

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME (BEELIAR WETLANDS) BILL 2018

Third Reading

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning) [3.40 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton) [3.40 pm]: We went through this bill at great length in both the debate on the second reading speech and at the consideration in detail stage. I have to describe this bill as the worst bill brought to this house by the McGowan government, and it has had some shockers. The Human Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 was supposed to prevent discrimination, but we found out after a long-drawn-out period that it would cause discrimination. We teased out the various aspects of it, particularly in the upper house, and the Premier called that undemocratic and designed to stop voices. Anyway, that is a different one. The Western Australian Jobs Bill 2017 defined jobs in New Zealand as Western Australian. I have not seen the tectonic plates move very much but I think New Zealand is a different country from Australia and a different place from Western Australia. Probably the worst, from my perspective, because of its harm on the economy was the Duties Amendment (Additional Duty for Foreign Persons) Bill 2018 that, basically, has put a stop to foreign investment in high-rise and infill developments in the state and has not raised any money. Those are three examples of idiotic bills, but this one is the worst.

Let us go through some of the things that we teased out. The McGowan Labor government made an election commitment to do two things to Roe 8—not build it and rip up the contracts, which had been let, and redistribute those to some of the people involved in the contracts for other purposes. It has done that. It did not say that it would excise the land for the Beelihar wetlands from the road reserve, which is the intent of this bill. That was not an election commitment. More importantly, the government has gone out and abrogated the established planning processes. Let us recognise what that is. For decades and decades, this state has developed a planning process whereby road reserves and other things are based on a decision-making process that includes addressing people impacted over a process. Usually, amendments to the metropolitan region scheme go through an established process and take 24 months, and for good reason. We are changing use, rights of land, that fundamentally change how we live, how we build, how we develop and how we work. Also, people make investments on the basis of those long-term plans and changing them, as we are doing here, is an act that enhances sovereign risk. Ripping up contracts also creates sovereign risk. The government has decided that for part of the Beelihar wetlands, the right way for Roe 8 is to use a bill to expedite the excision. The reason given is that it is in a hurry. The remainder of the Roe 8 road reserve will go through the standard metropolitan region scheme. It has not come up with an adequate explanation for why we would treat one part of the road reserve one way and another part another way.

We have such an extensive process for considering planning changes because it is important to consult with the community and businesses that would be impacted. We look at the environmental impact of a change in land use. The Cities of Cockburn, Melville and, I believe, Kwinana, and, indeed, the South West Group consortium of councils, have undertaken work, which they have, hopefully, provided to the minister, and have said that if we do not build Roe 8, we will have to do these types of investments in adjacent roads. If we excise this road reserve, it will have impacts elsewhere. To our knowledge, that work has not been done except by the councils. When we ask about it, we learn that the government has not taken those issues on board or had any program. Once it excises the road reserve, what next? It is not so much about roads to the port, but the adjacent roads and right of way that affect the local community. When the government makes this decision, it has ramifications, as all planning decisions do. The local cities have said that if we do excise this road reserve, it will have an impact on them and they would have to invest in the vicinity of \$600 million of additional money on roads impacted that would have to take the traffic and the activity that would otherwise be on Roe 8.

The government has not addressed this issue. By rushing this bill through Parliament and not using the standard methodology for an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme, the government is telling the Cities of Kwinana, Melville and Cockburn that it does not care about the impact of its decisions on the communities that the councils and, hopefully, the government represents, and the impacts on the adjacent areas and other roads.

Another issue with the long debate on Roe 8 was that the Beelihar wetlands has some very sensitive areas, but a lot of it has been seriously degraded. Hope Road and a high-voltage line go through the area. The vegetation is regularly trimmed and pesticide is used to stop it from growing in the high-voltage line area. We also know from the assessment that the existing structure of Hope Road and the use of Horse Paddock Swamp, and others, have led to significant degradation of the watertable and threaten flora and fauna of the area. It is not a stable and pristine area. There are threats to the area. One of the reasons that the Environmental Protection Authority approved Roe 8 was that the program for building Roe 8 would address a number of these existing deficiencies.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

By excising the land from the road reserve, it should be incumbent upon the government—if we had followed the standard metropolitan region scheme amendment processes, it would have been considered—to consider issues such as the poor drainage of one area north of the right of way to the south of it. There are problems there. It should explore areas of asbestos pollution in areas that have been used as asbestos dumps. It should address the issue of oblong turtle transfers. When I raised the issue of turtles being smashed and killed on Hope Road, I was ridiculed by the minister. But this issue was raised just last week by the City of Cockburn when it found—this is a very important aspect of it—that it is a rare and endangered turtle species. For a variety of reasons, the female goes to dry land to lay the eggs, moves out of the swamp and crosses Hope Road to drier areas to lay the eggs, and they are being killed in substantial numbers along Hope Road. I might add that one of the ironies of this process is that this is an attempt to excise a road reserve, but it keeps an existing road reserve, Hope Road, through the area. According to the modelling that I have seen, the traffic on Hope Road will increase and, therefore, the threat to the oblong turtles will increase. If we went to the standard process of amending the metropolitan region scheme, these issues would be teased out and the government would be quite rightly asked what it will do to protect the turtles. The proponents for Roe 8 were asked that, and they addressed it.

The Environmental Protection Authority raised this as a major issue and required the previous government in this proposal for Roe 8 to address it. By skipping and avoiding the standard amendment process, this government fails to address this. It has a way of not addressing it. The irony of all this is that this is supposedly about protecting the wetlands. Turtles are a part of the wetlands, but this process is preserving into the future threats to the wetlands. Why would we do that? My assessment will take place. There is a range of problems—existing roads; existing high tension wire right-of-ways that are regulation trimmed; clear areas that have been used and abused as dumps; threats to the flora and fauna; and threats to the water movement under the Beelihar wetlands. As I said, it is not a pristine area. In this process, the government should have explained to us, and to the people of Western Australia, particularly those who enjoy the area, how it is going to fix up those. How is it going to address the real threats to the Beelihar wetlands that exist now in its current use that it is preserving? The Minister for Planning by choosing this process in this bill avoids addressing the real issues. It raises the question: what is the purpose of this? Apparently, because of her actions, it is not about the environmental value of the wetlands. Otherwise, she would have done that; why would she not?

The opposition moved two amendments. We raised the issue: is this about saving the Beelihar wetlands, as referred to in the title of the bill? Clearly, as I explained earlier, it is not. If the government was really concerned about the Beelihar wetlands, it would address it in the bill, firstly, by going through the metropolitan region scheme to identify and quantify them. It would have had reports from the EPA, and would have addressed the true issues raised by the South West Group of cities. However, it has not done what it should have done.

The government has two processes underway for the long-term transport planning in that area. The first is the Westport Taskforce, which has issued a report—and will issue a final report—since we last debated this bill in consideration in detail. The Westport strategy was a commitment of the government at the last election, and it promised to address the long-term planning needs for the harbour and its transport links. The Westport strategy has repeatedly stated that the limitations to the existing port, the port of Fremantle, are not the port itself. It can grow to over \$3 million to use. That is counter to what the government said during the election. Nevertheless, it said a lot of things before the election that turned out to be just fictional. When the government brought this bill to the house, it was told by the Westport strategy—its pet strategy—that the key weak link in access to the port of Fremantle was transport links, both rail and road. The question the opposition had was: why would the government bring a bill to this house to excise the land before the finalisation of that report? The report that it is spending \$20 million on—it is paying its advisory staff a large amount of wages—has a mandate to look at the links and the government is pre-empting it by excising the land in this bill. The McGowan government has pulled \$20 million out of schools in my electorate—\$11 million from a rebuild of Willetton Senior High School and \$2 million a year from reductions to students' funding. However, it is spending \$20 million on the Westport strategy, and it is just nobbling it. It is useless. We find in the most recent report last week that the Westport strategy was always told that it could look at the long-term plan, but that the long-term plan could not include Roe 8 and Roe 9, so the government nobbled it.

The report last week came out with a statement that if the government had included Roe 8 in its assessment, it would not have been part of it. I have never read a report that says it was instructed not to include a road, but that if it had included a road, it would not have done it. Twenty million dollars for that piece of rubbish? The government must be joking.

Dr D.J. Honey: Propaganda.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Propaganda. This issue goes to the heart and soul of the Labor Party, as we saw on the weekend. Large sections that know a lot about the port and transport links, such as working-class unions—the Transport Workers' Union of Australia, the Maritime Union of Australia, the Construction, Forestry, Maritime,

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Mining and Energy Union—are all for Roe 8. It is the people who know nothing about it who are against it, but that is the Labor Party's problem. I do not really give a stuff about it, but nonetheless —

Dr D.J. Honey: Care.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Care—I do not care. That is a weak link to the soul of the Labor Party. However, what I can say is that Westport has said that its priority is an outer harbour, and that the outer harbour ranks highest, relative to the expanding port of Fremantle, than the other options, including on environmental grounds. We read in the fine print—actually, it is not fine print; it is quite blatant—that no environmental assessment is included of the outer harbour, ideological or otherwise. Westport says that a giant outer harbour, including millions of tonnes of dredging, will have less of an environmental impact than building Roe 8. You must be joking!

The point of this bill was to pre-empt the Westport strategy. The government just took \$20 million and threw it away. It also went to the last election—the opposition addressed this in an amendment to the bill—proposing that the major task of Infrastructure Western Australia was to take “politics out of infrastructure planning and develop a long-term coordinated plan”. I might add that two of the leading lights in the Westport strategy are the chairman and deputy chairman of Infrastructure WA, so they should know something about these issues. Why would we excise a road reserve that has been there for over 50 years when we do not know what our future option uses are before the strategy is even underway? We would not be doing it if we were really interested in long-term planning for the state. We definitely would not be doing it if we were interested in taking politics out of infrastructure planning. The government is injecting directly into it in the worst, most obtuse way I can remember. Indeed, this government has gone to great lengths to politicise virtually every aspect of infrastructure policy, starting with Roe 8. It is ripping up the contract and issuing new ones, and every other aspect of it. In other words, like the Westport strategy, this bill and the government's action have rendered Infrastructure Western Australia useless.

I assure the government that because of its actions, a future Liberal government will potentially ignore even the good work that Infrastructure WA might do, because the government has clearly instructed the Westport Taskforce and Infrastructure Western Australia not to look at all the issues—Roe 8, Roe 9 or certain things. In other words, right from the beginning, the government politicised Infrastructure WA and did something to nobble it. The whole purpose of Infrastructure Western Australia was to have long-term planning and to depoliticise it, and the government has done exactly the opposite. The government has stopped it from looking at the long term. The government has stopped it from looking at all the options. The government has injected its political views right into Infrastructure Western Australia's terms of reference. Why did it do it? The government should cancel Infrastructure Western Australia and tell its consultants to go home and get off the gravy train; the government has ruined them. That is what the government has done. It is a shame. I actually support the concept of Infrastructure WA. I have seen it work in New South Wales and Victoria, and I have definitely seen it work at the commonwealth level in Infrastructure Australia. But the government has ruined it, because the government cannot stop playing politics when establishing institutions. We have seen that almost every step of the way. Hopefully, we will not see that with the Voluntary Assisted Dying Bill.

The Beelihar wetlands bill has not only undermined the planning processes on amendments to the metropolitan region scheme, but also rendered the Westport Taskforce and Infrastructure Western Australia useless. The government should cancel it and make it go away. We were forced to reject the government's plan. When the Liberals next get into government—I hope we continue with Infrastructure WA—the plans put forward under this government's watch will be looked at with a great deal of scepticism and we will not necessarily commit to them. We cannot because this government politicised it. A clear lesson from this is that the Beelihar wetlands bill is not about protecting, enhancing and saving the Beelihar wetlands; it is basically an exercise in securing a political totem for sections that have given votes and funding to the Labor Party, whether that be people who own houses along the right of way and seek gains from the excision of the right of way or environmental activists, who saw money flow into their coffers in the campaign, and I have some examples. Maybe it is the return of the socialists to the Labor Party. I note the ALP has signed up to the new international movement and become socialists again. We saw the member for Bassendean, the Minister for Water, adhere to that today when he renationalised work in the Water Corporation. By the way, that was something he also tried to do with crayfish.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: Don't you like public sector workers?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, I do. They are very valuable; I used to be one. But I tell the member that I am not a socialist like she is. The member for Midland is an official socialist. How does it feel?

Ms R. Saffioti: She's been called a lot of things but never a socialist.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No. This is the new Labor Party mantra. The members are all socialists now. It is quite absurd and not true nonetheless.

One of the ironies is that during this whole debate there were many fellow travellers on this, including the Conservation Council of WA. It fought hard against Roe 8, supported the government and, I suggest, pushed it

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

strongly, and has been a major proponent of this bill. Indeed, it had two full-time campaigners working against Roe 8. I remember in the second Environmental Protection Authority review, the Conservation Council of WA spawned over 1 000 tick-and-flick complaints to the EPA, which slowed the process by six months. Indeed, it spawned over 2 000 submissions to the EPA and Main Roads on Roe 8. Recently, the EPA considered the environmental impact of Metronet, in particular the Thornlie–Cockburn line and the two sections of the Yanchep line. The EPA showed that the environmental impact of Metronet on Bush Forever sites will at least double by every major indicator. It will impact on flora and fauna, water, protected species and the Carnaby's cockatoo. The impact of the Metronet project will be double the impact of Roe 8, but the Conservation Council of WA did not even make a submission to the Metronet assessments. When we contacted it, it did not even think about it: “Why would we do that?”

Ms R. Saffioti: You contacted them to make a submission?

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. I wanted to highlight hypocrisy.

Ms R. Saffioti: That's bizarre!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. It claims to represent conservation groups in this state. Members would expect that a group that was really concerned about protecting the Beelihar wetlands or the environment in that area would make a submission, but it did not make a single one. It made over 2 000 submissions on the Beelihar wetlands, but not a single one on Metronet. Why not? It is the environment. I rang the council after the EPA report came out and I noticed that its name was not there, and nor were the names of any other environmental groups to speak of. Therefore, the Conservation Council of WA does not give a stuff about the impact on the environment. This is about politics, and those types of people are behind this bill. They are the types of people the minister is trying to pay off by ramming this bill through with inadequate consideration. The minister does not give a damn about the planning process, the outer harbour and the planning for ports, the long-term infrastructure planning for the state and the institutions that this government set up with the Westport strategy and Infrastructure WA. The government is paying off people, like the Conservation Council of WA, who campaigned for decades against something that would have had a relatively minor impact compared with the impacts of Metronet.

