

**PEEL–HARVEY CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT BILL 2014**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from 9 September.

**MR M.J. COWPER (Murray–Wellington)** [4.45 pm]: A week ago we were debating the Peel-Harvey Catchment Management Bill 2014, a private member's bill introduced by the member for Gosnells to establish the Peel Harvey Catchment Council governing body. I was talking about the history of the area and how it played a fundamental role in the development of not only the Swan River colony and later Perth, but also the state of Western Australia—and it continues to do so. I also talked about the Burke government establishing the Peel Inlet Management Authority in 1984 or thereabouts, although it might have been later than that. The Gallop government did away with that authority in 2004. To this day I am perplexed by why the Labor government did that. Here we are today debating a bill in which the member for Gosnells proposes to establish a very similar body.

We heard debate from members on this side of the house about how the Premier's office and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet have a conglomerate of responsible agencies that have dominion over the Peel–Harvey estuary. That is commendable, and I agree that we need to put something in place. Notwithstanding that situation, we have an ongoing problem with ownership in particular matters, and I will touch upon an example of that in a moment. Back in 2004, a dam was built on the North Dandalup River, a tributary of the South Dandalup River that runs into the Dandalup River, which runs into the Murray River, which subsequently runs into the Peel–Harvey estuary. At the time, Richard Court was the Premier and the Minister for Water was Paul Omodei. This was the last dam built in the hills, on the south west Darling scarp. During the process of establishing the dam, there was discussion between government and land users, and people who lived within the vicinity, about riparian rights and the environment of the North Dandalup River. At that time, the policy position held by the then Court government was that there would be ecological flow released into that river, as is the case with many other rivers in south west. Since then, the river has flowed reasonably well, but no-one would not be aware that we have a drying climate and that there are competing pressures on the need to conserve water and the use of water.

Notwithstanding that, as I mentioned last week, the area in and around the estuary is a major food producing area. Landowners at South Dandalup have to continually deal with the Department of Water and the Water Corporation over the degradation of the river due to the lack of water coming out of the dam. Since then, a number of meetings have been held involving the directors general and previous ministers, and there is now a stand-off that has yet to be resolved. A number of problems have occurred. There is now an ecological and environmental issue to deal with, on which I will have to approach the Minister for Environment. The ecological system of the river has collapsed due to the lack of water coming down the river, notwithstanding at the moment there is still a bit of flow given we have had a little recent rain, albeit, restricted in recent times. Come another month or so, there will be no water flow back into that river and all the animals that live in the river, whether they be crustaceans or fish, will disappear. A whole range of birds that rely on the tree environment will disappear and, equally important, farmers will have no capacity to water their stock. There will be no water available for stock. We are now having ongoing meetings at which we are dealing with bureaucracies. In essence, herein is the problem with the Peel–Harvey estuary. Probably seven different bureaucracies have dominion over that estuary—the Department of Water, the Department of Parks and Wildlife, the Department of Transport, WA Police, the City of Mandurah and the Shire of Murray, to name a few. There is probably a host of others, such as the Water Corporation and so on. The problem is that they all operate within their own silos. They all deal within their own dominions or their own jurisdictions. There is no overarching control, connectivity or liquidity in the various government departments. It is becoming increasingly very frustrating for people in that area, particularly the landowners whom I represent.

Another example of the problems with the estuary is that a number of years ago a canal was built on the eastern side of the Peel estuary in and around South Yunderup. A channel was dredged that leads from the canal systems of South Yunderup all the way out past Boodalan Island almost to the middle of the Peel estuary. That was to allow boat access into the canal system. With the advent of the Dawesville Cut there has been a change in the oscillation of the actual estuary and the sediment and silt build-up in the channel has increased exponentially. A number of years ago, the Department of Transport did a deal with the Murray shire saying that it would relinquish to the Murray shire the management of the maintenance of that channel, and the state government gave the Murray shire a \$75 000 supplement, I suppose we could call it, to allow the shire to continue with that. With the advent of the Dawesville Cut, that \$75 000 was easily eaten into and has become a cost to the Murray shire in the vicinity of \$200 000 a year. The last dredging occurred about three years ago at a cost of about \$800 000. That required the Murray shire to borrow money to maintain the estuary. Previously in this place, I had spoken to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, about how

