

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME (BEELIAR WETLANDS) BILL 2018

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from 27 June.

Clause 2: Commencement —

Debate was adjourned on the following amendment moved by Mrs L.M. Harvey (Leader of the Opposition) —

Page 2, before line 5 — To insert —

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

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I want to follow up on a promise that the minister made when we last debated this bill. Clause 2 deals with commencement and royal assent. The origin of this is that the government decided not to go through the normal metropolitan region scheme processes. The second reading speech says the government decided not to do that because it is in a big hurry. The normal process takes about 24 months. The government wants to expedite the excision through a bill here so as not to take so much time. We have asked the minister to please tell us the reason for the hurry. Why are we in such a great hurry to throw away a long-established process for planning and go through a separate process? I might add that when the government excised the Fremantle eastern bypass, it went through the established metropolitan region scheme process. It went out and asked everyone who was impacted by the proposed changes about it and they had input into it. This time, the government is trying to circumvent that process. The second reading speech states that is because it can get it done quicker. The minister has not addressed the reason for the haste. The problem is that this haste stops and prevents people being brought into the process, whether they are people with a longstanding concern about excising it or people with new information that has arisen since then. We are not talking about any process. Planning is a very important long-term process. Plans are made, especially on road reserves, and society makes investments and decisions based upon those plans. If plans can be ripped up by a government that is avoiding adequate scrutiny, without taking into consideration additional information, it undermines the whole planning process. That is why this state has evolved, through its metropolitan region amendment process, a public consultation process. This bill will essentially rip that up. The reason is that the government is in a hurry. The process would normally take two years, but the government thinks it can ram this bill through Parliament because it has the numbers in this house. We will see what happens in the other place. Why is the government in such a hurry?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have a couple of things to say. We are not ramming it through the house. We have had a number of hours—I think over 11 so far. The opposition has proposed amendments without any prior notification, which is what it just did a whole suspension of standing orders on—the minister putting forward an amendment without prior notification. Yet the opposition has done it again and again. As I recall, the proposed amendments were scribbled on a bit of paper.

Mr W.R. Marmion: So what?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The opposition just did a whole suspension of standing orders —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am not interjecting on the member. I know the member for Nedlands is a little sensitive about the Lily Chen issue.

Mr W.R. Marmion: Who is she?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Who is she? She was a Liberal candidate at the last election!

Mr W.R. Marmion: Not in Nedlands.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is the member saying he does not know who Lily Chen is? Is that what the member is saying?

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is the member saying he does not know Lily Chen?

Mr W.R. Marmion: You're saying that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, no. I said, "Lily Chen"; you said, "Who is she?" That is what the member said. So the member is sitting here saying that he does not know who the Liberal candidate —

Mr W.R. Marmion: This is so relevant!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member is interjecting on me. I had started to address the issue and the member interjected. Let us go through it. It was an election commitment to keep this area for future generations. In case members opposite do not realise, families are out there every weekend planting along the corridor. People are volunteering their time. Members opposite might try to classify everyone who cares about the Beeliar wetlands as being on the fringe of society—that is what the Liberal Party does—but they are not on the fringe of society. Normal everyday families are participating in a community event by going out on weekends to replant. I want to give them some certainty. That is my plan. The opposition has an alternative plan; I understand that. We will take this issue again to the next election. Then, whatever happens, you guys get to implement your plan or we get to implement ours. Our plan is to preserve the area and allow these people to replant with the knowledge that there is some certainty for the future. That is what we are doing. We are not doing it in haste. As I said, I think we have been on this bill for over 11 hours. If members want to look at the content of the debate and the conduct that opposition members have shown in Parliament, that will relay how they have handled this legislation in the first few hours of debate. In 11 hours, the opposition has put forward a number of amendments, written on the back of a bit of paper, without any prior notice. That is what it just did the whole suspension of standing orders on. This is our plan. If the Liberal Party does not like it, we understand that. It does not have to like it. The Labor Party did not like a lot of things that the Liberal Party did when it was in government. We are a democratically elected government implementing a policy that we took to the election. If we had taken the opposite to the election, I could understand the shock and horror. If we did not make it clear at the election, I could have understood it, but this is something we made clear at the election. It is our plan. The Liberal Party has an alternative plan. If it wins the next election, it can rip this bill up and do it all over again. That is its prerogative. That is what the Liberal Party can do if it wins control of both sides of Parliament. This is our plan and we want to get on with it.

Ms L. METTAM: I have a further question regarding the process that has been undertaken. The government not following due process is an extraordinary move by it and shows contempt of not only Parliament, but also the people of Western Australia. It is an extraordinary step to bypass the planning process—a process that would usually take a couple of years. It would involve a great deal of consultation with the community as opposed to just trying to appease Green minority groups. There is a very clear process. When the Labor Party was last in government and bypassed such a process, it created all sorts of problems. I refer to the eastern bypass. It basically created a different set of congestion issues.

