to this bill having to go to the upper house, and the upper house having to read the debates in this place. I can tell the minister that logical statements and facts have been put on the record by the opposition. Members on the government bench are silent on this matter. The reason we are speaking so passionately about this matter is that we are representing the people of Western Australia in our electorates, and in the electorates of members opposite, who are telling us, “Roe 8 has to happen. This is a bad decision. You’ve got to do something to convince the minister not to do this.” Of course we know that the government, by going through this process in Parliament, rather than through the MRS process, does not need to consult people. It does not need to talk to people to find out what they think. The government can talk to the people who are based in at election time. The government can talk about mandates. All governments talk about mandates. This government has a mandate for a lot of things, but it has withdrawn from all those things. Some of those things were very important. The people of Western Australia will remember that.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Thursday, 27 June 2019]

p4862b-4871a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Libby Mettam; Dr David Honey; Mr Tony Krsticevic;  
Mrs Alyssa Hayden

---

This debate is very important. The government is continuing to let down the people of the southern suburbs, not only by not building Roe 8 and Roe 9, but also because of the outer harbour option. No doubt some people will say, “We have environmental concerns about Cockburn Sound. The outer harbour may not necessarily be the best solution.” If the government goes ahead with Roe 8 and Roe 9, fantastic! It will not have to worry about the outer harbour. It can leave the ocean alone. We will be able to work with Fremantle port for the next 50 years. Technological changes and other solutions will come into play, and the world may change in many ways, and the outer harbour may not be necessary. Why would the minister commit herself to locking this road reserve away and not giving the people of the southern suburbs the opportunity to have a good transport link and not giving businesses and truck drivers and operators the capacity to grow their business?

Member for Darling Range, can you give me a couple of extra minutes?

**Mrs A.K. Hayden:** No.

Several members interjected.

**Mr A. KRSTICEVIC:** Okay!

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, the question is that the words to be inserted be inserted. Before you start, member for Darling Range, I just reiterate that I think we are fully cognisant of the scope of your argument so far, from the range of views that have been put, around a fairly narrow argument, so can you please try to keep it a bit less repetitive, and more relevant.

**Mrs A.K. HAYDEN:** Absolutely, Madam Deputy Speaker. As I have said in this place before, I respect the standing orders, I respect the procedures, and I respect the fact that we are here to represent the people of Western Australia, but also do that in a proper process. That is why we support the amendment that has been put by the Leader of the Opposition, which states —

... this act comes into operation only if and when the government of the day commits funding to the construction of the outer harbour.

The reason this is relevant is that the minister believes she has a mandate to delete Roe 8 and Roe 9. Although we disagree with that, I do not want to rehash the arguments that we have put. Let us give the minister the credit that there is a mandate to delete Roe 8 and Roe 9. However, there is no mandate to delete the road reserve. The road reserve has been in planning for 60 years. The minister is ignoring expert advice and expert planners on how to design our road network to meet the population growth and future needs of Western Australia. The minister is completely ignoring 60 years of work. She is throwing that out the window by seeking to delete this road reserve. The deletion of a road reserve is a big decision. It will have a long-term negative effect on the future of Western Australia. We know there will be future growth in this area. We need to be able to plan and provide for that growth. I have spoken briefly about the road reserve that was deleted by former Labor Minister for Transport Hon Alannah MacTiernan. That was the Lloyd Street–Abernethy Road connection in Midland. If we delete a road reserve and sell it for a certain amount of money, and need to buy it back at a later stage, the price may have doubled, if not tripled. We need to acknowledge the foresight of the planners before us. If that Lloyd Street–Abernethy Road connection is required one day, the government will need to buy that back at an inflated price. That will delay the connection required to service the growing population of that area. The Beeliar road reserve will become a park, except for a small urban strip, which we will get to later, so no money will be received. If the government deletes this road reserve, it will be robbing the people who live, work and travel in this area of the ability to be delivered the connecting roads that are necessary

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, can I just encourage you, while we are sitting here listening, that this is about the funding commitment for the construction of the outer harbour. I am just trying to work it out. I thought the road reserve argument was done the other night.

**Mrs A.K. HAYDEN:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will listen to your words, and I will link it back. It is about committing the funds to construct the outer harbour. I say to the government: do not delete the road reserve. Change the date in the legislation to reflect the outer harbour, if and when it is built. As the member for Cottesloe has said, even if construction of the outer harbour were to start today, it would take two decades to be delivered. A lot can happen in two decades. Why have this legislation start now, and not when the outer harbour has been committed to? Not one cent has been committed to the outer harbour. Not one business case has been developed or planned. That will take decades of work. If members opposite do not believe me, Professor Fred Affleck has said that himself. He has also said that Roe 8 will be needed —

**Mr K.M. O'DONNELL:** Madam Deputy Speaker —

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, member for Kalgoorlie. What might you be on your feet about?

---

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Libby Mettam; Dr David Honey; Mr Tony Krsticevic;  
Mrs Alyssa Hayden

---

**Mr K.M. O'DONNELL:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to hear some more from the member for Darling Range.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I thought you might. Go ahead, member for Darling Range.

**Mrs A.K. HAYDEN:** I thank the member for Kalgoorlie; I really appreciate that.

Professor Fred Affleck said that the outer harbour would take at least two decades, so there is no urgency for this legislation to commence until that outer harbour is built. There is no urgency for it whatsoever. I hope the minister is listening. The amendment is 100 per cent accurate and will still deliver what the minister believes she has a mandate to deliver, but the legislation will start once it is needed with the outer harbour. I note that the minister is playing on her phone, as she has done through the whole debate on this legislation, which shows the disregard and disdain for Parliament and legislation.

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members!

*Point of Order*

**Dr A.D. BUTI:** This again goes to the point of relevance that has been brought up by many members. What the member for Darling Range is talking about now has nothing to do with the amendment—nothing at all.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Quite correct. Sorry, member can you keep it on focus.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs A.K. HAYDEN:** By bringing this legislation —

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am sad to say that I have to interrupt this debate under standing order 61.

Debate adjourned, pursuant to standing orders.