I thought it was disingenuous for the state government to do a deal with the Murray shire and change the playing field with the advent of the Dawesville Cut, which has accelerated the silt build-up in the channel. Among all the other functions the Murray shire conducts every seven to eight years to do what is necessary, the shire has to find a considerable amount of money that it does not have the capacity to raise.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr M.J. COWPER:** As a result, none of the various government agencies has direct ownership of it, notwithstanding that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has, I suppose, a loose alliance. I am very interested to hear how a proposed body would be established. I am not sure that the Swan River Trust evokes a lot of confidence in the community with its capacity to manage the Swan and Canning Rivers. I suspect there is a fair bit of concern that it does not do the job as it should, given a fair bit of politics and bureaucracy is involved within that very organisation. But we certainly need to cut through to get some decisions made on the Peel–Harvey estuary—167 square kilometres of waterway, including the Murray, Serpentine and Harvey Rivers.

There are challenges for people in that area. As I mentioned before, I have difficulty when comments are made, particularly in the local newspapers, by people on the eastern side of the estuary who hold the view that the people on the western side should or should not do certain things. I find it extraordinary that they sit in their double-storey homes on the canals in Mandurah and comment, particularly when they had to fill in the Creery wetlands to establish their own homes. I find that very interesting. The farmers who have been operating farms for many years are acutely aware of the impacts farming has on that land—the people I believe are the experts in the field on what stock the land has the capacity to hold. I believe we should have an agency that will support farmers as opposed to someone standing over them with a big stick and whacking them about every time they go about their lawful business on their own properties.

The member for Gosnells raised in this place the issue of GD Pork, the great Danish pork company, which has bought an existing piggery in Coolup. I have heard comments from various places, including from the press who have said that this company is a polluter of the waterways. I can tell them that that piggery has been operated by the Christmas family for more than 30 years. It was sold six or seven years ago to GD Pork. Every year since GD Pork took ownership of that piggery, the nutrient flow from the bores adjacent to the piggery that have been tested have reduced each year. I have heard people comment on the nutrient levels. That prompted the owners of GD Pork to put in additional test bores underground, upstream, if you like, of the piggery to establish the flow into the piggery. Guess what? The results have come through and the nutrient level flowing into the piggery is exactly that which is flowing out. GD Pork plans to remove the ponds and apply brand-new technology, which is exactly the type of investment in agriculture we need in Western Australia because it brings in state-of-the-art agricultural methods. GD Pork will use its evaporation ponds and enclose them and capture the methane that is emitted and use it as power generation for the plant. Some people, for their own reasons, have tried to scuttle this agricultural enterprise. I suspect it is a case of them not recognising that this is an agricultural area and, therefore, we can expect to find farm animals making noises and doing what farm animals do. If a person is not happy with that, perhaps they should not buy a property in a farming area. At the risk of offending a lot of people, we have about 40 000 horses in the Murray–Wellington electorate—a great number. They are a very important part of our community and a very important part of our industry in that area that employs a lot of people. Notwithstanding that, here are a number of people taking a pot shot at the cows and the pigs around the place, but do not actually look in their backyard when it comes to the contribution to nutrient run-off, in particular from horses. I am aware that the Shire of Murray is now saying to people who are, if you like, “lifestylers” who own properties that they have to put in a plan to demonstrate how they will deal with nutrient run-off. There are processes in place that are working, but there is nothing there that is orchestrated. The question before the house today in the form of a private member's bill brought by the member for Gosnells is: should there be a body that looks after the management of it?