I would like some further clarification of why this government is taking such extraordinary steps, particularly in light of the fact that the government has no clear plan to address the significant congestion issues in the south metro region—heavy vehicles and trucks—and how it would impact over 70 private properties. There is obviously a lot of concern amongst south west metro residents about road safety issues. This side of the house believes there is merit in going through a process. Not only is this government stopping the opportunity to utilise \$1.2 billion to invest in Roe 8 and Roe 9, but also it is stopping future governments from doing that. We would like to hear what the minister has to say about that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have been advised by the lawyer at the table that this bill is, in a sense, a higher order legislative process. Changing a planning scheme is a subsidiary legislative process. It is under existing legislation—there are no two ways about it. This is all allowed. The member asked a question. I would like her to sit down so I can answer it; otherwise, I will sit down.

Mr W.R. MARMION: This is an extraordinary step. I would like the minister to provide an answer to this question: on what other occasions has a bill been rushed through so that a matter does not go through the normal process? Can the minister provide historical examples of when this has happened? That will give us a benchmark to see the significance of this particular bill in relation to bills that have gone through similarly, and the significance of doing this. Clause 2 relates to timing. Why the rush? The government is trying to close off an option for the future. Even though the Labor Party may not want to build Roe 8 or Roe 9 now, in 50 years' time another transport mechanism might be needed. That reserve might be needed for a fast train—who knows what? All sorts of things might be needed.

Mr M. Hughes interjected.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am not taking interjections; I am talking to the minister.

Can the minister give us some past examples of this being done; that is, the MRA process has been obfuscated and a bill has gone through to change the zoning?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for that question. I had a discussion with my advisers at the table. There have been many examples of specific areas that the government of the day felt needed legislative instruments. In a sense, it provides a lot of scrutiny. To be honest, through this parliamentary process, it will probably get more scrutiny than other processes in the past. For example, the Hope Valley–Wattleup bill was a legislative mechanism—

understanding the special requirements of that area. The Swan Valley planning legislation that the previous government brought in—but then it ran out of time—and that we intend to bring in is specific legislation that deals with all the planning issues in that area. It is done through the legislative process, not through the MRA process. There have been examples over time. When we believe that an area requires special consideration, given the values it may represent to the economy and to the environment of Western Australia, and to Western Australian society because it is a special bill, this is a part of that.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Specifically I am interested in significant roads, like highways and freeway reserves, where we have actually gone backwards. I understand that what the minister just said is true, but can she provide us, on notice, with a list of examples? I am happy to keep it to just highways and freeways; not local roads, but basically significant main roads, and not just part of a main road because the road has been redesigned and we no longer need a ramp or whatever. I know there are a lot of little minor amendments, but I cannot believe that they would have gone through an act of Parliament anyway. Can the minister give the chamber examples of major road corridors that have been turned into reserves so that they are no longer road reserves, through an act of Parliament?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, I can, and I think it is one that the member as former Minister for Transport was involved in—the Stirling Highway corridor. The Stirling Highway corridor is a very key corridor in that area. The traffic statistics show that it is a heavily utilised corridor, primarily for cars, because the truck route is West Coast Highway and Curtin Avenue. The member’s government reduced the Stirling Highway corridor just before the last election.

Mr W.R. Marmion: Through an act of Parliament.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, through a metropolitan region scheme.

Mr W.R. Marmion: No, only through acts of Parliament. We’re not worried about an MRS.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member asked about key changes. His government rushed that through just before the election. Why would the Liberal Party want to reduce a road corridor through the western suburbs? Why would it want to do that? The former Minister for Transport would have been providing advice on that MRS at the time. Was it a wise thing to reduce that corridor on Stirling Highway? I cannot hear anything. The former Minister for Transport was very comfortable with the reduction of the reservation on Stirling Highway, which was rushed through before the election, but he is now saying, “Oh, you can’t take any other road reservations out.”

Let us go through the matter of Curtin Avenue, if the member wants to talk about road reservations and so forth. It is a clear issue that Roe 8 and 9 equals the duplication of Curtin Avenue. The Infrastructure Australia report that came out yesterday highlighted Curtin Avenue and West Coast Highway as major congestion spots by 2031. If we do not look at an outer harbour and keep Fremantle port indefinitely, we will need to duplicate Curtin Avenue through the western suburbs, and West Coast Highway will need major upgrades. That is the reality. With regard to road reservations, it is apparently okay for the Liberal Party to reduce road reservations through its suburbs, but it wants to make sure that other electorates end up with the roads. This has always been the issue with Roe 8 and 9. The Liberal Party never looked at it as a system-wide issue; it thinks it would be okay for all these cars and trucks to appear on Roe 8 and 9, which stops on the other side of the river from the port. The Stirling Highway bridge would have to be duplicated, and what impact would that have on East Fremantle and on Canning Highway? It is my understanding that we cannot do a grade-separated interchange on Canning Highway, so we would still have the traffic lights. We then have to look at the northern part as it goes north. The Liberal Party has never, ever explained properly to the community how it could keep Fremantle port forever without doing any other roads except Roe 8 and 9. We all know that Curtin Avenue would have to be duplicated; that is clear, and the voters of Cottesloe know that. They raised these issues with the Liberal Party before the 2017 election. That is why former Premier Colin Barnett was always sensitive on this issue, because he knew that Roe 8 and 9 would not be the only road required to keep Fremantle port forever; there are actually also other roads. That is fundamentally the problem that the Liberal Party cannot accept.