I might add that once this is excised, the Conservation Council, if it was really interested in the environment and the Beelihar wetlands, would be screaming at this government for failing to address the very many environmental issues that this bill leaves unanswered, such as the impacts on water, flora and fauna, Hope Road and the railway voltage line. A true group would actually be on our side on this and say, “You should've gone through the standard process”, but it has not. This is a terrible bill that should be, and I hope is, voted down in the upper house. This is a bill that sections of the Labor Party should campaign strongly against. Remember, this government is not our friend when it comes to long-term planning for ports and roads, addressing congestion in the south west and, more importantly, protecting the environment—the flora and fauna and water—in the Beelihar wetlands. It is basically out there paying off its voters. This is a narrow, unrepresentative group of people who have duped a lot of people who live in the area. The proponents of this have let us down.

This is a truly terrible bill. The minister made a couple of statements during the consideration in detail stage that I do not respect her. I respect her as a person and a member of Parliament, but ministers earn respect and this does not earn her any respect at all.

MS L. METTAM (Vasse) [4.08 pm]: I would also like to contribute to the third reading and to support the comments made by our lead speaker, the member for Riverton, who has outlined very articulately some of the great challenges and issues with the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2018. It is an extraordinary piece of legislation that bypasses due process. It is a piece of legislation that once again illustrates economic vandalism by the McGowan Labor government. It ignores due process and a system of public consultation that would have taken up to two years and would have identified some of the significant issues in the south metropolitan region—a region that has had its transport and congestion issues ignored by this government. Afternoon commuters face congestion and a commute time that is 20 per cent above the metropolitan average. Trucks on Leach Highway have a crash rate of two to six times the average when compared with the number of crashes on other roads. This bill misses an opportunity. It removes not only the investment of —

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Ms L. METTAM: I am sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I do not think your interjections are welcome.

Ms L. METTAM: I cannot hear what she is saying. The important point is that —

Ms S.E. Winton: You didn't do it in eight years; that's the important point.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you for the first time.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Ms L. METTAM: If the member for Wanneroo's strongest argument against Roe 8 and 9 is that it was not achieved in eight years, perhaps it illustrates that she is a supporter of this important road project. Perhaps she is a great supporter of the \$1.2 billion.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Vasse!

Ms L. METTAM: It is just noise. I would prefer not to hear the interjections from the member for Wanneroo.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carry on.

Ms L. METTAM: Perhaps she would take the opportunity of the \$1.2 billion that is on the table, ready for the important Roe 8 and 9 project—an investment that would create up to 10 000 direct and indirect jobs. It is one thing for a government not to invest in an important road infrastructure project such as this, but it is quite another for a government to make a decision to introduce a piece of legislation to bypass proper process and stop future governments from investing in an important road corridor such as Roe 8 and 9. That is why I stand with the Liberal opposition and the National Party in opposing this legislation.

The Liberal Party of Western Australia believes in building projects. We are a party that builds. We are a party that has invested in important projects and has transformed WA, after the previous Labor government had relegated our state to the unfortunate title of "Dullsville". We were a government that invested in important projects such as Perth Stadium, Elizabeth Quay and Perth Children's Hospital. We are a party that invests and supports investment. This legislation illustrates what the Labor Party represents—economic vandalism. It represents saying no to progress. Once again, as I stated, it is turning its back on the important transport issues facing those in the south metropolitan area.

We have seen Westport Taskforce's recent report, which has been rubbished, and quite fairly so, by many commentators in the community.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, we need to keep this as a third reading contribution that is relevant to the bill. Do not bring in new arguments from your perspective. I am just redirecting you there a bit.

Ms L. METTAM: I go back to the bill and what it represents. According to Westport Taskforce's 2014 report, the capacity of Fremantle port is at least 2.1 million 20-foot or equivalent units; more recently, we understand that that capacity could be as great as 3.8 million TEU. However, the transport corridor has been highlighted as the biggest constraint on that capacity. Those transport corridor issues would be addressed, quite obviously, by Roe 8 and 9—a project that has been effectively blocked by this legislation that has been so recklessly introduced by the McGowan government.

As I stated earlier, Labor governments have form in this area. As I raised in my contribution to the second reading debate, a previous Minister for Transport under the former Labor government blocked the proposed eastern bypass and the potential opportunities for Fremantle. This bill also represents a great deal of hypocrisy. The government has used an environmental argument to introduce this piece of legislation to stop Roe 8 and 9 from going ahead. However, environmental considerations have been flatly ignored in previous legislation. In the Thornlie-Cockburn Link, for example, 54.9 hectares of bushland, including 22.8 hectares of a Bush Forever site and cockatoo habitat, have been cleared as a result of that project being progressed. The Liberal opposition is highlighting the hypocrisy and the arguments around hypocrisy. How can one important transport corridor receive no environmental objection, yet another important piece of corridor that is important for transport and road safety issues—that is, Roe 8 and 9—receive so much inflammatory and significant environmental objection, at a cost to the people of the south metropolitan community?

The hypocrisy does not stop there. As the member for Riverton pointed out, by effectively ramming this legislation through and bypassing proper process, we have seen real threats to the oblong turtle, which will undoubtedly be threatened and will become a protected species as a result of the construction at Hope Road. There are real environmental impacts that have not been considered by this government. It is quite obvious from the debate during consideration in detail that there has been no consultation with the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions or the Department of Water and Environment Regulation. That is another reason that the Liberal opposition objects to the process undertaken by this government.

By not pursuing Roe 8 and 9, the government is ignoring significant environmental benefits, such as the 450 000 tonnes of CO₂ that would have been reduced by 2031 as a result of removing 7 000 heavy vehicles or up to 74 000 light vehicles from local roads in the area—less fuel, less emissions, and better environmental outcomes. It is well understood that the Roe 8 and 9 project had received environmental approvals at both a state and federal level and had been tested in the Supreme Court and the High Court. The people of Western Australia should have a lot of confidence in the process that was followed. It is fair to say that in contrast with what we have seen here,

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

the process was quite exhaustive and extremely thorough in what was a very important road project for the people of the south metropolitan region and for the transport industry as well.

Earlier I referred to the McGowan government's hypocrisy. In my contribution to the second reading debate, I also touched on the fact that although this government uses community and environmentally based arguments, it does so selectively. We see that happening as well with its plans to urbanise sections of Whiteman Park as part of the Metronet project. This land was sold to the state government in the 1970s with an understanding that it would be dedicated to providing good community outcomes. In opposition at that time, the now Minister for Transport raised concerns about consultation with the community on the process, the importance of Whiteman Park being dedicated to the community and ensuring that the community had its say on the park's usage. I also question the extent to which consultation has happened on the government's plans to urbanise a section of Whiteman Park around the Ellenbrook rail and what has been proposed. We know that in the past it has been disallowed by the Greens and by the opposition. I imagine that there is already a great deal of community concern about this government's lack of consultation on that issue.

Ms R. Saffioti: Seriously. This is the third reading.

Ms L. METTAM: This was raised in the second reading debate and it is an issue of hypocrisy. On the one hand, this government uses the environmental card and the community card when it suits it, and, on the other hand, it completely ignores —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Point of Order

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am trying to hear the speaker and I cannot hear her.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member. I do not think that is a point of order, but it is a good point. Would you like to continue on, member.

Debate Resumed

Ms L. METTAM: I think it is a very good point. This government continues to urbanise community land to pay for its budget blow-outs. We know that the cost of the Metronet has already blown out by over \$2 billion.

This legislation will hurt the community. It says to the south metropolitan region that this government does not care. This government is turning its back on this project in the short term and it is also inhibiting future governments from investing in Roe 8 and 9 at a time when \$1.2 billion is on the table. This project would be of great benefit to the electorates of not only Bicton and Cockburn, but also Riverton, Willagee, Jandakot and Fremantle. Roe 8 and 9 would be of significant benefit to the 5 000 students who attend schools along Leach Highway and in the local area and who, when travelling to school, have to compete with many of the trucks that also share that local road network. This legislation illustrates how this government is willing to turn its back on an opportunity to remove over 74 000 vehicles, including 7 000 trucks, from those local roads. This should be of great concern.

One of the issues raised during the consideration in detail stage was the role of Infrastructure WA. Earlier this year we heard in this place that the government wanted to introduce a greater level of transparency into infrastructure projects. This government wanted to establish a body that would give confidence to the people of Western Australia by helping to build a strong economy through improving infrastructure coordination and planning, encouraging investment and supporting job creation. But when the Liberal opposition moved a motion to have this legislation considered by a new body—Infrastructure WA—it was concerning to all of us when that motion received no support. If this government were serious about transparency and the infrastructure, transport and congestion issues faced by those in the south metropolitan region, one would think that it would have at least supported the motion proposed by the Liberal opposition. It is unfortunate but quite consistent with the government's behaviour so far through this process. We also moved a motion to see what the outcomes of the Westport Taskforce report were ahead of introducing this legislation. I question why the minister brought on consideration in detail of the bill ahead of the Westport Taskforce report being introduced. I am sure that many members on this side of the house would have liked to ask some questions about the limitations of the flawed Westport Taskforce report and their relationship to this bill. This is a legitimate point because it touches on the way in which the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill was introduced.

As I stated earlier, this legislation is economic vandalism. It ignores the great efficiency gains for the freight industry that would have been created through supporting this transport corridor. This government is turning its back on the \$1.2 billion dedicated to the important Roe 8 and 9 infrastructure project—money that is still on the table as a result of the federal government's commitment to this road project. This legislation ignores the fact that in 2016, Infrastructure Australia recognised Roe 8 and 9 as the most strategically important road project in the country, beating 93 other projects at that time. The community of the south metropolitan region, the Chamber of

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Commerce and Industry of Western Australia and the Western Roads Federation are concerned about the government's politicisation of this issue. There is a whole community of concern out there.

I stand with my Liberal colleagues in opposing this bill. During the second reading debate, I also talked about what would happen under this government's do-nothing approach. Main Roads WA undertook a report in 2016 that highlighted the impact on roads in the area of a do-nothing approach by a do-nothing government. The Main Roads Western Australia report looked at the section of Leach Highway between Carrington Road and Stock Road and recognised that by 2031 there would be an additional 15 000 vehicles on that stretch of road. The report also highlighted that there would be an additional 13 000 vehicles on the section between Stock Road and North Lake Road; an additional 13 000 vehicles on South Street between Stock Road and North Lake Road; and an additional 13 000 vehicles on Stock Road between South Street and Leach Highway. The government's approach to road congestion, which is merely a High Street upgrade and a roundabout at Stirling Highway, does not nearly go far enough towards addressing the significant road safety and congestion issues in the south west metropolitan region, and that is absolutely why it has received such condemnation from not only members on this side of the house and many industry groups, but also many Labor Party members. We saw that on display on the weekend. There is obviously great concern within the Labor Party about the government's policy on and approach to transport. I expect that Hon Kyle McGinn, the member for Mining and Pastoral Region, and Martin Pritchard, who both walked out —

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, relevance! I think you are drawing a bit of a wide bow. Can you get back to the third reading topics that you previously covered.

Ms L. METTAM: When this important Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliiar Wetlands) Bill 2018 goes to the upper house, we will all be keen and eager to see the level of support for the community and the level of opposition to the economic vandalism that it represents. It is fair to say that there is great concern about this legislation from not only this side of the house, but also industry. It is also important to recognise—I appreciate that I am not able to talk about the Westport report today—that Roe 8 and Roe 9 would have not only served the inner harbour, an inner harbour that has significant capacity for at least the next 30 years, but also supported a future outer harbour whenever one is economically viable and would have also supported the Kwinana industrial area. Importantly, Roe 8 and Roe 9 would support the community. They would have supported the more than 5 000 students who go to school in the local area and they would have supported the freight industry. Certainly, I was very interested to hear from the Nationals WA—the concerns extend much broader than Perth—about the needs of the freight industry and farmers' concern about seeing this important road project go ahead. Many businesses in the south west metropolitan region that I have spoken with have great concern about not only seeing the road congestion issues addressed, but also the government's alternative to address the congestion issue in these transport corridors.

I raised the issue of the proposed changes to Leach Highway as a heavy vehicle trunk in my second reading contribution. It could potentially have an impact on more than 70 homes and businesses in the local area. There is fair reason for the community to be outraged, and we should not be surprised that many homeowners in the area have their own placards calling for Roe 8 and Roe 9. The momentum is only building. I also believe that many people feel ripped off by this government. They feel that they have been sold a pup when it comes to the environmental issues that were originally raised about the Beeliiar wetlands and Roe 8 and Roe 9 given that just 0.49 per cent of the wetlands would have been affected, that it was a top-down construction and that they would have had the benefit of cutting 450 000 tonnes of CO₂ due to reduced emissions as a result of heavy haulage vehicles not going through as many as 15 traffic lights. Those real environmental benefits were not acknowledged in the previous debate. At the time, the former government made a commitment to invest \$45 million in the restoration of this degraded area. It committed to invest in offsets in the Mandurah area that would have resulted in an area 1.5 times the size of Kings Park. Significant consideration of the environment was undertaken during planning for Roe 8 and Roe 9, and they received environmental approval at the state and federal level, which was tested in and supported by the Supreme and High Courts. This government has no consideration for proper process. It has bypassed community consultation. The oblong turtle will continue to be seriously threatened because Hope Road will be maintained. The oblong turtles were considered in the original Roe 8 and Roe 9 plan because Hope Road would have been deleted. These are some of the considerations as to why this bill is fatally flawed, similar to the Westport Taskforce and many other pieces of legislation. The member for Riverton talked about the Human Reproductive Technology and Surrogacy Legislation Amendment Bill, which has effectively been thrown out because it is fatally flawed. The Western Australian Jobs Bill was apparently about WA jobs, but it is also about jobs for New Zealand and other Australian states. They are a few of the issues that have been highlighted. I support opposition members. We cannot afford to turn our back on the important Roe 8 and Roe 9 projects, which would reduce congestion, improve road safety and increase efficiency for the transport industry. This legislation is economic vandalism and, once again, the government is willing to bypass proper process for its own political objectives, which will come at a great cost to this state.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Leader of the Opposition) [4.39 pm]: I, too, rise to voice my objection to the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. Other members have articulated significant reasons for it, but I would like to address a couple of the concerns that were raised during consideration in detail. A repetitive and deceptive catchcry seems to emerge from members on the government benches whenever we talk about this project. They repetitively say, “You didn’t build it. Why didn’t you build it? Why didn’t you prioritise it over the years that you were in government?” There are good reasons for that.