I have always held a strong view that is the view held by a number of people in my electorate, including those people who have been around for a long time, that if you ever want to know something, go and ask the locals. I bring to the chamber the name of Bruce Tatham. The Tatham family are a fishing family; they have been fishing on the Peel–Harvey estuary for many years. Bruce Tatham lives and breathes that environment. He has been appointed to a number of various boards over his journey; in fact, he was a member of the Peel Inlet Management Authority, going back a number of years. He and I have discussed some ideas he has brought to me on how we might go about better managing the environs. He is a person who could contribute to getting a better outcome for everybody in respect of where we are going in relation to the Peel–Harvey estuary.

One of the challenges for the river systems is boating. People like to recreate. If we go down there on a beautiful summer's day, we will see people going up and down the Murray River. They will be going up to the Pelicans on the Murray cafe, then up to The Riv and then meander on up further to the Ravenswood Hotel—favourite places for many generations of people who go there to spend a lazy Sunday afternoon. The problem with it, though, like

in any aspect of society, there are always one or two people who do not observe the amenity of the other people or they do not observe that they are potentially causing damage to the riverbanks. Certain areas of the riverbanks are degraded. What is very complex about this is that if the degradation occurs within the canals, it is a matter for the Murray shire. If it happens out in the main river, it becomes an issue for the Department of Transport—and if it is not part of the Department of Transport, it becomes part of the Water and Rivers Commission. There, in essence, lies another example of the demarcation or jurisdiction of responsibility of what section of the waterway belongs to whom. There has to be consistency, transparency and a place where people can pick up a phone and call direct to a one-stop shop and voice their concerns, whether it is regarding boats speeding on the river, the water lapping against the riverbanks causing degradation or providing boating facilities. Members might know that every time a person pays their boating licence at the Department of Transport, they pay a contribution to a fund called the boating industry fund. That fund pays for various things, such as boat ramps and upgrades of amenities, sullage and jetties. We have had some pretty good money spent in the Murray shire, might I add. We have some great facilities at the Pelicans, and new boat ramps in the area, and we are hoping that we will be able to add and provide more, particularly in and around the Ravenswood Hotel. The proprietors there, Jenny Taylor and Dave Lawn, have spent a lot of their own money in refurbishing the beer garden at the Ravenswood Hotel. Unfortunately, adjacent to that is this higgledy-piggledy broken down bank that is treacherous and is some reason for concern, particularly for seniors and the young.

I hope that working collaboratively with the community, the landowners adjacent to the water, and with the Murray shire, we can get this one over the line. It is a no mean feat because it will involve not only the shire, but also the Water and Rivers Commission, the Department of Transport and a whole host of people to achieve one outcome. As you can appreciate, Mr Acting Speaker (Mr I.M. Britza), given your experience as a local member, the time to deal with various government departments from time to time is a bit like herding cats—not exactly the easiest thing to do. People are well intended; I have no doubt that people are well intended and want to help. Unfortunately, sometimes process and regulation and the like cause outcomes to be delayed, and when things become delayed, they become frustrating and people become frustrated—particularly with their local members, local shires and government. In order to streamline all those things, I see some merit in having a one-stop shop. I would encourage the ministers in this place get together, have a look at the private member's bill that is brought by the member—as is his right as an elected member of this place—and see how we could possibly appoint a governing body or a responsible body that has the capacity to deal with it. Would that be in the form of the Peel Inlet Management Authority? Would that be in the form of some new genesis of a range of government departments? The fact that it is controlled from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet here in Perth means that it will lack the capacity to have connectivity with the likes of the fisherman Mr Bruce Tatham, whether it be the local farmer on that eastern side, the landowners out at Birchmont, down at Fisherman's Point, at Nirimba or for that matter landowners in those areas that are becoming challenged by the urban environment and sprawl. If we do this correctly, there is great capacity and a great opportunity for expansion of the urban environment down that way. That is where the future of Perth will be. We already have a number of key points—the freeway, the railway lines, the water and the electricity—already there, as opposed to the northern suburbs of Perth, where every time we add another suburb, we have to tack on all the various infrastructure.