With regard to road reservations, I will say this again: we took this to the election. The opposition may not agree with it, and I understand that, but it had eight and a half years to build Roe 8 and 9 and it did not do it. We are a democratically elected government, implementing our election commitments. People threw the word “mandate” around a lot in respect of federal government taxation issues. It is ironic that I was standing there next to the federal member for Tangney. He talked about Roe 8 and 9 after talking about the issue of mandate in respect of taxation in the federal Parliament. We are implementing our election policy. We took this to the election, and we have the legislative instruments to do it. It has been done before for specific areas, and if we are talking about road reservations, the previous government reduced the size of Stirling Highway when the member was Minister for Transport.

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: I would like to hear more from the Minister for Transport.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5505b-5515a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Bill Marmion; Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Dr David Honey

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Nedlands as former Minister for Transport reduced that reservation. He was happy to reduce a road reservation in his electorate, but he is not happy about reducing road reservations in other electorates.

Mr W.R. MARMION: It was a very simple question. I just want the minister to give us some examples of road reserves that have changed through an act of Parliament. That is just one question—simple. If the minister does not know the answer, she should just tell us. If she can provide information in answer after this proceeding, it would be appreciated.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have outlined the cases —

Mr W.R. Marmion: You haven't said any—zero. You haven't given one.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: How is the member's relationship with Lily Chen? If the member wants to keep interjecting, I will ask him the questions I want to ask him. How many meetings were held by his office?

Point of Order

Ms L. METTAM: The minister is clearly not answering the question and there is an issue of relevance.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Thank you, member. There is no point of order.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: If the member for Nedlands is going to interject while I am on my feet to ask other questions, I will ask him the questions I want answers to.

Let us go through it again. There are specific examples of cases in which legislation has been passed to change reservations or planning schemes for intended land use. It is done for economic and environmental reasons, and that is the model we are following.

Mr W.R. MARMION: It is a very simple question. The minister is saying no road reserve has ever been put through an act of Parliament. It is simple; the minister can just give me an example. If she does not have any, she should just say that there is none.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Fremantle) Act 1994.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Can the minister outline some rationale around that act and why it was put through?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I believe it was 1994; we are just checking the date, and we will get back to the member after question time on the specific date, but I actually thought it was a 1994 act.

Ms L. METTAM: I am just touching on the comments made earlier that there was some consultation undertaken before the introduction of this bill. Last time during consideration in detail, the minister mentioned that she was going to provide some information on the consultation that took place before the introduction of the bill. Can the minister please outline what sort of consultation she has undertaken with the community, given that the government has quite clearly bypassed a process that could take up to two years and involve a process of advertising and discussion with the community.

We are just asking and following up from the question that the member for Riverton asked last time about what information has been provided.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I understand it, the targeted consultation was made with the City of Cockburn, City of Fremantle, City of Melville, the Western Australian Planning Commission, Main Roads and the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions. I would just like to read some notes about the history of the Fremantle eastern bypass. It was included in the metropolitan region scheme as a controlled access highway reservation in 1973. Kay Hallahan, the then Minister for Planning, wrote to the chairman of the State Planning Commission in 1990 directing that the Fremantle eastern bypass reservation be deleted from the MRS, but subsequently agreed to defer initiation of the amendment until traffic studies were completed. In November 1991, the State Planning Commission, in response to an August 1991 request by David Smith, Minister for Planning, resolved to proceed with the minor amendment to the MRS to delete the Fremantle eastern bypass. MRS amendment 880/33A became effective in October 1992. In 1993, the late Richard Lewis, then Minister for Planning, directed the State Planning Commission to reinstate the bypass in the MRS. Planning control area 26 was declared in April 1993 to once again protect the Fremantle eastern bypass alignment. The bypass was then reinstated in the MRS in September 1994 by the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Fremantle) Act 1994.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I thank that minister very much for that response. I think that clarified things. Can the minister also clarify whether all those amendments were done under the normal MRS procedure, or was there an act of Parliament?