Members would probably recall that when the Liberals took over government in September 2008, planning for the project commenced. In November 2009, the Environmental Protection Authority basically set the level of assessment required for the public environmental review. That was then released for public comment between June and September 2011. There were over 3 000 submissions—that is on the record. Then in June 2013, the EPA basically went into committee to consider its decision. Conditional approval for the project was granted on 13 September 2013. A process was followed. During the debate, we highlighted that the government has thwarted other processes in bringing this legislation forward. We took government in 2008, got the project significantly commenced and started the EPA approval process, which was given conditional approval on 13 September. Then the fun started. The EPA approved the Roe Highway extension in 2013. The minister made his decision for approval of the project in July 2015—I think that might have been Minister Jacob at the time. Then there was an appeal to the Supreme Court, which in December 2015 ruled that the EPA approval was invalid. Once again, there was a stoppage in the ability of the government to start the project. There was an appeal to the Supreme Court in December 2015, and the Supreme Court ruled that the EPA approval was invalid. The Supreme Court judge at the time gave his reasons for ruling that the EPA approval was invalid. The government then went to the Court of Appeal, through the Supreme Court, in July 2016. In handing down its decision, the Court of Appeal unanimously agreed that there had been an error in judgement by the judge of the Supreme Court—there was an error at law in his judgement with respect to overturning the EPA approval and ruling it invalid. The appeal judges unanimously agreed that the EPA approval was valid. That then brings us to another appeal—an attempt by those opposed to the project to take it to the High Court.

While all these actions were in train, a responsible government would not continue to progress a project. We needed to allow the courts to consider these actions before making a decision to commence a project; we did not want to be in contempt of the High Court. However, the High Court dismissed the challenge on 16 December 2016. The government of the day had gone through many, many years of approval processes and planning; achieved the funding for the project; geared up with a tender process, with lots of companies employing people; and started the project. Then the protests started and we found ourselves in an election.

We have put on the record that those now occupying the government benches ran a very schmick campaign—they made the entire Roe 8–Roe 9 project out to be about freight and trucks. Yes, it is important for freight traffic. It is really important that we get those 74 000 light vehicles and 7 000 heavy vehicles off Leach Highway. There are 20 sets of traffic lights at which they need to stop and start between the Kwinana Freeway and Stock Road. There are 28 bus stops between the —

Mrs L.M. O'Malley interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bicton! I do not think the Leader of the Opposition is indicating that she wants the interjection, so I think you should let her continue.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Seventy-two per cent of crashes on Leach Highway are rear-end crashes because of the stop–start nature of the traffic. I drove down Leach Highway just yesterday. I drive down Leach Highway a lot, actually; I somehow find myself with business in the south metropolitan area. That is why I know that, as an opposition, we are onto a winner with this project. I drive up and down Leach Highway and I run the gauntlet between those trucks. There are container trucks and heavy vehicles. I see what motorists do; they cut in front of the trucks. At one stage, I was at the corner of Leach Highway and North Lake Road where some resurfacing had been done and the line markings were not complete. Vehicles that were desperate to try to get ahead did not realise that it was actually only three lanes of traffic, so they were going onto the shoulder of the road and queuing, cutting in front of the trucks, on a section of road that was basically going to end 10 metres past the intersection. It is really dangerous and disconcerting. That is what every commuter in every vehicle that uses Leach Highway endures on a daily basis. These are people who are trying to access the Murdoch health precinct or the educational and university precinct. They run this gauntlet every day. They get stuck in congestion on the Kwinana Freeway every day. Every day, their lives are made miserable as they sit in their vehicles and chew through their fuel as they try to get through that section of road that the Roe 8–Roe 9 project is designed to provide a solution for. That is why we are onto a winner.

One of the reasons the opposition will continue to progress this project and continue to campaign for it is that we are being continuously contacted by people who get stuck in that congestion all the way along Leach Highway. Driving along Leach Highway, the signs are out: “Build Roe 8–Roe 9; it makes sense”. That is what people in the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

community are telling us. Those who now occupy the government benches ran a dishonest campaign during the election period. We have been communicating with people from schools, such as Melville Senior High School, and various community groups. They are really annoyed that they were sold misinformation during that election. They are really annoyed that they were misled by members on that side during that campaign against the highway. It is quite disturbing to think that their view of politicians is so low that they actually believed that the incoming Labor government would say, "The project's too far advanced. We can't rip up the contract. It will progress." That is what a lot of people living in that south metropolitan area have fed back to us in opposition—they knew what Labor members were saying, but they thought they would get to the point where they would not be able to rip up the contract because it was too far progressed. They have voter regret. They regret giving their vote to the Labor government, because they wanted that road to be built. It was pretty clear that they did not want our team to be in government—they particularly did not like our Premier at the time, and that was pretty obvious as we got out and about—but they still did want Roe 8–Roe 9. I acknowledge that there are disparate groups in the community—the groups that were mounting the challenges—that do not want the project. I accept that they have a view. But the vast majority of people—the silent majority—do not get involved in these campaigns and do not go to protests. They just go to the polls believing that they want to chuck out a government, which is what voters do—they throw a government out. They do not necessarily vote for an opposition.

The silent majority in the southern suburbs are furious about this road being cancelled. Every day that they are in their vehicles stuck in congestion, it reminds them that they made the wrong choice. That is why we will continue to push for Roe 8 and 9, and why the member for Tangney, Ben Morton, is campaigning on this project. He wants and is pushing for this project to be built in this term of the McGowan Labor government, and has ensured that the commonwealth is holding the funding to commence this project substantially.

Members on this side of the house do not understand why the government cannot get on to those clever engineers in Main Roads, because the clever engineers in New South Wales tunnel everywhere, build bridges and find solutions to these tricky and complex environmental problems that come with trying to retrofit important infrastructure in an urban environment. Around the world, engineers build these projects and preserve the environment, so why is the government not talking to those people and asking, "How can we have our cake and eat it, too? How can we build Roe 8 and Roe 9 and look after environmental considerations?" I think we can do it. I think we have some very clever engineers in Western Australia. The member for Nedlands knows many of them. I know that those engineers would be able to come up with a solution that would give congestion relief to commuters in the southern suburbs of Riverton, Willetton, Rossmoyne, Murdoch, Cockburn and even Fremantle, who are caught trying to get to the employment centres connected along the Roe 8 corridor. Those commuters also want this project. They were looking forward to having a link into the Roe 8 and Roe 9 project and a direct, seamless, traffic light-free commute to their places of work in the eastern corridor, but they have been denied that.

The government throws up excuses for abandoning this project. Yes, there is the environmental excuse. We have talked in great detail about the \$48 million that was set aside for environmental offsets and improvements to the Beelihar wetlands as part of this project, but that will not happen. The \$48 million that was going to go into improving environmental outcomes for those wetlands is off the table because the project is off the table, which is really sad. One would think that if the government were really committed to the integrity of the Beelihar wetlands, it would be stumping up funding for a project like the one we proposed. Our government at the time proposed to put in a series of boardwalks, birdwatching stations, interpretive signage with Noongar names for all the local plants and animals and outlining their purpose in Noongar culture, and a ranger program around for the wetlands, but we are not getting any of that either. The government has proven that its commitment to the environment is somewhat wishy-washy because it has not stumped up funding for that project.

The other excuse the government throws up is that Roe 8 and Roe 9 is a road that is only required for the continuation of activity at Fremantle port and will not be needed if we build an outer harbour. That is just wrong. Whether or not an outer harbour is built, Roe 8 and Roe 9 is needed to alleviate commuter congestion. That is the bulk of its purpose. We know that it will be a massive improvement for freight traffic, because trucks will not have to stop and start at all those traffic lights, whether they are going to Fremantle port or another port—this visionary, imaginary port that is still being planned for—but the project is needed regardless. To link Roe 8 and Roe 9 directly to the future of the Fremantle port, or a new outer harbour at Kwinana, is also a nonsense.

Then we have the environmental hypocrisy of that position. I am a keen recreational fisher. Recreational fishers care for the environment. Cockburn Sound has lost over 70 per cent, or it might be 80 per cent, of its seagrass. Seagrass is the fish nursery for the fish species in the entire metropolitan west coast bioregion—that is, snapper, mulloway, dhuiies. All those species of fish lay their eggs in the water, which then sink and stick to the seagrass. If there is no seagrass for the eggs to stick to, they float away into the ether, and that is our fishery completely ruined. If we do not have the fish nursery—the habitat for our fish to lay their eggs—we will lose our fishery, and that will be a complete tragedy. That will be the outcome if we have any further destruction of the seagrass beds

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

in Cockburn Sound, and that is why the group called the Fish Army, led by Mike Pritchard, is ramped up and ready to oppose the outer harbour.

Ms R. Saffioti: Do you talk to them?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes, I do talk to them.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, member, I just warn you to keep —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members! I am sorry but I am trying to have a discussion with the member on her feet about the relevance of her contribution. Can you keep to the third reading and not raise any other issues.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am happy with your direction, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The government will have to address those concerns if it wants to build the outer harbour. Another option floated is whether Fremantle port has a future—with or without Roe 8 or Roe 9. Today, the Premier read from a report that says that Fremantle is a less than desirable option into the future. If the government wants to shut down port activity, build condominiums and have urban infill around Fremantle harbour, those people will need to get around the city. If we are going to increase the population in Fremantle without giving people the option to commute east–west, like Roe 8 and Roe 9—Leach Highway is already congested to the point of being almost unworkable—what will happen? It is all well and good to say that we are going to create this wonderful harbour precinct and have high-value residential moving in, but those people need to get around the city and they need roads to do that. We are not quite in the era of *The Jetsons* yet, when we can fly around the city easily! People need roads because they need to get around in motor vehicles and on public transport. Roe 8 and Roe 9 provides a solution for that.

The other reason that we objected to this bill is because the government did not follow the metropolitan region scheme amendment process. We talked at great length about how the metropolitan region scheme is usually amended. I will remind members of that process. There are normally 10 steps in an MRS amendment process. The first step is the Western Australian Planning Commission making a resolution to amend the metropolitan region scheme and referring it to the Environmental Protection Authority. The second step is the EPA determining the level of environmental assessment. The third step is preparing an environmental review if required. The fourth step is the WAPC submitting to the minister for consent to advertise. The fifth is advertising the amendment, seeking public comment. The sixth step is the WAPC considering submissions and making recommendations. Then the environmental conditions are incorporated if required. The Governor then approves the amendment. Then it is considered by Parliament. Finally, the amendment takes effect in the MRS. None of those steps were followed and the government has not undertaken the usual level of consultation one would expect when removing an important road reservation that may be required for the future of Perth. Once it is gone; it is gone and there will be no opportunity to revisit it. We do not know the future prospects for construction that might enable tunnelling, or whatever it might be, to allow for an alternative to the Roe 8 and Roe 9 project, but once the MRS is amended to remove this road reservation, it is gone forever. The opposition believes that that is not in the best interest for the future of Western Australia. It may be needed. The government can remain committed to not building the road, but removing it, deleting it from the metropolitan region scheme forever, is an act of planning vandalism. One of the points we raised is the hypocrisy of the government. Its Infrastructure Western Australia legislation will set up a body to independently assess infrastructure needs, requirements and priorities for the state by an independent panel of people who can, separate from the political process, assess the infrastructure needs of the state, prioritise them and make recommendations to the government, of whatever flavour, about those priorities to then go to Infrastructure Australia to be assessed. Infrastructure WA did not exist in the previous term of government, but Infrastructure Australia did, and it ranked the Roe 8–Roe 9 project as the highest priority in Australia because of what it would deliver for commuters and freight efficiency. It ranked it as priority 1. Infrastructure WA is not committed to consider it. It is not even permitted to consider whether this legislation is appropriate and whether the Roe 8–Roe 9 road reservation may be required in the future. It has not been given an opportunity to consider this at all. What is the point of having Infrastructure WA if the government is going to take away a \$2 billion road infrastructure project that was given the number one priority by the federal infrastructure body? What is the point of having Infrastructure WA if it is excluded from deliberating on important deletions from the MRS, such as what we are considering in Parliament at the moment?

The opposition has done its job. We have done our job very well. We have listened to the community on this project. We accept that we did not build it, but we were given one hurdle after another, after another—the Supreme Court challenge and the Court of Appeal challenge. We went through the appropriate Environmental Protection Authority approval process. We went through the appropriate process, went out to consultation to all and sundry and had the EPA as an independent assessor look at this project and in the first instance either approve

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

it or not approve it. The EPA approved it and put appropriate conditions in place to mitigate for any environmental issues that may arise as a result of the project. We followed the appropriate process and in doing so perhaps we should have had more of a cavalier approach to process, such as this minister has, and disregarded all that appropriate process, cut out a couple of steps and decide to build it anyway. Perhaps we should have done that. Perhaps we should have started building it, and then fought the appeal processes through the court while we were constructing it. Then the road would be substantially underway by now and commuters in south metropolitan suburbs such as Southern River, Thornlie and Gosnells who also want this project would know that there would be some relief for them on their commute east–west, because this project was coming. We did not abandon process. That is not how we rock; it is not how we roll. We do not abandon process and make political decisions about road infrastructure. A plan was in place that has been in place in this state for over 55 years to facilitate a freight route around the CBD. If members go to any well-planned city in the world, they will see that there is a circle route around the CBD that facilitates freight movement.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: That is what every modern city has. That is what Roe 8 and Roe 9 would have achieved. The 55 years in planning started with Roe 1 and Roe 2. When we got to Roe 7, the condition of the commonwealth funding commitment to Roe 7 was that the then Labor government remained committed to leaving the Roe 8 reservation in the scheme. That commitment was made. The minister who made that commitment is still a member of this cabinet. But her word to the commonwealth agency in 2007 to keep the Roe 8 reservation in the scheme is worth nothing today, because she abandoned that by supporting this legislation, this act of planning vandalism that will take out that road reservation forever. Imagine that. She gave her word to the commonwealth agency and commonwealth members of Parliament and ministers at the time, took millions of dollars' worth of infrastructure funding to build Roe 7 on the condition that the state government leaves the Roe 8 reservation in the scheme, and then 12 years later said, "What I said 12 years ago doesn't matter. I gave you my word 12 years ago, that was our agreement, but times have changed and we don't want that anymore. I will be part of a cabinet that makes a decision that removes the Roe 8 reservation, completely contrary to my cabinet decision in 2007." It is completely contrary. That is what the minister in the other place Hon Alannah MacTiernan has done in being part of this decision.