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [5.07 pm]: — in reply: I rise to conclude debate at the second reading stage on the Peel–Harvey Catchment Management Bill 2014. I thank all members who contributed to the debate. Thanks to the member for Murray–Wellington who brought his local knowledge and some of his experiences and history to it as well; my colleagues the member for Mandurah and the Leader of the Opposition; and also my thanks to the Minister for Water, Minister for Environment and Minister for Health, who I think was speaking more in his capacity as member for Dawesville. The bill we have presented to the house does exactly as the member for Murray–Wellington says. It endeavours to bring together all the bodies involved in looking after that Peel–Harvey waterway. During debate we have discussed the various agencies. There is a multitude—the Department of Fisheries, Department of Transport, various local governments, the Department of Water, the Water Corporation, the Department of Environment Regulation, Department of Agriculture and Food, and I dare say others with some stake, involvement and degree of responsibility. What we consistently find is that when it comes to resolving the problems of the Peel–Harvey, we just do not have a single agency that is in a position to take charge.

I will just dwell on one issue—that is, nutrient load. The member for Dawesville endeavoured to suggest that things were not so bad and perhaps things had gotten better. He drew on some of his experience from back in the Court government, when I believe he was Minister for Water Resources and worked closely with the then Water and Rivers Commission. He felt that things had, perhaps, improved. I want to correct him on that point. If I can just turn to the intended nutrient loadings on the Peel–Harvey system when the environmental protection policy was entered into back in 1992, which was a follow-up to the creation of the Dawesville Cut. The intention was that the nutrient discharge into the Peel–Harvey from the various rivers would be capped at certain levels

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Chris Tallentire; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Ms Mia Davies

---

and there would not be more than a total of 75 tonnes of phosphorus when the amounts from the various rivers were added up. What do we see? The 1992 discharge target for the Serpentine River was to be less than 21 tonnes a year, the Murray River target less than 16 tonnes a year and the Harvey River target less than 38 tonnes a year, recognising, of course, that these rivers have drains and other tributaries going into them. Those are the total loadings on each of the rivers. What have we found instead? There are figures in a report from a couple of years ago, so not today's figures, and that report was very well presented to the government. The figures are part of the "Water Quality Improvement Plan for the Rivers and Estuary of the Peel–Harvey System" and they are from September 2007, so I dare say they have gone up considerably more. If the government has better figures on this, it can let me know, but I am afraid there is a tendency in government not to provide factual information, so I am relying on the best available data I have been able to get. What do we see? The target for the Serpentine River was supposed to be topped out at 21 tonnes, but in 2007 there were 69 tonnes of phosphorus—more than three times what was to be the maximum. What do we see for the Murray River? The amount was 15 tonnes, so that target has been reduced by one tonne per annum. What about the Harvey River? The maximum target was supposed to be 38 tonnes in 1992, and in 2007 we find 61 tonnes. There we have it: a total of 145 tonnes of phosphorus when the total was supposed to be 75 tonnes. That total target was set in 1992, but instead in 2007 the total came in at 145 tonnes.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza):** Excuse me, member. Member for Midland and minister, you need please to keep the conversation down.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** I think the issue of nutrient discharge into the Peel–Harvey is just one area with this need for an all-encompassing single, dedicated agency. The Minister for Health made the comment that we do not want something too regulatory, but I take the point the member for Murray–Wellington made that we want something that is governance at a local level—a governance arrangement that people can actually relate to and identify with. At the local level people do see the various activities of all those agencies I listed as being obscure.

[Quorum formed.]

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** This pressing need for a governance arrangement that works at the grassroots level is something local people can relate to. That is what we need, and indeed, that was the recommendation by Murdoch University —

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Excuse me, member. Members, if you want to carry on a conversation, keep it down or go outside the chamber.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** A report put out by the CSIRO into the Peel–Harvey estuary states —

... the critical point is that stakeholders and the general public lack an effective means to rehabilitate and manage the system **due to ineffective governance structures, or policies that are only weakly implemented**. The report highlighted a few areas of governance that were of particular concern, such as:

- **“Unclear roles and responsibilities”:** “The effectiveness of catchment-level policy interventions is frequently limited by overlapping jurisdictions and fragmented administrative structures. In some cases this resulted in weak or non-existent monitoring of assets.”