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5505b-5515a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Bill Marmion; Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Dr David Honey

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, it was an act of Parliament. It was the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Fremantle) Act 1994. The then minister did a planning control area, which I have not done, but maybe I should have! A planning control area was done to stop all future decisions affecting the land—a minister is able to do that—and then legislation was brought in.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Really, the proposal here was to put off this decision to excise the land until we had some clarity about the outer harbour. When I asked a question about this issue yesterday, the minister and the Premier gave the clear impression that they were committed to the outer harbour. That is not how they have set up the Westport strategy, which was allocated \$20 million. Westport has published a number of documents and was recently, and maybe still is, consulting with the community. This is a useful process. There is a report due some time later. The information the chairman of the Westport Taskforce provided to the community states that a number of options are being looked at, including retention of the Fremantle port for the foreseeable future. If the government is pre-empting the Westport strategy, I would like to know, but right now we have no clear government position on the length of time Fremantle port will remain. We know, because the Westport strategy made it quite clear, that the port has decades of capacity. The issue is the transport links to it—whether rail or road when both are required. The question is: why is a right of way for Roe 8 being excised through this process when, according to the current strategy, Fremantle port might go on for decades? As the minister quite rightly said, if the port of Fremantle goes on for a long time, there will have to be a major expansion of the road network—and rail network, actually—to that port, both north and south, as it grows. The question with the amendment is: why is the government excising it before it has its strategy for the long-term future of both Fremantle port and the outer harbour? The other question is: is the government going to maintain Fremantle port while it builds the outer harbour and then replace Fremantle port with the outer harbour, or keep them both? Those are issues that the Westport strategy is looking at, and it has told my community and the minister's that that is what it is doing. Then the question is: when will we go to the outer harbour? It might be in 20 or 30 years. The question with the amendment is: why is the government making a decision that will curtail, contain and undermine the effectiveness of the port of Fremantle when it has not made a decision about its future? Indeed, there is a very expensive process underway to explore the future of the port of Fremantle. That is what this amendment addresses. Why is the government jumping the gun on excising this land when it has stated that it needs to do something like turning Leach Highway into a freeway or truck-way if it is going to keep the port of Fremantle and has made a decision on it? That is what this amendment deals with. What is the government's position on the port of Fremantle and the outer harbour?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton said something about me turning Leach Highway into a truck freeway, which is incorrect. I have never said that.

Dr M.D. Nahan: That is one of the options.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member said I would turn Leach Highway into a truck freeway.

Dr M.D. Nahan: No, I said turning it. That is one of the options of the strategy.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member said I was going to turn Leach Highway into truck freeway, which I am not. He asked what our plan was, and I have outlined it a number of times. The interesting thing he said was that he accepted that Roe 8–Roe 9 is not the only road that would need to be built to Fremantle port.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Roads will need to be expanded.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Like Curtin Avenue.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member! The minister has the call.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The reality is that Curtin Avenue could not stay as a single lane each way; it could not. The member has just accepted that in the debate. At last, the Liberal Party has started disclosing that although Roe 8–Roe 9 is a focus it wants to have because it assists the members for Riverton and Bateman —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Riverton, the minister is responding to your question.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In fact, Curtin Avenue would have to be made into a dual carriageway. That is what the member for Riverton —

Dr M.D. Nahan: No, I did not.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So, the member would not.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Bill Marmion; Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Dr David Honey

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Riverton, you will get your chance.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Riverton, you will get a chance to respond.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton said that he accepts that Roe 8–Roe 9 would not be the only roads that need to be expanded. The Liberal Party’s plan, which was obviously never told to anyone at the last election, would be a dual carriageway on Curtin Avenue and further traffic on West Coast Highway. That is what I understand is being acknowledged by the Liberal Party for the first time. I am not sure how the member for Vasse discusses these things in the party room, but I wonder whether she has told the member for Cottesloe what her position on Roe 8 means for the good people of Cottesloe. I do not think anyone told the member for Cottesloe what Roe 8–Roe 9 means for the good people of Cottesloe. I fear what it will do to that nice bike path we just built through the Cottesloe area. It is clear that the Liberal Party plan to keep Fremantle forever—I know “Freo Forever” is the tagline for the Dockers, so I do not want to confuse it!—would be to build Roe 8–Roe 9. Then another bridge would have to be built over Stirling Highway and there would be all these trucks collecting on the East Fremantle side of the river. An interchange could not be built there because of the proximity of Canning Highway to the river and all those businesses, unless we want to completely change the nature of Canning Highway for a few kilometres. All those trucks would be brought into East Fremantle. Then we would have to get over the river to get to the port. Then, of course, we would have to look at the other key routes, and those other key routes include, for example, Curtin Avenue. I ask the Liberal Party why it wants to bring all the traffic into the western suburbs and around Fremantle. It is clear that the eastern corridor is increasingly going to be the focus for freight and intermodal developments, with the development of intermodals, the development of the Tonkin Highway, the future Tonkin Highway extension down to Mundijong and the Tonkin Highway project up to Muchea. Why do members opposite insist on having a plan that will bring all the freight and trade into heavy residential areas that, frankly, were not planned to take this level of traffic into the future forever? Why would they do that? You guys want to talk about plans from the 1960s. There are lots of plans from the 1960s that we cannot keep going with because the community will not accept them. Member for Cottesloe, can I get on record that you were told that Roe 8 and 9 would include the duplication of Curtin Avenue? Did the member for Vasse tell the member for Cottesloe that Roe 8 and 9 would include the duplication of Curtin Avenue? Silence.