Mr T.J. Healy: Didn't you promise not to raise TAFE fees?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition is taking interjections.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am sure the member for Southern River is going to get up. I will not interject on the member; I am not rude like he is.

In closing, I would like to say that we have explained a multitude of reasons to have the government change its mind on this act of planning vandalism. We will do whatever we can in the other place to prevent this legislation from going through. We are working on the sensible heads in the Legislative Council because the government does not have the numbers. The leader of government business in the other place will not stoop so low as to speak to members of the crossbench to try to garner their support for any of this legislation, so we will work with them; they are very sensible. They see the removal of the road reservation for Roe 8 and Roe 9 as the act of planning vandalism that it is and they are opposed to it, for the same reasons that we are. Firstly, the proper process has not been followed; the government has not properly consulted. That is the first big reason. Secondly, the government has no solution for the commuter congestion that people in the southern suburbs are experiencing every day. Roe 8 and Roe 9 is the only solution that will work. Thirdly, all those people who use Leach Highway—the truckers, container traffic and heavy haulage vehicle drivers—want a safer solution, and Roe 8 would deliver a road safety solution like no other, by providing an opportunity to take away the stop–start nature of heavy vehicle traffic, and therefore other commuter traffic, on Leach Highway. It would solve the road safety problem. The government has no solution on the table to solve that road safety problem and no solution for alternative access to an outer harbour, should it ever be built, or continued access into the Fremantle port. Finally, the government does not even have the intestinal fortitude to test this legislation with the Infrastructure WA independent assessment process. These are all reasons that we are opposed to this bill. I will be voting against it, and I will be talking to every single one of those intelligent crossbenchers and Liberal and National members in the upper house to ensure that this legislation does not get through. One thing I forgot to mention was the other reason that this road reservation is needed. All our regional grain producers and pastoralists who are trying to get their animals to market want a seamless journey. When people who transport sheep in a vehicle, for example, have to stop and start, it is not the best from an animal husbandry point of view. But if they had a seamless route to Fremantle port, it would improve the efficiency for our farmers and pastoralists, it would improve the efficiency for truck traffic and it would improve the animal husbandry for those animals that have been moved. There are many reasons not to do this,

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

minister. I know that she is not listening to us, or the commuters who are talking to us, but we will keep campaigning because the yellow-and-black signs on Leach Highway keep us motivated.

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe) [5.09 pm]: I rise to make a contribution on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. Establishing a park in the Roe 8 extension route is an act of complete economic vandalism and completely ignores the safety of road users in the southern suburbs. When I came into this place, I was interested to see legislation coming before Parliament. Sometimes, legislation comes before us and we look at it and say, "Look, I do not agree with it, but I can see why the government is doing it." The minister would know that I thought that parts of the Strata Titles Amendment Bill were okay and I could say, "Yes, I support those." I did not agree with the parts of the bill that gave the balance of power to developers, but I could understand why the minister was doing it. She stated quite clearly that she saw it as a way of activating more housing development in the state. I did not agree with that. I did not think that the balance was right, and there was some effort—I give the government credit—to improve that balance. I think it could have been improved more, but I respect that the minister had, from her perspective, good reasons for doing it. When I look at this bill, I cannot see any of that. This is pure vandalism for some purpose other than the wellbeing of the people of this state.

Let us look at the economic aspect of this bill. We all know that the inner harbour at Fremantle port is absolutely critical to the wellbeing of the state. Essentially, all the containers go in and out of this state through that port. People focus on flat screen televisions and air conditioners going through that port, but people who have studied this in more detail will know that that port is an absolutely crucial portal for the exports of this state. Those exports have to compete with all the return traffic that is coming back through the port. I went through some simple calculations, but I think they bear repeating. If we look at a three per cent compound increase in traffic through the port of Fremantle, in 10 years, that is a 36 per cent increase in freight through Fremantle harbour. I have given the government credit for it; I think the government has done surprisingly well, better than people expected, in getting some freight on rail. We know from all the experts that the best the government will ever do with rail out of Fremantle harbour is around 30 per cent. That is about an eight per cent increase in container freight by rail.

What does that mean? It means a 28 per cent increase in container traffic by road. Let us not worry about the 7 700 truck movements we have today. We are going to see a 28 per cent increase in freight through that port. The government will do nothing. In 10 years—nothing. There is no way that there can be any meaningful development on an outer harbour in 10 years. I will dwell on that later. The member for Riverton and others have gone through that in some detail. That means one of two things. We will have absolute chaos and Armageddon on those southern roads, trying to jam that extra 28 per cent of freight through the roads that exist and every other road the poor drivers can possibly find. It is extremely unlikely they will be able to do that. What will the government do? This government will restrain the economy of this state because we will not be able to get container traffic through Fremantle.

The government has made a bit about some road improvements. A roundabout and some slip lanes will essentially do nothing to improve the flow of traffic into that port. They will do nothing for the number of interactions that car drivers have with traffic travelling down Leach Highway and South Street. Those improvements will not stop accidents. We have heard it already. It has been said today and it bears repeating: Leach Highway has double the average number of truck versus other vehicle accidents in metropolitan Perth. That is no surprise. An enormous number of trucks go down that road. Roe Highway after the freeway exit has six times the average number of accidents than in the rest of Perth—that is, other vehicle versus truck accidents. When we talk about this being an important matter economically and safety-wise, it is a real safety issue. It is about people either getting smashed into by a truck or smashing into a truck. Just imagine, members, if that traffic is expected to increase by 28 per cent over the next 10 years. Just imagine the accidents we are going to see. The number of accidents will go up exponentially. It will not be a 30 per cent increase. If we double the traffic, there could be four times the number of accidents. That is the rough mathematics of it.

When I say that the government does not care about the safety of people in the southern suburbs, it is demonstrable. It could not possibly bring in a bill to stop the completion of Roe 8 and Roe 9 and proper access into the port and also care about people. The government does not care about the state economy. It does not care about people being injured in accidents. The great tragedy—members on this side of the house and I take absolutely no pleasure in saying this—is that people will die because of that decision, and that is horrendous. As I said, we take no delight in that, minister, but I would say, in normal circumstances, the minister would be concerned about that.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Dr D.J. HONEY: Minister, I am surprised —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, minister!

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am surprised that the minister would ignore that. I am surprised that she would be part of making a decision that will have a profound impact on this state's economy and the safety of road users in the southern suburbs of this city. As I said, this is economic vandalism and it completely ignores the safety of road users in the southern suburbs of Perth.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Dr D.J. HONEY: As I said, that increase —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): I will have to start calling people, reluctantly, if you continue. Member, are you taking interjections?

Dr D.J. HONEY: No. There is too much to talk about.

Let us dwell on the topic of safety, because it sounds as though some members care about safety.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am glad that members opposite are activated on this topic. It sounds as though some of them care about safety. Let us talk about safety in the context of the consequences of this bill. I suspect that a significant number of members opposite have no idea what the alternative plan is for this bill and no idea what has already been done. But I have raised it before and I will raise it again. This is a surprise to pretty much every person with whom I have discussed it, but Roe Highway now exits between Murdoch University and the hospital precinct. That is where it goes. Let me tell members where the member for Bicton and other members opposite are putting 7 700 trucks a day—this is where the great majority of them will go—adjacent to the St John of God Murdoch Hospital entrance. That includes the community hospice, the Wexford Medical Centre, dermatology services, WA Cardiology and the orthopaedic clinic. The government is putting the trucks right in the spot where people turn into Fiona Stanley Hospital. That includes the education —

Mr S.A. Millman interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Mount Lawley, this is your last warning.

Dr D.J. HONEY: That includes the education building, the emergency department and the Harry Perkins Institute of Medical Research, and also the cyclists trying to get across the road, and students, lecturers and visitors trying to turn into the university. The list does not end there: HeartsWest, the State Rehabilitation Service and Murdoch Police Station are also located there. The poor old police have to get out in an emergency when there are trucks tearing down the road. Murdoch Fire Station is another critical emergency service for that area that will be interacting with 7 700 and more vehicle movements a day. That is what it is now, not what it will be in 10 years' time. South Metropolitan TAFE is another education institute on the Murdoch campus. Wandoo Rehabilitation Prison is there. Prison vans and staff move in and out of the facility. The Melville State Emergency Service is another critical service that will have to interact with all those vehicles on a daily basis. The Animal Resource Centre is there—with people who actually care about animals, unlike those on the other side—along with Wesfarmers Chemicals, Energy and Fertilisers, the Telethon Community Cinemas Murdoch and Orthocell Ltd. The trucks will be sent along there. Roe 8 and 9 was not going to allow that because no-one in their right mind would have contemplated doing this, but that is what the government has done, and that is what the completion of Roe 8 and 9 would have prevented.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Your data comes down to 10 trucks a minute through that thing.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Ten trucks a minute. I thank the member for Riverton; I am obliged to him. Members should imagine their kids going to Murdoch University, or imagine themselves having had a procedure in the hospital and having to interact with that traffic when they come out. It will be chaos because the Roe Highway extension will be a parking lot for trucks. They will not be able to get through the lights at South Street. It will be an absolute unmitigated nightmare. It is not a concern just for the people, but for the truck drivers. I have a deep empathy for truck drivers. They do a difficult job. They carry Australia. Truck drivers are not oblivious to the risk of having accidents. They care passionately about it. It worries them sick. Truck drivers are on the edge the whole time, sitting on their brakes, waiting to slam on the brakes so they do not run into someone, because they know that there are people in the cars in front of them and they do not want to hurt them. That is why they are so passionate about this. That is why the truck drivers are saying, "For goodness sake, government, have a second thought about this one. Yes, you had a rush of blood. Yep, you had a bit of success in the election campaign with it, but now we want you to have a second thought about this and let us go ahead with Roe 8 and 9." Members, how the government

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

funds it is its business. However, the unequivocal truth is that Roe 8 and 9 is the only practical solution to prevent the issues we have talked about.

We talk about the apparent justification of the environment, and the hypocrisy of that has been pointed out. Let us consider the environmental impact assessment of the Yanchep rail extension. I have not heard a peep from the other side on this matter—not a peep from members on the other side who wave their environmental credentials all over the place. They are out there caring for the environment. They do not want Roe 8 to go through the Beeliar wetlands because they are such great environmental warriors. Let us look at the environmental impact statement for the Yanchep rail extension. What are the potential impacts? Permanent loss of native vegetation and permanent loss of threatened ecological communities —

Point of Order

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: Yanchep is completely irrelevant to the Beeliar wetlands. Mr Acting Speaker, I ask you to direct the member to return to his contribution to the third reading debate, with particular regard to Roe 8 and 9.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Yes, member, I would ask you in the third reading debate to stay close to the subject.

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. The reason I am going through this is that we are told that this bill is about a key environmental issue—that is, not causing harm to that part of the Beeliar wetlands. We already know that that part of the Beeliar wetlands is highly degraded. We already know that the larger part of it is an easement for the powerline. Anyone who has bothered to go there—it is clear that members opposite have not—would know that about 200 metres to the south of it is Hope Road, which goes right through the middle and has a two to three-metre raised platform, which makes it a complete joke. In the other projects, 53.19 hectares of remnant native vegetation will be cleared. Where is the voice from the other side on that one? Where is the outrage over that? The member for Riverton did a very good job of pointing out the absolute hypocrisy of the rent-a-crowd the government had before the election. Do members know where they are on those important environmental impacts? They are missing. They are nowhere to be seen—not a peep; not a sound. It is clear that they were not serious about it. They were just political hacks for the Labor Party.

I gave my speech in the second reading debate. It was a relevant comparison. Through its infill policy, in 10 years this government will account for 37 000 hectares of tree canopy being destroyed in Perth.

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: This is a third reading debate and the speech needs to be confined to either the contents of the bill or the discussion that was undertaken during the consideration in detail stage. It is not an opportunity to rehash a speech in the second reading debate.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Yes, I remind the member for Cottesloe that I would appreciate it if he confined himself to the discussion.

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. It is apparent that members opposite do not care about the environment and they do not want to hear it discussed. They are absolutely hypocritical in suggesting that environmental considerations are anything to do with the motivation of this bill. I am prepared to accept that most of the time when the government introduces legislation, there is some justification for it. There is no justification for this bill outside of raw political purposes—outside of simply trying to reignite a successful campaign before the last election. I am sure you will not allow me to go into an analysis of the state government, Mr Acting Speaker; however, it is clear that it is in deep trouble internally and in deep trouble with the electorate.

[Quorum formed.]

Dr D.J. HONEY: It is clear that this bill has nothing to do with the environment. We heard during earlier debate and questions asked that the plan that was developed previously was an excellent plan to minimise any environmental impact, which goes further to prove that this is not an environmental bill at all. It is purely for political purposes to garner favour with certain groups that people were looking at before.

Several speakers pointed out very well some issues with the legislation. This is not just an issue about trucks. Trucks are vitally important. Trucks are important to the economic wellbeing of this state; however, people being able to get to and from work is also vitally important. We will see not only a substantial increase in truck movements, but also a greater increase in car movements. That is an area in which the government is completely

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

missing in action. What are the plans of this government to deal with that enormous increase in vehicle traffic? Some people catch the train, but the overwhelming majority do not, and in 10 years' time, unless electric vehicles really get a move on, the situation will be exactly the same.