With this bill we seek we seek to resolve that ongoing problem of a lack of decent governance arrangements. Let us think about what is at stake with the Peel–Harvey; yes, it is people's quality of life. It is things like their ability to go fishing and catch not just blowfish, but other fish they would like to catch; to be able to go prawning; to be able to visit things like the thrombolites at Lake Clifton; and to be able to recognise that the Ramsar site is well protected so we can be proud of it and look at the migratory birds that visit the area at different times. We want to be able to enjoy all of those things and support the massive community involvement that exists—that volunteer effort currently brought through the Peel–Harvey Catchment Council, the wonderful work it does and its incredible reports that set the way forward. All that needs to be backed up by the very best of governance arrangements and that is why we need a Peel–Harvey catchment management trust. It should not just be a body that has the ability to liaise with government agencies, but one with an ability to work with all government agencies and direct them—to be that overarching governing body. I thank members for their contributions and I commend the bill to the house.

*Ruling by Acting Speaker*

**THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza):** The question is that the bill be read a second time; however, I advise that the Peel–Harvey Catchment Management Bill 2014 if passed would provide for the payment of moneys in certain circumstances. Section 46(8) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act provides that a vote, resolution or bill for the appropriation of moneys shall not be passed unless the purpose of the appropriation has

been recommended by message of the Governor to the Assembly. I rule that this bill requires a message and note that one has not been received. Therefore, in accordance with the practice of the house, the question for the second reading will not be finally put to the house unless a message is received. I direct that the bill go to the bottom of the notice paper until a message is received.

*Point of Order*

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** Noting your remarks, Mr Acting Speaker, I am keen to know whether the government has sought a Governor's message for this bill. I note that the government could well have pursued obtaining a Governor's message, had it desired to do so, and I expected that it had.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order, member, as it is a discussion point.

*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion*

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [5.19 pm] — without notice: I move —

That standing orders be suspended so far as is necessary to enable the following motion to be moved forthwith —

That this house requests the Premier to advise whether the Governor has been requested to provide a message pursuant to section 46(8) of the Constitution Acts Amendment Act 1889 in relation to the Peel–Harvey Catchment Management Bill; and if not, why not?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I will seek advice, member.

**Dr K.D. Hames:** We will have five minutes each. The government will say no, and the opposition will say that it should seek a message.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Is the member for Gosnells happy to take this interjection?

**Dr K.D. Hames:** We will agree to the suspension. The member can make his case in five minutes, and I will respond for five minutes on behalf of the government, and give the answer that we will not do it.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Do you accept?

**Mrs M.H. Roberts:** We accept.

**Dr K.D. Hames:** He is moving to suspend standing orders. We will support the suspension motion, but I need to amend the motion.

Several members interjected.

**Dr K.D. Hames:** All right—as long as you are solid on five and we are solid on five.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

*Motion*

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells)** [5.22 pm]: I move —

That this house requests the Premier to advise whether the Governor has been requested to provide a message pursuant to section 46(8) of the Constitution Act Amendment Act 1889 in relation to the Peel–Harvey Catchment Management Bill 2014; and, if not, why not?

The need for a Governor's message to support this bill is so pressing because of the urgency of putting in place decent governance arrangements for the Peel–Harvey area. If we refuse to do that, we are failing the people who live around that estuary, we are failing the environment of that estuary that we treasure as Western Australians, and we are failing the intent of those who went before us and provided a mechanism to reduce things like nutrients going into the catchment. They provided ways for agencies to come together and work together to protect the marine environment, the fisheries of the area and the recreational asset. They intended that we have such a body. This government has an ideological bent against statutory bodies, but on this occasion it is vital that we create something that has the authority to bring together all the agencies that do their very best, but fail us because of that fragmentation. That has been documented in report after report. It is clear when we look at the nutrient levels and when we hear people's complaints about the use of the waterway in a recreational and transport context. It is clear when we hear about people's disappointment with the fishing experience. There is no consolidated regulatory management of the Peel–Harvey catchment. That is why we need to properly debate and consider this bill. We have gone so far with that, but now we need a Governor's message to support it.