Dr M.D. Nahan: You made it. That’s your fabrication, not ours.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton stood and said that he understood that Roe 8 and 9 included a whole collection of other roads. He said that he understood it.

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: I would like to hear more from the minister, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: He understood that. I remember that he had \$40 million in the budget in 2013 to widen Curtin Avenue but did not proceed with it because—does he know what?—he did not want to build an expanded road through the western suburbs. That is the reality, so members opposite should not come in here and pretend they are pro roads and raise all the other issues. As I said, members opposite do not care about the environment because it is not in their electorate. That is the reality. The member for Cottesloe stood and talked about infill destroying trees, yet he stands up and says that we should not preserve the Beeliar wetlands. Members on his side are out there speaking against cutting down some trees in urban bushland but he is okay with this.

The member for Carine, who, unfortunately, is not here, was against a housing development on the old Carine TAFE site because it would mean there would be too many people and a loss of green space. It is quite hypocritical for members opposite to come in here and mock the people who want to protect the Beeliar wetlands—the good community who go out there. I see on Facebook all the time all the families and schools replanting the reservation. I want to give them some certainty; members opposite do not, as they have made clear. They can take it to the election and we will take our position to the election.

Talking about contempt of Parliament and contempt of the processes, this is getting to that point because members opposite have been asking the same question again and again, showing contempt for the WA public because we took this issue to the election, and contempt for the operations of this place.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister should show us her election commitment in which she promised to do what this Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill will do. She said she would rip up the contract, and she did that, but where did she promise a bill to excise a right of way? The point the minister has failed to answer was that if Fremantle port continues to operate forever, it will increase the number of cars passing by it and trucks going to it. That is a fact. We have asked the minister: what is the government’s plan for the port of Fremantle? I know the minister has an advisory board underway on Westport. It has told the community that there are many options, including keeping the port of Fremantle as the operating port for decades into the future. From looking at what the minister is doing, I understand she is still in decision mode on that. That is fair enough. Our question in relation to this amendment is: why now excise a right of way for a road that is absolutely essential if the port of Fremantle is

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5505b-5515a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Bill Marmion; Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Dr David Honey

to continue to operate and the Westport strategy indicates that the major inhibitor is the rail and road link and this is an essential piece of infrastructure needed if the Fremantle port is to continue as a port in the near future, for the next few decades or beyond? We ask the minister: What is the minister's strategy for the port of Fremantle? If there is none yet, why is she excising this land and preventing one of the options into the future?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think I have outlined our strategy a number of times, but let us go through it. It is to improve the traffic connections on High Street and Stirling Highway. It is to put more freight onto rail. As I have outlined on many occasions, rail freight went from 15 per cent when we won government to over 23 per cent. Our strategy is to support intermodals and to plan for an outer harbour, and that is what we are doing. We are implementing all our election commitments. When the member for Riverton asks what our commitment is for preserving the Beeliar wetlands, we probably told members hundreds of times throughout the election that we would preserve the Beeliar wetlands.

We can see how members opposite are running away from the Curtin Avenue issue. They come in here and say that we have to build Roe 8 and 9 because all the planning says we have to build it. The same planning that members opposite believe tells us to build Roe 8 and 9 says that we have to duplicate Curtin Avenue. That is right, member for Riverton.

Dr M.D. Nahan: It doesn't. Show us.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Over the coming weeks, I will show him the Curtin Avenue plans and the duplication that would be required if we keep Fremantle port forever.

Does the member for Cottesloe really want Curtin Avenue as a dual carriageway across his electorate? There is silence.

Mr D.R. Michael: Maybe they will help us get some federal funding for it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They probably will fund it. I know the member for Tangney would be keen. Members opposite come into this place and talk about this in isolation. That is their problem. They have always thought this road would cure all ills and everything else. They have become irrational and illogical about the debate. If they want to have a proper discussion about the roads, they have to accept that Roe 8 and 9 would lead to the duplication of Curtin Avenue. They are silent on that because they know that is correct. I have been briefed by Main Roads. I know what it is planning for Curtin Avenue if Fremantle port stays forever. The member for Cottesloe will have to explain why he stood and supported the opposition's position on this when it would mean a dual carriageway of Curtin Avenue and ripping up the beautiful principal shared path we have just delivered. If members opposite want to have a sensible discussion about roads, they are not sticking to the words in front of them. They again want to go through the potted history of this and the future. We will keep going with this for hour upon hour because the more we get into this, the more I want to have a discussion. I want to have a discussion about the western suburbs roads such as West Coast Highway and Curtin Avenue and what this will mean for traffic on the western corridor both north and south of the river.