The minister made a lot of moment in her response to questions when we went into the consideration in detail stage about the issues of traffic through the southern suburbs. The only analysis that I believe is available on this is in the "Developing Transport Networks; Delivering Safer Roads" report that was published in 2016. I will go through those estimates. In 2021, the total vehicle movements down Curtin Avenue and Stirling Highway is estimated at 52 000, with only 3 200 of that being trucks, which is significant. Trucks are significant, but only 3 200—six per cent—are trucks and 94 per cent is general traffic, commuters and other commercial traffic, not trucks carrying containers. In 2031, the estimated total will be 69 000 vehicles—17 000 more vehicles over that period—which is a 33 per cent increase in commercial and commuter traffic along that road. With a 17 000 increase in general traffic, the estimated increase in truck traffic is 700, so it goes from 3 200 to 3 900 trucks, and that models the government's "no Roe 8" option. Including Roe 8 in the model means the numbers vary slightly, but, essentially, it is the same issue.

What is the problem on the roads? The commercial and safety problems are trucks on roads, but the other problem for the state is that enormous 25 per cent increase in commuter traffic. If we took all the trucks off the road, there would be a 25 per cent increase in commuter traffic on Stirling Highway and Curtin Avenue. I asked the minister about this, but the government has no plans. There is nothing in the forward estimates. The minister was talking about the cyclepath, and she knows that I give credit where credit is due. I gave the minister good credit in extending the cycleway, and I am really looking forward to that going further. But I do not give the minister any credit for this decision because of the estimated 25 per cent increase in commercial and commuter traffic along Curtin Avenue and Stirling Highway but the government has no plan at all. Whether the government builds the southern port tomorrow will make no difference whatsoever, because all of those butchers, bakers, candlestick makers, mums and dads, and people commuting to and from their workplaces are going to have to drive down those roads and it is going to be absolute chaos.

I asked the minister what her plans were to deal with that issue. I provided some suggestions. Again, as was outlined earlier by the Leader of the Opposition, there are excellent engineering solutions in places like Sydney. I encourage the minister to go to San Diego and see how it dealt with the major traffic issues there. Tunnels are a fantastic, low-cost solution for traffic and congestion through areas, especially with established buildings. There are good engineering solutions and I support the Leader of the Opposition's comment that the government has the option to look at those other solutions. The completion of Roe 8 and Roe 9 thereby improving the link through to the Fremantle port is an absolutely critical project for the safety of all road users in the southern suburbs and the economic wellbeing of the state.

Let us come back to the economic wellbeing of the state. Fremantle port is owned by all of the taxpayers in Western Australia. It is a multibillion-dollar asset that is owned by all of us. Imagine if a person had a multibillion-dollar asset and someone said to them, "Spending virtually no money, we can double the productivity of that asset, and by the way, you expend a fraction of the money of an outer harbour—in fact, you can take this port up to four times its current capacity." Members, that is our asset. In spending a relatively small amount of money, we can potentially improve the productivity of that asset by up to four times. But even if we do not do that, if members talk to people at Fremantle port, they are essentially saying, "With very little effort whatsoever, other than getting more product in there, we can double the capacity of the port. That is our multibillion-dollar asset." Imagine a person with a business saying, "Yep, I've got \$5 billion invested in my business, but, you know what? Blow it! I can increase it. I can double the productivity of it for very little money, but blow that! No. I am going to build one 20, 30 kilometres away, 'cos, you know, I want to; 'cos I don't want to put a road through here that's got an imaginary environmental issue that can't be solved. So I'm going to go and do that." No-one in their right mind would say that.

If I had a conversation with an ordinary member of the community who is not necessarily tied into these issues and asked them about these sorts of things, they would say, "You what?" They would be dumbfounded. This is a government that said it is capital limited. It is a government that says it wants to pay off state debt and that that is its priority. It wants to pay off state debt, but it also wants to build on some critical existing infrastructure to improve the state. This government that says it is focused on debt reduction and responsible environmental management but is going to spend \$6 billion—that is the estimate I heard—when it has an asset that is only one-quarter used. Members should hear crickets when that comment is made, because it is profound. The government says that it is struggling for money for a new women's hospital in Perth, but I tell members that \$6 billion would build a pretty swanky new women's hospital, would it not? The government says it wants to push forward with other critical transport and infrastructure project, but part of that \$6 billion would do a pretty good job of that. The member for Carine told horrendous stories about the outcome for people who are out there on the streets and that the Premier cannot find a solution for a lovely family who are down south.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Member for Cottesloe, I think that has veered well and truly off the track. I will ask the member to come back to the issue of Roe 8 and 9. Thank you.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much, Mr Acting Speaker. I greatly appreciate your guidance.

What we have is a multibillion-dollar asset that we own and that this government controls on behalf of this state that can be substantially expanded for very, very limited expenditure, simply so we have proper freight transport access into it. But the government says, “No, we are going to ignore that. We are going to have some ships come in every now and then and will turn it into townhouses, or something.” We know that that was looked at by the previous government. It does not recover a fraction of the value of that asset as a working port. In my previous life, I had a lot to do with unions. By and large, I found that a lot of the unions had pretty sensible folk in them. But on this issue, they are trying to give the government guidance. They are trying to say to the government, “Guys, you’re our friends; we pay for you; we support you, but we want you to look at this again.” They are doing it for a good reason because they know the basic arithmetic. They know that spending \$5 billion or \$6 billion on a new port that cannot be ready for at least 10 years is folly. They know that we should be maximising the value of the Fremantle port asset for the people of Western Australia so that the government can then use that money for its other projects.

If the government wants to put on a hard hat and open things, great. Go and open that brand spanking new women’s hospital. The people of Perth would welcome it. Go and put in that other critical infrastructure that the state needs. Talking about our friends from the regions—I do not want to go too far down this path—all of our regional friends know that a few billion dollars in the regional areas could transform the regional centres of Western Australia. The government should go and spend it there. The minister could get all the credit for it. The minister would have a hard hat on and a fluoro jacket. The minister would be out there doing the opening. The government should do that, because putting in this bill to stop Roe 8 and Roe 9, to starve, essentially, Fremantle of proper expansion and proper utilisation and to then spend billions of dollars on a harbour to the south is absolute folly. It is pretty straightforward what this bill demonstrates about this government. The truth is that this government does not care about the safety of families in the southern suburbs who are using those roads. If it did, it would be doing something substantial—not some little made-up bandaids thing, whereby a kid has taken a crayon and drawn a few lines on a map. It would be doing something substantial to take a substantial amount of traffic off those highways. It would not look at the 25 or 30 per cent increase in traffic that we have seen in the figures and allow that to happen. This government is doing nothing about that. It does not care about the safety of families and communities in the southern suburbs. It does not care about the welfare of truck drivers. I will not go through it again—I am conscious of sticking to the bill—but truck drivers have an enormously stressful job, and that stress is made worse by traffic congestion. This project was about giving truck drivers a better working life. The stress of that working life leads to a range of negative outcomes for truck drivers.

This government does not care about job creation; we have heard that from all members. There is \$1.2 billion, and that is just for Roe 8. If we go through with Roe 9 and the extension to the port, we know that there will ultimately be more on the table, but let us stick to the \$1.2 billion. This government does not care about job creation, because it does not want this project to go through. The federal government has a sensible head. It has said, “This project is absolutely critical. It’s crucial for Australia, it’s crucial for Western Australia, and we want it to go through.” It is clear that this state government does not care about job creation.

The government does not care about the economic growth of this state. As we stand, the growth of this state is going to be constrained in the next 10 years. I refer to those new lithium exporters—it looks like we will get a couple down in Kwinana now—and the nickel sulphate and other exporters. There is a raft of industries that are looking to establish down at Kwinana. They will not have any extra port capacity in the south. They will have to put their product in containers out through the port of Fremantle, as they do now, in case the minister did not know. That is where those specialist mineral products go out.

It demonstrates the rank hypocrisy of this government claiming that this is an environmental project, when its other decisions are destroying thousands and thousands of hectares of trees across the city of Perth. It illustrates that this is a ruse by this government for purely political purposes—to garner support from disparate groups that it activated before the last state election in the hope that it can pull off a victory in this state election. We have seen through this. As our leader said, we are working really hard. We know that the greater majority of the members in the upper house and some sensible heads on the government side of the house see this as absolute folly. This bill should be defeated, and we will do everything in our power to make sure it is. We will do everything in our power to make sure that this state is not held back by a reckless bill like this.

MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central) [5.42 pm]: It is amazing how four pieces of paper are causing all sorts of problems for this government. Four little bits of paper are causing not only problems for the Labor Party,

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

but also a severe problem for the people of Western Australia, our industries and the people who use transportation to head to Fremantle port. It sends a clear message that regional ports in this state are not part of this government's way forward.

Everything that we have heard in the debate around this bill is about trying to protect these wetlands, which will cause all sorts of chaos on the road if we go forward with this bill. Members of the Nationals WA spoke in this house during the debate on this bill and said, "Put this bill through Infrastructure Western Australia. Put Fremantle port and the outer harbour through Infrastructure WA." The response from the Premier when this bill was read in was that Infrastructure WA had not been formed. But now it has been formed.

The Premier said —

The role of Infrastructure Western Australia would be to provide advice to government on prospective infrastructure projects.

I do not know what a prospective infrastructure project is, but when we talk about billions and billions of dollars for the state—I have heard \$6 billion for the outer harbour—the reality is that is only a projected cost. There are a lot of other associated costs along with that, so we are looking at \$10 billion plus. Does that not warrant going through Infrastructure WA to see what the best option is, not only for transport, exports and imports, but also to look after the taxpayers' dollar? Every question time, we get up and ask, "Why haven't you fixed this? Why haven't you done that?" The answer is, "We can't, because of the debt." Hang on a second: how can the government say that on one hand, and then on the other hand look to build these projects worth billions of dollars—like I said, something that could possibly cost \$10 billion or more of taxpayers' money—when we have an asset sitting there that is only a quarter utilised? More importantly, politically, the government has set up an infrastructure body to evaluate major infrastructure projects for the state. However, two projects that I can think of that together are potentially worth \$20 billion—that is, Metronet and the outer harbour—are not going through the Infrastructure WA committee, which has been set up by this government and is now operational. Why is that the case? Is it perhaps to protect where the Deputy Premier's seat is, or Cockburn or Bicton? Are they the seats?

Dr M.D. Nahan: Willagee?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Is it Willagee? Is it political? This bill comprises four pieces of paper. The government's own members are like this chamber—half of them are not here. Half of the Labor Party does not believe that this is the way to go. We need to be able to complete Roe 8 and Roe 9 and make sure that we can maximise Fremantle harbour's potential.

Members opposite are failing to see that we have growth in the regions. We have the ports of Esperance, Albany, Bunbury and Geraldton; in the Pilbara, we have Karratha and Port Hedland; and all the way up to Wyndham. There are opportunities to perhaps utilise that \$6 billion—I say \$10 billion in today's monetary terms—to expand those ports to ensure that, for example, the containers that come into Fremantle port and have to go up the Great Northern Highway or the North West Coastal Highway can instead be delivered through Karratha or Port Hedland. How about looking at investing in our regional ports to ensure that we do not need to waste any taxpayers' money in developing the outer harbour, ensuring that Fremantle can realise its potential, and any expansion, Minister for Transport, is through the regions? It is absolutely commonsense. Develop the road networks, rail and ports in regional Western Australia—there is the answer. The answer is not an outer harbour.

We moved a motion in this house back in November 2018, in which I said —

That so much of standing orders be suspended as is necessary to allow the following motion to be moved forthwith —

That this house calls on the McGowan government to defer its Beeliar wetlands bill 2018 until it establishes the independent infrastructure of WA body to assess transport infrastructure necessary to service Fremantle port in the future.

This motion was moved by the National Party last year. The response was obviously inadequate, because of four pieces of paper, which not only are causing members opposite a hell of a lot of trouble internally, but also will put pressure on future governments, because this is not going to be done in this government's term. I would say that the outer harbour will never be built, because any government with commonsense, whether it be next term or the term after, will say that it is not cost effective for taxpayers in Western Australia. This is not realistic. This does not meet the needs of Western Australia. The answer is always going to be to grow the port of Fremantle and regional ports, not to waste billions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I say "waste" because we do not know what is going to happen. This government has established Infrastructure WA to evaluate these projects and their benefit to the taxpayers of Western Australia.

Mr P.J. Rundle: It is on the laptop.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is on a laptop or the back of a napkin. I cannot see why Infrastructure WA cannot evaluate this bill and the infrastructure that it will affect—Roe 8 and 9, the Fremantle port and the outer harbour. No-one with any commonsense, any respect for the taxpayers of Western Australia or any knowledge of roads, ports, trucks, exports or imports can support this bill in its present form. Members on this side of the house—the Nationals WA and the Liberal Party—will be joining forces to oppose it. We know that we are not going to win the vote in this house, but in the other place it will be a different story. It will be a win for the people of Western Australia. It will potentially save the taxpayer in the order of \$10 million today—not in five or 10 years' time. It could save a lot more money, but, as I said, this bill will never get through. This is a political stunt that is backfiring. The government's dogged approach to this is going to backfire. It did not win the election on this issue and everyone knows it. Everyone knows why this side of the house lost the election. We are opposing this bill because we know that it will cost the government politically. It does not make sense and it does not suit the needs of or look after the people of Western Australia.

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: The member has been talking about four pages consistently since he started his speech. There is an issue of relevance. The bill does not mention Roe 8 and 9, nor does it mention Infrastructure Australia, the outer harbour or the Fremantle port. The member has not touched on one clause contained in the bill or any discussion that was undertaken during the second reading debate. I do not think he has actually read the bill. If he continues on like this, you need to sit him down.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Thank you, members. I will bring you back to the subject of the bill, thank you, member for North West Central.

Debate Resumed

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The member is right. I apologise. It is actually only three pieces of paper because one is a title page. Government members are fighting over three bits of paper. On page 3 of the bill, clause 5(2) states —

Nothing in this Act affects the operation of the Planning Act with respect to amendments to the Metropolitan Region Scheme as amended by this Act.