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Chris Tallentire; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Ms Mia Davies

---

It will not be a huge impost on the state of Western Australia. We are talking about making sure that this statutory body has the necessary administrative and secretarial support so that it can function in bringing together all those different agencies. The Department of Fisheries can make a valid contribution, along with the Department of Water, the Water Corporation, the various local governments, the Department of Parks and Wildlife, the Department of Environment Regulation and the Department of Agriculture and Food. They can all work together but be directed by a single agency that makes sure that the direction of the Peel–Harvey catchment is positive, and there is no further diminishing of the environmental standards. That is what we are seeing at the moment—the standards are dropping.

We have seen already that the levels of nutrient loadings on the Serpentine River have more than tripled. When we look at the 1992 levels, it was supposed to be capped at 21 tonnes, but in 2007 we see it has grown to 69 tonnes. As much as I appreciated the contributions from the Minister for Water and the Minister for Environment, I did not hear any presentation of scientific information about the nutrient levels going into the Peel–Harvey catchment at the moment. I heard from the Minister for Health, the Deputy Premier, and member for Dawesville, that he thinks things might be getting better. I have presented in debate the facts about where those nutrient loadings are going. They are going dramatically upwards. The Serpentine River should be at 21 tonnes, but it is up at 69 tonnes per annum. That is a disaster that shows that the fragmented approach we have been using is absolutely failing us.

There is a need for this consolidated agency that can work with people. We are not talking about creating a bureaucracy that will just be another layer of red tape. We are creating a body that will work at a community scale. Anyone who lives in the Mandurah area, the Shire of Murray and the other shires that adjoin, including Serpentine–Jarrahdale, the Shire of Harvey —

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.M. Britza):** Excuse me, member. Members, there is a constant drowning in the chamber, and I am struggling to hear myself. If you want to talk, I ask you to leave the chamber, please.

**Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE:** The case is compelling. We need a single body that can fight for the Peel–Harvey, and the bill before us deserves a Governor’s message to deliver that.

**DR K.D. HAMES (Dawesville — Deputy Premier) [5.27 pm]:** It would ordinarily be the responsibility of the Minister for Water to respond, but because the motion requests the Premier to advise, and I am here as the Deputy Premier, it is important that I respond to this motion. No, a message has not been requested, nor will it be requested. If this had been put to the vote, we would have voted against it for the reasons that I have given previously. The member quoted the Peel–Harvey Catchment Council and its involvement. It has been critically involved in the system that has been established by this government under its commitment given at the last election. My understanding is that the council is very happy with those arrangements. It has only been in place for two and a half years, but the vast majority of the phosphates and nitrates coming down those rivers are historical. Those phosphates have been coming down through the practices, particularly of farmers, for the last 100 years.

We need to go back and look at issues to do with the Bayswater main drain and the Bayswater Integrated Catchment Management Steering Committee. I was the local member, and Judy Edwards was chair of the committee managing that integrated catchment of the main drain. We had 70 tonnes of phosphate coming down that drain annually, the vast majority of it from the CSBP site that had been closed down years before, but still continued to leech phosphate through the soil into that catchment. It took many years of very hard work by the City of Bayswater and Dr Judy Edwards and the catchment management group to mitigate those very high levels of phosphate. That will be the case into the future, and this committee will do the job that is required. As I said, this was the commitment given by the Labor Party prior to the last election. It did not win the seat of Dawesville, although it won the seat of Mandurah, but, at the end of the day, that committee is in place and it is doing the job it was given funds to do, and I think that system is working very well. We do not need another body. We do not need another layer of governance over the people doing exceptionally hard work to look after the quality of the rivers. The member talks about what is happening in that catchment from his position in Gosnells. I talk about what is happening in the catchment from my position on the water. The member says that he would like to catch fish, but I go and catch those fish. He would like to catch crabs, but I go and catch those crabs. He would like to catch prawns, but I go and catch those prawns.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I am on my feet, member for Kwinana. Thank you.