Members should step back and look at a map of Perth and ask: do we really want to keep pushing all the freight westward into areas of significant residential living and, in a sense, a structure of a road network that was never really built for all the types of movement that will occur in decades to come? They have to look at where our future lies—where we can further develop intermodal industrial estates. If members opposite think continually growing Fremantle is the solution, they can take that to the election. If their vision for WA is to grow Fremantle forever and build Roe 8—9, they can take it to the election. We will debate this again at the election but this is a democratically elected government implementing its election commitments. If members opposite want to keep frustrating that, they can. As an opposition, I suppose they have a right to frustrate. However, all I can say is that if they want a debate about roads, I will debate the entire road network. We can talk about Roe 8—9, West Coast Highway, Curtin Avenue and the good folk of East Fremantle and what members opposite are planning to do to their suburb.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am fascinated by the minister's assertions. One reason that container traffic travels north is that it cannot travel east because it is so congested. Truck drivers take a route through my electorate and further to the north simply because it is difficult and dangerous for them to travel east. That is because of the massive congestion on Leach Highway and South Street. Building Roe 8 and Roe 9 and reducing that congestion—the Minister for Transport will have to come up with better solutions for getting that traffic to the port—will reduce the container traffic that is currently travelling through my electorate. By not building Roe 8 and Roe 9, the government is forcing container traffic through my area because it is so difficult to travel east—west.

Has any comprehensive traffic modelling been done on this proposal? I understand that commercial traffic comprises around 50 per cent of the traffic travelling north—south. Container traffic is only a small part of that commercial traffic, and not the major part. I understand that it has been estimated that commercial traffic north—south will approximately double, which is a substantial increase in traffic through that area. Is there comprehensive traffic modelling that builds into the government's refusal to build Roe 8 and Roe 9? Has the government also considered

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Bill Marmion; Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Dr David Honey

how traffic will move smoothly through my electorate with that expected doubling in commercial traffic, regardless of port traffic?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for the question. Curtin Avenue is described in “Directions 2031: Draft Spatial Framework for Perth and Peel”, which is a document I think the previous government produced, as an important freight route connecting Fremantle inner harbour to the north via Port Beach Road, Curtin Avenue and West Coast Highway. The member’s assertion that the only reason Curtin Avenue is used by container traffic because Roe 8 and Roe 9 have not been built is wrong.

Dr D.J. Honey: That’s not what I said, minister. Be fair.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I ask the member for Cottesloe to listen. I feel sorry for him because he has been sold a pup. He is trying to sell this pup to the community—that is, the idea that Roe 8 and Roe 9 will solve problems in his electorate. It will make the problem worse. Further information will come out showing that keeping Fremantle port forever will require the duplication of Curtin Avenue. I am sorry that members of the Liberal Party, in this Ben Morton–inspired grab for an agenda, have sold him a pup. The member for Bateman is saying that Curtin Avenue will have to be duplicated anyway; that is the Liberal Party’s plan. I know how the opposition will solve this. It has a plan for an outer harbour because then it will move traffic to the east —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Member for Riverton.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am sorry that the member for Cottesloe is sitting in this chamber, talking about North Fremantle and a bit further north, with a commitment to continually expand Fremantle port, pushing more and more traffic through his area. I do not know why he did not fund that principal shared path. The people of Cottesloe have to accept—they know this—that the plan for Roe 8 and Roe 9 does not stop at that. It affects the people of East Fremantle, North Fremantle, Cottesloe and Mosman Park. Maybe the member for Cottesloe should talk to Ben Morton about that because obviously he is running the agenda. The member should ask him what this means for his electorate and hear what he says. Pushing more and more freight into Fremantle port forever will create further traffic through his electorate. It is as simple as that.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The minister did not answer my question. As I said, I do not agree at all with her thesis. In fact, there is an absence of adequate transport routes to the east, which services the great majority of container traffic. As the minister knows, container traffic going north is quite typically local traffic going to businesses in normal circumstances. There will have to be north–south container traffic, regardless of where the port is. That container traffic is not the container traffic going to the major industrial areas, which are to the east, which the minister knows. However, at the moment industrial traffic is going through that area because it cannot go east. I absolutely totally reject the minister’s assertion about that.