That is the problem and what we on this side of the house are concerned about. This government is amending something that does not need to —

Ms R. Saffioti: This is good. You should be leader. Why aren't you leader? You should be deputy leader.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is the Premier's leadership that is being torn apart by three bits of paper.

Ms R. Saffioti: Where did you go for a week when you tried to take the job? Where did you disappear to for a week?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I had influenza, if the minister would like to know. This is not about our leadership because we are not in government. Members opposite are in government. It is all about their leadership, which is being questioned.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I ask that the member for North West Central come back to the subject of the bill, please. We have seven minutes left and I would like the member to finish talking about the subject of the bill.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: When it comes to this and the changes to the —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, I will have to call you soon.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: We know what this bill is about. As I said, the government is trying to change the planning act to suit its political needs. This bill is not right for the local communities surrounding Roe 8 and 9 and the Fremantle port, and it is not right for future governments, so why would anyone support it? It is commonsense. If we put aside the politics and what is happening in this chamber, the reasons put forward by the Maritime Union of Australia and Transport Workers' Union of Australia are actually valid.

Ms R. Saffioti: Why don't you ask Mr Acting Speaker whether he will support you as leader? It's just another vote.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The minister is making me stray away from the bill.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. Member, will you ignore interjections and just talk to me, thank you.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: These three bits of paper are causing leadership tensions on the other side. They are going to cost the member for Bicton her seat. It is going to have an impact on the seat of Fremantle. The member for Willagee is also going to be impacted by this. Do members know what? It is an election issue. Members opposite have made it an election issue now because this bill has no commonsense attached to it whatsoever.

Point of Order

Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY: What is the relevance?

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY: I know, relevance.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Order!

Debate Resumed

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The relevance is that the member is going to lose her seat.

Mrs L.M. O'Malley interjected

Mr V.A. CATANIA: No. The joke is that this bill is trying to hoodwink the people of Western Australia. It is a dangerous bill, but it can be repealed by an incoming government, which this side of the house will do when it comes into government. We all know that that can be done. We all know that the outer harbour is never going to be built. If the government actually had any vigour or credibility behind the outer harbour plan and what it is trying to push forward, it would get the body that it established to look at it. What has it got to hide? What does it fear? The government fears that someone will actually find out that this three-page bill—it is probably only two and a half pages of material—will result in a huge amount of taxpayers' money being spent and that will cause problems into the future. If we look at what the Premier sent out, it is amazing to see what a person says prior to an election compared with what they say when they get into government.

Ms R. Saffioti: Particularly for you! It's amazing what you stood for before an election and where you crossed to afterwards.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: But I represent my community, and the government is not doing that in this bill. It is not doing what is right for the people of Western Australia.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, minister.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The minister's leader said that an independent advisory body—Infrastructure WA—will report on all major projects, and that projects costing more than \$100 million will be subject to a transparent cost-benefit analysis. These words were spoken by the Premier. Why is he not following through on a project that will cost in the order of, as I said, \$6 billion—it is probably worth \$10 billion—and Metronet, which is worth another \$10 billion? Why are they not being reviewed by that body?

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The minister can be childish and say that, but I am asking a genuine question: why has the government not put this project through its own infrastructure body, which is meant to be transparent, to look at the cost-benefit analysis and ensure that taxpayers are getting the best deal possible? I am not hiding any agenda. I believe the Premier would say something like that, and I am saying, "Okay; you've said that. That sounds good to me, but why aren't you doing it? What's the fear? What is this government hiding?" That is the point that we on this side of the house are making.

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: Sit down, mate!

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Member for Forrestfield, that is my job.

Mr S.J. PRICE: Once again, I have to talk about relevance. When the member did not quite succeed in the takeover of the National Party—I do not need to say a number—and he had that week off, he missed the opportunity to make his contribution to the second reading debate, so he is trying to do it now. Can we get him back on to the bill?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Sorry, member, there is no point of order. Member, I remind you that you are talking to those three pieces of paper there.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Debate Resumed

Mr V.A. CATANIA: Yes. As I said, the National Party is not going to support this bill. We put forward a motion to say that this needs to go through Infrastructure WA, and this government is not going to do that. We support the Liberal Party because —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Oh, no, don't you start!

Mr V.A. CATANIA: — the right thing to do is to ensure that the taxpayers of Western Australia get the best benefit. There is plenty of scope in the Fremantle port, and Roe 8 and 9 is needed for the safety of the people of Western Australia.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, given the hour, I will vacate the chair until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I have looked at this three-page piece of legislation and have quoted it intently, may I say. This bill will cost taxpayers a huge amount of money in the long run. I do not think the outer harbour will ever be built. During the dinner break, I was reflecting on the fact that the previous government, which I was a part of, had proposed the Perth Freight Link, and I came across a document entitled "Construction of Perth Freight Link". The document refers to the environmental benefits of the Perth Freight Link and states that although around 100 hectares of native vegetation will be impacted, more than 400 hectares of native vegetation is proposed to be purchased as an environmental offset. That is a logical and responsible way of ensuring that we look after the environment. The document states also that the proposed new freight route will benefit the community. It will enable trucks to bypass 14 sets of traffic lights, resulting in less delay and frustration for drivers, and there will be 500 fewer trucks per day on sections of Leach Highway. That will be a great outcome. It will increase safety for drivers and the community; reduce the cost of haulage, help protect the environment and save taxpayers' money. Fremantle port has a projected lifespan of 20 to 25 years. There is no need to spend money on the outer harbour. The former government's transport plan is also a logical way forward for regional areas such as Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany, Esperance and the Pilbara.

[Quorum formed.]

Mr V.A. CATANIA: As I said, we need to utilise the opportunities in regional Western Australia to ensure that we can grow the resources sector and tourism. We need to improve our port infrastructure in regional Western Australia. I do not know why the government needs to rush this legislation through the Parliament. This piece of legislation has significant flaws. As has been indicated by the Liberal Party, and also by me on behalf of the Nationals WA, we will not be supporting this legislation in the other place. This piece of legislation, albeit just three pages long, has caused major division, not only in the community and the transport and logistics industry, but also internally in the Labor Party. What the government is proposing in this legislation is not popular. It is not right. It will not get through the other place. I urge the crossbench members to reflect on this extremely important piece of legislation. This legislation needs to be defeated. We need to apply some commonsense and come up with a plan for transport logistics in Western Australia that will maximise the opportunity for growth outside the Perth metropolitan region. We need to look to the regions to provide a solution when Fremantle port reaches capacity in 20 to 25 years. The government and the Minister for Transport need to reflect on the fact that this bill will not get past the other house.

What are the government's options? We on this side will be happy to take this to the people of Western Australia as an election issue. The Perth Freight Link makes commonsense. It will meet the needs of the people of Western Australia. It will help reduce congestion and danger on Roe Highway. It will provide an action plan for our regional port infrastructure into the future. If the government has \$6 billion or \$10 billion that is burning a hole in its back pocket, it should use that money to grow our regional ports and help bring transport infrastructure closer to where it is needed. There has been talk about a container port in the north of Western Australia, whether at Karratha or Port Hedland. It is crazy that cargo ships travel down the coast and past the north west of this state to the port of Fremantle, and that cargo is then trucked back up north. It makes sense to either develop Anketell port at Karratha or look at ways of expanding Port Hedland port. Geraldton port provides a great opportunity to access the midwest. We need to ensure that the materials and infrastructure needed by resource companies and the community are in people's backyards, not hundreds or thousands of kilometres away.

As I said, this is a flawed bill that does not protect the environment. The environmental outcome from the Perth Freight Link is much better than this outcome, because the other options that the government is looking at are just not realistic, and will never happen. To quote Seinfeld, this is about nothing.

Mr D.R. Michael: You want to build the road to nowhere.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Mr V.A. CATANIA: This is about nothing. When we look at who is left in the room here, where is Costanza? There he is, sitting over there. I am looking for Kramer but I do not believe he is here at the moment. It is clear that this is an episode about nothing.

Mr M.P. Murray: If you'd stayed on this side, you might have had some influence, but by being over that side, you're hopeless.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: What was that? This actually affects the member for Collie–Preston's patch, and he should be advocating for Bunbury port to be expanded to cater for future growth and new industries. I know that he has been advocating to get rid of the coal industry in his patch, because that is the Labor Party's policy, but how about advocating for the expansion of Bunbury port to look at new industries to cater for the electorate of Collie–Preston?

We can keep going and rehashing, but I just want to say this: the National Party does not support this bill. We asked from the outset whether the government is serious about looking at Perth's infrastructure needs, as the Premier said when he was Leader of the Opposition —

An independent advisory body, Infrastructure WA, will report on all major projects. Projects costing more than \$100million will be subject to a transparent cost–benefit analysis.

This is why people have trouble with politicians, because they say one thing and do another, and that is what this Premier has done.

Mr M.P. Murray: At least he didn't swap sides. What a person to say that—you of all people! You swapped sides. What's the difference?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: The difference is that I actually delivered for my community, as I said I would. As a Labor member, I said that I would do X, Y Z, but I could not do it as a Labor member, so I did it as a National Party member, and it delivered that X, Y, Z. That is the difference. The Premier said one thing —

Mr M.P. Murray: It is a pack of lies. You never had the ticker.

Mr V.A. CATANIA: I know that the member for Collie–Preston wanted to come across back then as well, but he said that he was too old. Maybe he is too old now. There is a spare seat behind me—come across, because I know you want to! I do not have much time left, but it is great to see the member for Collie–Preston still in the chamber at this time of night.

As I said, this measure should have gone through Infrastructure Western Australia. We moved that motion last year, and we are sticking by it, because if we want to be open and transparent —

Mr D.A. Templeman: How's that other motion you had?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: There is Costanza! I knew he would pop up. There he is. He can start talking to Elaine there, next to him. As I said, it is an episode about nothing, and that is what we have in this bill. The way to keep everyone in this chamber happy, and perhaps have some opportunity of getting this bill through the other place, is to refer it to Infrastructure WA. How about that? I will give the government an opportunity. If it refers the bill to Infrastructure Western Australia, perhaps we will pass it through this place and then it can go to the other house, and perhaps the other place can consider it after the report has been handed down to see whether this really is transparent and whether this really is about ensuring that a cost–benefit analysis has been achieved. Then everyone could see whether this is the best way forward for the taxpayers of Western Australia, for our imports and exports, for people who utilise Roe Highway and for our heavy haulage. Let us do something that the government is not very good at—look to regional Western Australia for the answer to future growth needs of this state and our ports. Let us look to regional WA as an answer, in time, once Fremantle port reaches its capacity, of which only one-third is being met at the moment. It is commonsense. This side is all about commonsense. I challenge the government to put this bill through Infrastructure WA and then we can have a real debate about whether it is good value for the taxpayer.

MRS L.M. O'MALLEY (Bicton) [7.15 pm] In adding my contribution to the third reading debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018, I will do what members opposite have failed to do so far—speak to the bill. In particular, I will refer to page 2, clause 4(1) under “Metropolitan Region Scheme amended”, which reads —

The Metropolitan Region Scheme is amended by reserving the land shaded dark green on the Plan as “Parks and Recreation”.

Before I go on to expand on clause 4(1) and speak further on what this bill is about, I will first outline what this bill is not about. This bill is not about Roe 8, Roe 9, the failed Perth Freight Link or the opposition's obsession with toll roads, and it is not about the outer harbor. This is about an act to amend the metropolitan region scheme to change the reservation of certain land in the Beeliar wetlands and for related purposes. This bill recognises the environmental, cultural and social significance of one of the few remaining remnant wetlands of the Swan coastal

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 27 August 2019]

p5954b-5983a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

plain. Much has been spoken of in both second and third reading contributions about the environment within the area of wetlands that this bill aims to protect. This bill is focused exclusively on the issue of wetlands protection.

I would like to assist members opposite in their understanding of this bill by providing the following definition. Wetlands are areas where water covers the soil, or is present either at or near the surface of the soil all year or for varying periods during the year, including during the growing season. Wetlands are not static things; they are living, breathing changeable environments and, yes, member for Cottesloe—although he is absent, I would still like to make this statement—sometimes they are dry. Any loss of any wetland can have devastating effects, as highlighted in the following extract from the Cockburn Wetlands Education Centre's website —

The Beeliiar Wetlands is the name given to the two chains of wetlands that run parallel to the west coast of Western Australia. While one chain of lakes is saline, the other is freshwater. The wetlands are located towards the southwest portion of metropolitan Perth within the larger Beeliiar Regional Park.

The wetlands on the Swan Coastal Plain and in particular the Beeliiar Wetlands are a surface expression of the underlying groundwater. There is still much to be learnt about the effects of climate change on our wetlands. What the data shows us is that for about the last 40 years we have been receiving less rain.

Members opposite remind us, falsely, as it turns out, that only a small portion of wetlands would be impacted should Roe 8 progress. My point is that even if a very small percentage of the wetlands will be impacted, it will have devastating effects across the broader chain. The website continues —

Groundwater levels have never been static, decreasing during summer and increasing when recharged with winter rain as water makes its way through the soil to groundwater. With decreasing rainfall, the groundwater recharge has decreased and levels have dropped. Together with the decreasing recharge, there has also been incessant removal of groundwater to supplement our supply of drinking water.

Although some may look at the wetlands of Beeliiar in isolation, we should not do that. They are part of a very important environmental, social and cultural chain throughout the whole Swan coastal plain on which we all rely very heavily for our drinking water in light of the considerable impact of our drying climate.

In most cases, this has led to our wetlands drying out more often or for prolonged periods each year. However, bear in mind that a drying wetland is natural and it is during the drying times that the intrepid birds fly in from Siberia to eat the bugs out of the mud. It is tricky business and, honestly, none of us has the whole story. The unpredictable changes in the lakes due to drying and filling have also complicated our revegetation efforts. Although, in general, we are allowing for increased dry conditions and adjusting the zones in which we plant, on several occasions we have been caught with heavy summer and spring rains inundating some areas. These conditions highlight the need for adaptive management.