The minister did not answer this important question: if around 50 per cent of the traffic going north–south across the bridges is commercial traffic—that will double in 10 years as part of this whole approach to traffic—which we are talking about, what are the minister’s proposals to deal with that massive increase in commercial traffic travelling north–south, which is not container traffic? Container traffic is only a small part of the commercial traffic that travels north–south. If the minister is confused, I am talking about the normal traffic of butchers, bakers and candlestick makers, along with builders, people transporting goods to shops and businesses, and so on. As I understand from conversations with the previous transport minister, his department forecast that that would be expected to double in 10 years. That means there will be a massive increase in traffic travelling north–south. It will either cause chaos or the government has a plan to deal with that large increase in traffic travelling north and south. Even if we took every container that currently travels north–south off the road, we would still be looking at an enormous increase in commercial traffic travelling north–south. What are the government’s plans to deal with that? Quite clearly, what we have now cannot persist, regardless of container traffic. As I said at the outset, I utterly reject the minister’s assertion and this dialogue that she is trying to build to cause some issue around containers generally. If we had better east–west access, there would be less container traffic on the road going north–south.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I want to get this right. The former Minister for Transport, who was sitting next to the member for Cottesloe, said that the Liberal Party would duplicate Curtin Avenue in 10 years.

Dr D.J. Honey: He did not say that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thought the member just said that.

Dr D.J. Honey: Am I permitted to answer that, Mr Acting Speaker, or is it a rhetorical question?

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is rhetorical.

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Bill Marmion; Mrs Jessica Stojkovski; Dr David Honey

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member said that Curtin Avenue would need to be duplicated anyway. I do not know what kind of universe he is living in. What would reduce the traffic impact—keeping Fremantle port forever or building Roe 8 and Roe 9? Out of the two options —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Riverton.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: If the Liberal Party has two options—to construct an outer harbour or keep Fremantle port forever—which one does it think would take traffic off our roads?

Dr D.J. Honey: It is a rhetorical question.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Member for Cottesloe, if we keep Fremantle port forever, will it increase traffic or would traffic decrease through your area if we built an outer harbour? I ask the member to just answer. What does he think? What is his intuition?

Dr D.J. Honey: When you sit down, I am happy to respond.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member wants to interject in other situations. The assertion that the way to solve traffic issues in the member's electorate is to keep Fremantle port forever is absolutely false. I know the situation that the member is in. He has been sold a pup. That is why the former member for Cottesloe was a little more wily on this issue, and that is why he resisted Roe 8 for so long. The former member for Cottesloe resisted it for so long. He said that he partially agreed with the building of Roe 8 but he knew that building Roe 8 and Roe 9 would dump all that traffic into East Fremantle, which would create the need for a second bridge over Stirling Highway. He knew that it would create a lot of traffic through Cottesloe and that is why he did not support it. There was a battle between the electorates of Riverton and Bateman, or the previous name, and Cottesloe. The electorate of Cottesloe held its own for a number of years but then Mathias Cormann and federal government members came along and did some deals with the member for Bateman. The member for Cottesloe was not involved initially. Then, the former Labor government had \$500 million that was in the budget to fund public transport. Members will remember, Tony Abbott won the election and said that public transport is not in their knitting. It had \$500 million in the budget, and it had to find a project to give the \$500 million to, and then tell the member for Bateman and some of the feds, who concocted the Perth Freight Link. This is the so-called detailed planning that the previous government did. There was \$500 million in the budget. It was Cottesloe versus Bateman and Riverton. That is what it was.

Dr D.J. Honey: Because we were worried about losing Cottesloe.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think the former member for Cottesloe was just protecting his electorate. He probably did a better job than the current member for Cottesloe. That is an interesting comment from the member for Cottesloe: "Because we were afraid of losing Cottesloe", mocking the concerns that the previous member for Cottesloe had in ensuring that Curtin Avenue did not eventuate into a dual carriageway, as I understand it.

If the member for Cottesloe wants a proper discussion, he will have to accept that keeping Fremantle port forever would increase traffic through his electorate. It is as simple as that, because all it would do is increase the need for people to be travelling through his electorate. In relation to containers, the member said that there are not significant container numbers. I was out there riding along that pedestrian shared path on Monday.

Mr D.J. Kelly: It's a lovely PSP.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is a lovely PSP. It is a one-lane road. There are issues with traffic; I acknowledge that, but keeping Fremantle port forever would make it a lot worse.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Thank you, members. I would like to remind everyone that we are still on clause 2 and we are dealing with the amendment. The question is that the words to be inserted be inserted. I think we did very well getting through clause 1. If we could keep it moving, that would be great. Thank you.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The minister put a number of questions to me. I recommend my second reading contribution to the minister. If the minister reads that, she will see exactly my response. It is not either/or. As the minister knows, I am a keen supporter of the outer harbour. However, the outer harbour is not an alternative to the existing Fremantle port; it should be an adjunct to the existing Fremantle port. I did not say that container traffic through the northern suburbs is not an issue or is insignificant. What I said is that the container traffic is a relatively smaller portion of the total commercial traffic going north–south.

The minister has not answered my question, which is a concern directly relating to this bill. If the minister is going to close this road and is not going to extend Roe 8, has she done the detailed traffic modelling that shows the

impact, including how this government intends to deal with the substantial increase in traffic, which is largely driven not by residential traffic but by commercial traffic that travels north–south through my electorate? I am asking about the large percentage of commercial traffic, not the container traffic. Either the minister has not done the modelling, so she actually does not know; or she has done the modelling, and she does not have a plan; or, in fact, she has done the modelling, and she knows that there needs to be some capacity to increase flowthrough of traffic through that area, and this government has a plan to deal with that. Which of those is it, minister?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Our plan to take pressure off that route is an outer harbour. That is our plan. Our plan more generally is freight on rail. The good thing is that finally the member for Cottesloe has stood up and said he supports the outer harbour.

Dr D.J. Honey: That is fine.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member just said it now.

Dr M.D. Nahan: We do, too.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Why would you build \$4 billion or \$5 billion worth of roads?

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. Nahan: That is your point. How do we fund an outer harbour, \$4 billion to \$5 billion? Where is it in the budget? When are you going to build it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The opposition shows again no vision; no plan for Western Australia.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.C. Nalder: It's called process.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: “Process”, the member for Bateman said. I will just outline how the previous government thought up the Perth Freight Link. Let us go through it. The member for Riverton took it to the 2018 election, did he not?

Dr M.D. Nahan: Not the PFL; it was Roe 8.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member wrote to everybody saying “I will build Roe 8.” What did he do for the next four years?

Dr M.D. Nahan: Planned it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, you did not.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Yes, we did.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member said he was going to build it, and he did not.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! The minister has the call.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is amazing. We ask them why they did not deliver their election commitment, and they blame the federal Labor government!

Dr M.D. Nahan: Who is funding most of your infrastructure?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We made an election commitment. The PFL funding is funding most of our roads.

Dr M.D. Nahan: No, it isn't.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, it is. The PFL funding allocated to us is funding a lot of our roads. We made that very clear. It was our election commitment; we are delivering it. When the member wrote to all those good people of Riverton saying, “I will build Roe 8”, was it subject to someone else doing it for him? What was it subject to? The opposition made a commitment to build Roe 8 and it did not do it. I will go through it again: in 2008, then in 2013, then 2014 came along, 2015, then there was this sort of manic action to try to prepare a project. They came up with the PFL. As I said, the former Premier was always a bit reluctant on this, because he actually understood where the community was at, and who better than the member for Riverton? The former member for Cottesloe knew that Roe 9 in particular was a difficult proposition because of the disturbance into East Fremantle at enormous cost, and, of course, even the former member for Cottesloe was probably a bit nervous about the toll roads that they were going to build. We have not even explored that; hopefully we can explore the toll road issue later today. The member comes in here saying that he had this plan. What he had was a failed election commitment—something concocted, frankly, in a very rushed time frame, to actually put a lot of traffic on the other side of the river, and there we are, sailing across the river. There was going to be a floating tunnel. There was going to be another Stirling Highway. We still do not really know what the answer is. Then, again, the idea that Roe 8 and 9 and keeping Fremantle forever will actually not require any other roads being built. What the opposition fails to acknowledge is its plan to duplicate the dual carriageway of Curtin Avenue through Cottesloe.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Member for Bateman, honestly; go back to the dining room.

Mr D.C. Nalder: I haven't been to the dining room. You are going to get rid of the Fremantle port; is that what you are saying?

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know the dodgy little project that the member concocted with the federal government. One of the reasons why the former Premier, the member for Cottesloe, dumped him was that he did not support the way he went about his business. Secret deals with the feds; trying to prove himself with the feds. That is what happened.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kingsley.

Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI: I would like to hear more from the minister, please.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is what we have in front of us. The reality is that keeping Fremantle growing forever would have significant impacts for Cottesloe.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The idea that we can build Roe 8 and 9 and we would not duplicate Curtin Avenue.

Mr P.C. Tinley interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Cottesloe is trying to say we do not need a duplication of Curtin Avenue.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I said, the member for Cottesloe has been sold a pup by the member for Bateman and the member for Riverton. They are worried about their own electorates, but they have sold the member for Cottesloe a pup. It is that the Liberal Party plan would require full duplication of Curtin Avenue. That is exactly it.

Even the member for Riverton acknowledged that today. He said that of course Roe 8 and 9 cannot be looked at in isolation; we need to look at the whole network. What they did not tell the good people of Cottesloe, although some of them were awake to it—they were onto it—was the impact it would have on roads through the western suburbs.

We have a plan. The Liberal Party wants to frustrate a democratically elected government from implementing its plan for Western Australia.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for Riverton for that contribution yet again.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes—"Thank you for that," says the member for Riverton.

We have a plan. The Liberal Party wants to frustrate that.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Minister for Small Business, Liberal Party members have been contemptuous in this place by frustrating the proceedings. They have been writing amendments on the back of pieces of paper.

Mr M. McGowan: No!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes! That is what they have been doing. They have not given me advance warning of the amendment they are pushing. We should seek to suspend the standing orders of this house so we can debate the contempt the Liberal Party has for this place.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 5528.]