I would like to speak briefly to the 10-year management plan. I had the absolute pleasure to chair the rehabilitating Roe 8 working group, which brought together community members; people from Main Roads Western Australia; and me, representing government and other agencies. We worked for months and months to come up with an adaptive management plan to rehabilitate the Beeliiar wetlands areas that were devastated prior to the election. It is incredibly important that although in the scheme of things some might say it is a reasonably small percentage, it is an absolutely vital part of the chain that I referred to earlier.

Not only the wetlands and wetland vegetation are affected by the lowering watertable, but also many of our bushland features depend on groundwater for survival. Changes in global climate may well be a contributing factor to lower groundwater levels. However—this is the important bit, people; it is a shame there are not many members opposite to hear this—healthy, well-maintained wetlands can also be a key tool in our efforts to lessen the impact of climate change on other systems. One of the systems reliant on the health of wetlands and other environmental areas is our own system of humanity. We rely greatly on every aspect of our natural environment. We will take a closer look at the Beeliiar wetlands and how climate change has impacted some of the wetland functions. The hydrology is changing. The Beeliiar wetlands depend on seasonal rain to recharge. Over the years, the amount of precipitation has fluctuated, which has caused alterations in wetlands, which impacts the distribution of native plant species within the wetlands.

I refer to the loss of biodiversity, which is incredibly important. It is absolutely horrifying to hear members opposite denigrate that area and devalue it by saying that it is simply a wasteland. That is the way they have referred to Horse Paddock Swamp. There is an incredible amount of biodiversity in that very small area. I urge members to go down to the wetlands, walk through the area and have a good look at what is there, what was lost and what is now regenerating.

On carbon loss, many of the wetlands are experiencing a dry spell and territorialisation. Carbon trapped within the soil is released back into the atmosphere. There is further loss of capacity to capture and trap carbon in the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

atmosphere due to the growing number of dysfunctional and degraded wetlands. I think we have heard a few times that our bushland and wetlands are like the lungs of the earth that help us to continue to exist on this land. Members opposite have talked about the ability of the natural environment to continually adapt, but it cannot do that. At some time, we will suffer the inevitable consequences of that approach.

This Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill will protect this area now and into the future for generations. It will protect the vital east–west flora and fauna corridor and create important and sustainable parkland. That is what this is about. Great attempts have been made to move away from the purpose of the bill, but its purpose is very simple; it is about creating parkland and a recreation reserve forever.

Clause 4(1) will enable the creation of this corridor, an important piece of natural infrastructure endorsed by the peak local community group, the Cockburn Community Wildlife Corridor group. The corridor group sees itself as a vital avenue through which this east–west corridor can be realised. The broader vision is for that important corridor. It is referred to as the waves to the wetland in its entirety. It will take a long time to get there but these are very passionate and committed people. It could become the Kings Park of the south. It is a big and important vision. In creating this parkland under this bill, we can realise some of the cultural significance. There are definitely plans for recognition of local Aboriginal culture within the space. The need for pathways for cycling and walking is recognised. Passive and active recreation could also be realised through the creation of this parkland. Basically, the corridor group sees this as becoming a link between the Fremantle coast and Bibra Lake and that there be important and sustainable areas of natural bushland and parks that form this beautiful corridor. It is home to the majestic Carnaby's black-cockatoo, shy bandicoots and stunning flowers. The corridor is nestled within the urban environment alongside homes and existing roads. Another really important aspect of sustainable natural bushland is the links that are created around homes and where people reside and recreate. It creates a great sense of ownership and respect for that area when it is connected in and near homes, schools and the like, so it is incredibly important.

I also want to refer to previous speakers' references to environmental offsets. Another thing that makes me quite agitated is the flippant reference such as, "It's okay if we build this road, there'll be an offset." I have an extract from the *Elsevier Biological Conservation Journal Homepage*, which refers to environmental offsets and states, in part —

Environmental offsets are used increasingly as a conservation tool to balance demands of development and environment but there is little evidence that offsets are effective. Our study assessed the effectiveness of the offset package developed for the Roe Highway Extension, in Western Australia, for Carnaby's black cockatoo, red-tailed black cockatoo and southern brown bandicoot. Black cockatoos were accounted for in the offset requirements, while Southern brown bandicoots were accounted for in the mitigation requirements of the approval but not the offset requirements. The development was cancelled after partial clearing and has not been completed. Pre-development consultant surveys were examined in relation to the offset requirements ... The offset sites provided 64% of the black cockatoo habitat required by the Commonwealth offset requirements, and were of a lower quality. Similarly, undergrowth vegetation ... varied between the development and offset sites, indicating the offset proposal approval criteria 'similar or better quality' was not met.

I have a longstanding vision of someone dressed in a Carnaby's black-cockatoo costume at a Roe 8 site during a protest. He was holding a sign that pretty much said it all with the words, "Please point me to my offset". How would a living creature know which way to go to ensure that they were protected?

I have another vision that will always be in my mind. When I was campaigning in a park in Melville in the lead-up to the election, we saw a mob of black cockatoos in one of the trees before we headed off to do some doorknocking. It was such an incredible sight but it was really traumatic because those birds should not have been there. They should have been in Beeliar, because that is where they were meant to be. They were starving in Bicton because there was no habitat for them where they were supposed to be. They were coming to Bicton and shredding cape lilacs and other trees because there was no forage where they should have been.

It goes without saying that I am incredibly supportive of this bill and really proud to see it come into this house. I look forward to its transition. I look forward to the sensible members on the crossbench supporting the bill in the upper house.

MR T.J. HEALY (Southern River) [7.30 pm]: I wish to make a very short contribution to the debate. I will be casting my vote with the ayes to approve the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. Earlier today the Leader of the Opposition very kindly asked me to make a contribution to this debate. During the third reading, I am absolutely happy to discuss why this bill is important. At the last election, through this bill and through this Parliament, Western Australia has continued to say no to the toll road that would have been the Roe 8, 9 and 10 unicorn plan or fantasy land of the Liberal Party to fix all the road problems throughout Western Australia.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

We have been through hours of Liberal Party filibustering. We have been through the first and second readings and the consideration in detail stage. It was wonderful to hear the member for Riverton argue his points on this matter as the lead speaker for the Liberal opposition. As many members would know, the member for Churchlands is a former teacher of mine. I would like to acknowledge former students of the member for Churchlands in the Speaker's gallery, who are listening to this debate tonight. All the debates have focused on the fact that at the last election we promised not to build this road. The opposition is unhappy that we are keeping our promise. Members should remember that it was going to be a toll road. My community of Southern River has to use Roe Highway. We did not want it to be a toll road. We also said that if the Liberal and National Parties won the election, they would have started building it. It would have taken three to four years. Roe 9 was potentially unfunded and unplanned. Maybe that would have taken another four to five years to build. Roe 10 was going to include either a bridge or a tunnel—we still do not know which. We are talking about significant amounts of time. Is Leach Highway a congested, busy road? Yes, it is. Is Roe Highway a nice road? Yes, it is. I remember when Roe 7 was built. It changed my life. It was great. Unfortunately, if a toll road had been created, we would have spent 15 years building a road to nowhere. If it had all been done at once, perhaps it would be different. If the opposition had said that it would not be a toll road, perhaps it would be different. Its own research showed that it would not take trucks off the road.

The \$1.2 billion of federal money—this mystical money that the opposition says is available—is not available. It is to be used on certain projects. Let us spend it on regional roads. We have said that there are dangerous roads in our community. If \$1.2 billion is available to be spent on roads, let us spend it in the electorates of the members for Roe and Geraldton. The Labor Party has the most country members of Parliament. We are very happy, including the member for Mandurah—the semiurban rural member—to spend the money in rural Mandurah. The member for Baldivis also represents a regional area. We are happy to spend the money in those areas. Please tell Ben Morton not to progress the plan if it is a toll road and if it will take so long, and simply say, “If there is \$1.2 billion, we are happy to spend it on regional roads.” On behalf of the people in my suburbs of Canning Vale, Huntingdale, Southern River and Gosnells, we continue to say no to the toll road. Thank you very much, Acting Speaker.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [7.34 pm] — in reply: I rise to conclude the debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. I thank everyone for their contributions. I have listened intently this afternoon. I have written notes and I will be responding to many of the issues that were raised. I thank the member for Bicton for her contribution and her commitment to her community, which is profound and deep. I think she represents her community well every time she speaks in this place, given her knowledge of the issue, her first-hand experience and her connection with her local community.

I want to address some of the issues that were raised this afternoon. Some of the members who raised those issues are not here; they are obviously in the dining room. A number of interesting points were made this evening. The member for Riverton rang the conservation commission and asked why it did not oppose Metronet, which is an interesting thing for the member for Riverton —

Dr M.D. Nahan: The Conservation Council.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sorry; the Conservation Council of Western Australia. He rang up and said, “Why didn't you oppose the Metronet project?”

Dr M.D. Nahan: No, I didn't.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Pardon?

Dr M.D. Nahan: I asked them whether they made a submission to the EPA.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Somehow the member for Riverton is out there trying to stop Metronet projects. That is what he was doing. He was trying to create agitation. It was a bizarre thing to do.

Dr M.D. Nahan: That's the problem, minister; you can't tell the truth.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I ask you to withdraw, member.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The comments made by the member for Riverton are not appropriate and he should withdraw. He is impugning the character of the minister.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Member for Riverton, I will have to ask you to withdraw those comments.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I withdraw it and ask her now to start telling the truth.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

The ACTING SPEAKER: No. Just withdraw.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It has taken one minute for the member for Riverton to lose his cool again on this project.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Can we move on.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. I am just going through the claim made by the member for Riverton during his speech on the third reading. He rang the Conservation Council and said, "Why didn't you oppose the Metronet project?" That is what the member for Riverton is up to now.

Point of Order

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I believe the minister is verballing and making stuff up. She is not actually going by the correct version of *Hansard*, and she should not be misleading Parliament or Hansard.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Under what section, please?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Minister, it is not necessary to provide a reference in the standing orders.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Given the number of claims and accusations made by speakers on the other side, which I sat and listened to—I think I interjected a little on the member for North West Central —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Will you stop verballing.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will not verbal. I interjected. I do not think I interjected on the Liberal Party speakers much at all.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: You did quite a bit. You did a bit on the member for Cottesloe.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Probably less than the member for Darling Range has already done in my first two minutes.

We heard about the Leader of the Opposition working with the Fish Army, which I was a bit surprised by. The Leader of the Opposition is working with the Fish Army on this issue. She knows them well, and works with them. I am sure she did not mean to say it, but I understand that this group has links with the Maritime Union of Australia and has also tried to infiltrate the Labor Party in the past couple of weeks.

Dr M.D. Nahan: I thought the MUA was part of the Labor Party.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Listen to what I am saying about the Fish Army. Is the member for Riverton working hand in glove with the Fish Army?

Dr M.D. Nahan: You just continue.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are you, member for Riverton?

Dr M.D. Nahan: They are part of the Labor Party.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are you, member for Riverton?

Dr M.D. Nahan: The MUA is a central part of the Labor Party.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because now we get a bit more of an insight into what is happening on that side. One of the worst claims made by the member for Cottesloe was that people will die. I have heard people stand in this place and say that on a number of issues—people will die in bushfires and on the roads. As I have said before, every month there are a number of deaths on regional and metro roads. Some of those road improvements have been on drawing boards for a number of years. The previous government did not deliver them. When someone dies on those roads, do I say that it is due to the Liberal Party? Do I say that? Of course not. It was absolutely disgraceful for the member for Cottesloe to say that people will die. The former government promised to build the Ellenbrook rail line. When anyone dies on those roads leading up to Ellenbrook, do I say, "It's because the Ellenbrook rail line wasn't built"? Of course not. It was a disgraceful thing to say.

Regarding the cycling community, we know what happened with Grant Street, which is in the electorate of Cottesloe. The previous government ignored it. I have never made accusations about who is accountable for people dying in that circumstance. It is disgraceful to say that people will die and I will be responsible. On every road where people die as a result of road accidents, I do not say it is because the Liberal Party did not fix that road in its eight and a half years in government. It was a disgraceful, gutter accusation to make. I actually think that the

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

member for Cottesloe is not in touch with modern society and modern community. He is stuck in the 1960s. It was absolutely disgraceful.

I will go through the member for Cottesloe's contribution. I wish he were here. He claimed that tunnels are somehow low-cost alternatives. On what planet does the member for Cottesloe reside?

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is, again, the hypocrisy of members on the other side: they do not care about the environment unless it is in their electorate. We are building a bike path in Cottesloe. When I was in Cottesloe, the member for Cottesloe came up to me and asked, "Have you spoken to the Friends of Mosman Park about that future bike path?" The Friends of Mosman Park are concerned about the bike path adjacent to the rail line. I understand their concerns, but why would the member for Cottesloe mention the greenery that is where we are going to build a bike path but he does not care about the Beeliar wetlands? Members opposite opposed the wave park, as the member for Bicton did, but she has been consistent in her opposition—it was because of amenity. Members opposite opposed a wave park. Why?

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: My understanding is that the third reading needs to stick to the elements of the bill. Mr Acting Speaker, I would ask that you redirect the minister accordingly.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Thank you, member for Wanneroo!

Within certain boundaries, you can address the comments that were made, but the minister's focus should be on the bill.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. The member for Cottesloe is concerned about the bushland that will have to be removed to build a bike path, but he does not care about the Beeliar wetlands. He said, "It's fine to destroy the Beeliar wetlands but you've got to be careful about this bushland." Members opposite opposed a wave park. Why? Because it would affect the amenity of their local community.

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: I do not remember anybody from this side of the house mentioning the wave park. It has nothing to do with the bill, which is about the Beeliar wetlands. In accordance with what has occurred all afternoon about redirecting members to the elements of the bill, I request that the minister be told to do the same.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): I will repeat: you may address the comments that people made when they were addressing the bill, but your main focus in the third reading should be on the bill itself.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure. I know there will be some sensitivity because people opposed that, but were happy to support Roe 8 and Roe 9 through the wetlands.

The member for Cottesloe said tunnels are a low-cost solution. Another view from the other side—I think the member for North West Central also raised this—was that keeping Fremantle growing exponentially forever is similar to a no-cost solution. As described in the *Westport Beacon*, the reality is that it will cost between \$7 billion and \$8 billion. In all this debate, the Liberal Party is still circa 2000 and I do not know what year, but it has not used facts in its analysis. Its whole idea is that somehow Fremantle port expanding forever is a no-cost solution, that no infrastructure upgrades would be needed in the port, and that birds and other things would not be impacted. It is absolutely false that it would not impact on North Fremantle in any way. The report shows that direct road links, together with associated infrastructure at the port, together with the other road links, would cost up to \$7 billion or \$8 billion. The Liberal Party's plan is to spend \$7 billion to \$8 billion on Fremantle. We have an alternative plan, and that is the outer harbour. That work is being undertaken at the moment.

I want to address the cost. The member for Cottesloe also said that Roe 8 would have cost \$1.2 billion and that Roe 9 would go to the port. Again, that is absolutely wrong. It shows a lack of understanding of what is before the Liberal Party and the policy it adopted. Roe 9 would not have gone to the port; it would have gone on the other side —

Mr D.C. Nalder: It joins up to Stirling Highway. It is what we have always said.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It does not reach the port.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Mr D.C. Nalder: It joins Stirling Highway.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am addressing the member for Cottesloe's comments, member for Bateman.

Mr D.C. Nalder: It does reach the port.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Roe 9 does not reach the port.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members! In general, the minister did hear other people in silence. I would appreciate it if you could do the same.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Roe 9 does not reach the port. Members opposite cannot be convinced about that. It will involve a new Stirling Highway bridge and either —

Mr D.C. Nalder: It needs it irrespective of the port. The bridge is needed for cars. Check with Main Roads.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: What was your plan?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Check with Main Roads.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I actually checked with Main Roads. Was your plan to tunnel under the river?

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, it was not.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That was your plan.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, it was not.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was. I checked the transport plan, member for Bateman.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Look in *Hansard*.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You know what Main Roads is saying: we need another river crossing between Fremantle and Perth. That is what you adopted in your transport plan.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No. You're talking now about Stock Road north. That has nothing to do with how you get into the port. It was duplication of the bridge. I am in *Hansard* as saying it. That was the plan.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are talking about commuter traffic. The commuter traffic is all about going east–west and accessing the other side of the river. Your plan was to tunnel under the river.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, it was not; it was duplication of the bridge. Go and check with Main Roads.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How much was duplication of the bridge going to cost? Is that something you are still committed to?

Mr D.C. Nalder: It is all in *Hansard*.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How much?

Mr D.C. Nalder: It was estimated at \$500 million. It was to widen the bridge and then tuck under Tydeman Road.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How much?

Mr D.C. Nalder: It was \$500 million.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So, \$500 million, member for Bicton—and, of course, all the trucks. Talking about those areas as well, all the trucks and impacts that would continue to have —

Mr D.C. Nalder: I also said it is required irrespective of the port.

Point of Order

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The minister is attempting to conclude the third reading debate but continues to be interrupted by the member for Bateman.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Point taken, Leader of the House. Minister, direct your comments directly to me so that you do not engage with opposition members.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sure, Mr Acting Speaker.

What the opposition is actually going to commit to is coming out now. As we continue to push this issue, we will see the cost of what it is proposing getting higher and higher. That is the reality.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Bateman, I will have to call you if you keep interjecting.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Now we are starting to acknowledge Roe 10, the third stage of the Perth Freight Link.

Another interesting thing that came out in the third reading debate was the Leader of the Opposition saying that the problem was that the Labor Party made the Perth Freight Link project all about freight. We did not call it the Perth Freight Link; it was all about freight because it was called the Perth Freight Link. The former government called the project the Perth Freight Link and then accused us of being misleading about it because we said it was all about freight, when it was called the Perth Freight Link and was based on a heavy user toll charge raking in, I understand, billions of dollars. That was proposed and that is exactly what Infrastructure Australia saw. If the opposition wants to give us the authority to look at that business case so we can double-check it, I am happy to do so.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You're talking about tolls. Are we going to get a debate about tolls?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, member. I do not think it is good to bring new arguments into the debate.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, now it has come out. There will be the duplication of Stirling Bridge and Curtin Avenue if Fremantle port is kept forever. I do not see why not; it is part of the plan. Why would there be a duplication of Stirling Bridge and not Curtin Avenue?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Have a look at the transport plan.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know about the transport plan. Would Curtin Avenue be duplicated if Fremantle port was going to be kept forever? I think the answer is yes.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The answer is yes. The member for Cottesloe needs to explain the duplication of Curtin Avenue to his community. He has to explain that.

I turn to the issue of reservations. I have gone through and asked more questions. Why did the Liberal Party reduce the reservation on Stirling Highway in the lead-up to the last election? Why did the Liberal Party do that? Why did it think it was okay to reduce the road reservation going through the western suburbs? Why did it not proceed with the Curtin Avenue duplication when it was funded in 2012? Why not? It is because it affected its constituents; that is why not. The Liberal Party reduced the Stirling Highway reservation of 80 metres. Why did it do that? Why did it take out that road reservation? It is because it affected its constituents. Why did the Liberal Party not proceed with Curtin Avenue, even though it was funded in the 2012 budget? It is because it affected its constituents.

The Liberal Party says it is pro-roads, but it did not build the roads it had funded and, of course, it never built Roe 8 and Roe 9. The Leader of the Opposition tried to give a history of how everyone else somehow was to blame for Roe 8 and Roe 9 not being built. The Leader of the Opposition said the Liberal Party was elected in 2008 and started planning, and in 2015 someone appealed something. What happened in those seven years? Why could the Liberal Party not progress it in seven years? We know it is because the then Premier did not see it as a priority. We know that is the case. In October 2013, Colin Barnett declared that the Roe Highway stage 8 extension would not be built in that term of government. The Liberal Party did not think it was a priority. The Leader of the Opposition tried to explain that in eight and a half years, everyone was blocking the government; there were appeals and there was this and that. The Liberal Party was elected in 2008 and the first time there was, in a sense, an appeal in that process was in 2015, so in seven years the Liberal government did not get on with it, but now the Liberal opposition says it is a massive priority.

I am glad that the Nationals WA stood up today, because there is apparently \$1.2 billion from the federal government sitting on the table. I say let us invest it now in the regional run-off-road crashes program. I heard the member for Pilbara advocating for that very strongly on radio in the north. He made really good points that were then, of course, backed up by some other key people in the region too. Everyone acknowledges that we are not building Roe 8 and Roe 9. The federal government has apparently given us that \$1.2 billion. Apparently, it is sitting there ready for something. Let us get on with it!

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Earning interest!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is earning interest! We will take the interest and spend it on regional roads. As I said, the regional run-off-road crashes program is a really good program for regional WA to reduce —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There is \$1.2 billion sitting there, member for Collie–Preston. Does the member for Collie–Preston think that that money could be spent on regional roads?

Mr M.P. Murray: Saving country lives.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Exactly! Therefore, I cannot believe the National Party says that it wants another metro road project that the Liberal Party says is not about freight anyway. That is the contradiction upon contradiction that is happening. Unfortunately, the member for Vasse is not here either.

Mr J.E. McGrath: She is on her way down. She has been in a meeting.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: She is here.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is she here?

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Like all your members are!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for Darling Range for a great contribution once again!

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are still looking! We are looking for our members, as we are looking for the member for Darling Range's Kalamunda small business. We are still looking for that Kalamunda small business. We are looking for that business that the member for Darling Range promoted. She said she ran a Kalamunda small business. When she was running for mayor, she promoted that she was running a Kalamunda small business.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are still looking for that one!

The member for Vasse basically said that Bussell Highway is going to be the number one priority. I am saying that there is \$1.2 billion on the table, so we could use some of that for the Bussell Highway duplication.

Mr M.P. Murray: That the member for Vasse did not advocate for before the last election.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Exactly, the one that she ignored when she was in government. Now there is \$1.2 billion on the table, let us spend that on Bussell Highway. Why would the member for Vasse not support that? We are not building Roe 8 and Roe 9; I think we have made that point pretty clear. We are doing these other initiatives that I will go through. Why would the member for Vasse not support that? Why would she not support regional roads spending? Why would we not use that money on regional roads? Does the member for Bunbury not think that we should use it for spending on regional roads? That \$1.2 billion could be spent on regional roads at the moment, could it not, member for Murray–Wellington?

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Cookernup!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Cookernup is doing very well!

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: For such a small population, so much is happening! It has got a postcode now! Got some other stuff.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It has a sign. First, it had a sign, now it has a postcode and soon it will have a new train station. Cookernup has advanced very, very far under this government!

But again, the opposition does not refer to anything we are doing—the enormous improvements we have had with freight on rail, intermodal development, improvements to High Street and, of course, the plan we are undertaking for the outer harbour.

The opposition talks about the southern suburbs being ignored, member for Jandakot. He is not in his seat, and so he cannot respond, but I will just point to him generally anyway! How is that Armadale Road project going, member for Armadale?

Dr A.D. Buti: Brilliant, fantastic!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are about to start work on the Armadale Road–North Lake Road bridge, too, member for Jandakot.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Jandakot cannot speak, but the member for Armadale said it is great; it is fantastic. There is Karel Avenue. I remember the infamous day. That is the third infamous day I have had with federal politicians on the side of the road. Karel Avenue is a great project. It is a huge bottleneck and we are fixing it.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am just talking about the southern suburbs at the moment. I will be hitting the north very soon.

In the southern suburbs, where the opposition says we are not doing anything, we are probably doing the most, with freeway widenings and the smart freeway project—the list goes on.

Member for Wanneroo, the work on the widening has been finished and the two interchanges, which —

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: I have tolerated this for as long as I could, but this has got —

Several members interjected.

Mr D.C. NALDER: This is a point of order. It should be heard in silence. We have gone well beyond the bill, which is about the Beeliar wetlands. I have given the minister a lot of leniency, but we are now hearing about Wanneroo, which is nowhere near the Beeliar wetlands.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): There is no point of order, but, minister, I draw you back to the bill, thank you.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is about a direct comment made by the member for Vasse, who said, “We do things. We build things. The other side stops doing things.” She is saying that we should stop a project that is under construction—that is, the Wanneroo Road–Joondalup Drive overpass now. The member for Vasse stood next to a potential mayoral candidate and said that we should “end this destructive program that no-one wants”. That is what the opposition said about a road project in the northern suburbs. It is interesting, is it not? It shows the hypocrisy of members on the other side. We had a plan, took it to the election and are now implementing it.

We have road projects across the state and a real plan to deal with freight going into Fremantle. That is what we are on about. Let us look at the timing of what is happening and some advertising in local papers. This is all about the Melville council elections and Liberal Party members making sure that their mate gets re-elected. That is all it is. The timing is incredible. The move that they are trying in Wanneroo —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, I draw you back to the bill, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We want to save the Beeliar wetlands. We are doing that while members of the Liberal Party are campaigning for their council mates to become mayors across the suburbs. They used Wanneroo Road as a platform, but this is an example that is all about the council elections —

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: Mr Acting Speaker, you have asked her to come back to the bill. I point out that this bill has nothing to do with council elections.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney): Minister, I once again bring you back to the bill, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Cockburn council is being very supportive of this process.

Mr D.C. NALDER: We are still hearing about councils. You have requested and I ask that —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, the bill is not about local government. It is about the Beeliar wetlands. I ask you to come back to the Beeliar wetlands.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am saying that the Cockburn council is working with us on the Roe 9 reservation and is very supportive of the bill before us at the moment. I am saying that.

In relation to the Beeliar bill, the Cockburn council, which I know you guys are trying to manoeuvre to change, is very supportive of the approach.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Joe Francis for mayor!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Joe Francis for mayor? That is interesting

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

The ACTING SPEAKER: That certainly stopped the debate, did it not?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Information from the other side is coming out! Members may have missed it, but the member for Riverton rang the Conservation Council of Western Australia and asked why it did not oppose Metronet projects, and the Leader of the Opposition is working with the Fish Army on some issues. I want to say that what is happening to the member for Bicton on social media right now is disgraceful.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Has the member for Riverton seen what is happening to the member for Bicton?

Dr M.D. Nahan: I have seen what you do.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton should not ridicule that if he does not know what he is talking about. Does he condone someone's family being used?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Does the member for Riverton support a member's family being used in a fake social media account? Does the member for Riverton support this grubby and dirty little project?

Point of Order

Mr D.C. NALDER: I ask that the minister come back to the bill. It is about the Beeliar wetlands and she keeps going way off track.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr R.S. Love): Members! I have not yet ruled on the point of order. As to the point of order, minister, could you bring your contribution back to the bill itself.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Bicton spoke on this bill and is a key supporter of this bill. She and her family are now being attacked on social media because of her support for the Beeliar wetlands. That is disgraceful.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you to order for the second time.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think the member should check who is linked to that page and should reflect on his support for that type of attack on the member for Bicton.

This is a bill about Western Australia's future. It supports the preservation of the wetlands. It is consistent with our election commitment and delivers on it. We are keeping our promise to all those people who trusted us to preserve the wetlands and develop a freight and trade future for Western Australia.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr R.S. Love) casting his vote with the noes, with the following result —

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 27 August 2019]
p5954b-5983a

Ms Rita Saffioti; Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Mr Vincent Catania;
Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Terry Healy

Ayes (31)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Mr J.N. Carey
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke
Mr M.J. Folkard
Ms J.M. Freeman
Mr T.J. Healy
Mr W.J. Johnston

Mr D.J. Kelly
Mr F.M. Logan
Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr K.J.J. Michel
Mr S.A. Millman
Mr Y. Mubarakai
Mr M.P. Murray
Mrs L.M. O'Malley

Mr S.J. Price
Mr D.T. Punch
Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms C.M. Rowe
Ms R. Saffioti
Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski

Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms S.E. Winton
Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr D.R. Michael (*Teller*)

Noes (19)

Mr I.C. Blayney
Mr V.A. Catania
Ms M.J. Davies
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Dr D.J. Honey

Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr S.K. L'Estrange
Mr R.S. Love

Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr J.E. McGrath
Ms L. Mettam
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder

Mr K. O'Donnell
Mr D.T. Redman
Mr P.J. Rundle
Mrs A.K. Hayden (*Teller*)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 8.09 pm