**Dr K.D. HAMES:** This committee is not required. The government will not seek funding for it and, as I said, if the motion had been put before the house, we would have opposed it.

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Chris Tallentire; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Ms Mia Davies

---

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah)** [5.30 pm]: I understand that only two minutes are left on the clock. The opposition is very keen to get this to a vote and the reason is very simple: the comments of the members for Dawesville and Murray-Wellington seem to paint a picture that all things are rosy in the Peel–Harvey estuary system. They should read the reports that have come out over the last five to six years, including one by Regional Development Australia in 2011, that say that all the indicators of the health and wellbeing of the system, such as water quality, nutrient levels that continue to get into the system and fishing activity et cetera, are showing cause for concern and a decline in the health of the system. The glossy, rose-coloured comments of the members for Dawesville and Murray-Wellington that the Peel system is hunky-dory are absolute rubbish; the facts are there. They should go and find the latest information on the Serpentine River. It has been described by a number of scientists in a number of recent reports as being biologically dead. I have quoted those reports in this place on a number of occasions, so those members should not come in here and say there is no urgency to this bill.

The Peel–Harvey Catchment Management Bill 2014 is urgently needed and it is important for people who permanently live in the region who actually understand why the whole health and wellbeing of that system underpins the health and wellbeing of the social and economic benefits and the economic sustainability of the region now and into the future. Members opposite should not come in here and say that everything is hunky-dory just because they throw out their crab nets in front of their holiday house jetty and catch a few crabs—that is rubbish! Go and talk to the government’s mate Mr Peter Hicks; he knows about some of the reports that the Peel–Harvey Catchment Council has highlighted as cause for concern. It is not hunky-dory member for Dawesville—it is not hunky-dory at all! There are major concerns about the health and wellbeing of the Peel–Harvey estuary and the catchment, and for that reason the opposition has brought in this bill and wants to vote on it. We want to vote on it and we want a message sent to the Governor that money should be spent on a structure that we propose will address the issues that the member for Gosnells has so elegantly and effectively put in his original bill that was put before this house.

**MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Minister for Water)** [5.32 pm]: I am not sure how much time I have to speak.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** You have three minutes.

**Ms M.J. DAVIES:** I have three minutes. A number of contributions have been made in this house over the course of this debate and this side of the house laid out very carefully why we do not support the Peel–Harvey Catchment Management Bill 2014. The previous contribution from the member for Mandurah totally misrepresented what the Deputy Premier had put forward.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Go and read *Hansard*.

**Ms M.J. DAVIES:** Absolutely! He sat in the house and listened to the debate.

**Mr D.A. Templeman** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah, let us hear what the minister has to say.

**Mr D.A. Templeman:** Go and read what he said in his second reading speech.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Mandurah, I am on my feet.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** Did anyone kiss them?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I call the member for Collie–Preston.

**Mr M.P. Murray:** Would you like me to withdraw as well so I can repeat it?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I am on my feet. I would prefer it if you did not say anything at all.

**Ms M.J. DAVIES:** This side of the house laid out why we would not be supporting this bill and we acknowledge that a significant amount of work has been put into bringing this bill to the house. However, we have structures in place that deal with the issues that have been raised. We have also spent a significant amount of money trying to deal with some of the issues that have built up over a long period. It is happening not just in the Peel–Harvey estuary; we are actually making some inroads into the Vasse model. We have been working with the member for Vasse on the Vasse–Wonnerup Wetlands and have put in place a number of interventions. We absolutely have a very high-level group of people sitting around a table making decisions and including the community, which is exactly what the previous member argued we should be doing, as did the member behind me, the member for Murray–Wellington, saying that we needed to make sure that we had input from the local community. That is encompassed in the structure that we already have. It has been in place for a short time and we need to make sure that we give it time to start delivering outcomes. I am very confident that we are on the right track in this space so we will not be supporting the motion or the member’s bill.

*Division*

**Extract from *Hansard***  
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 16 September 2015]  
p6500b-6507a

Mr Murray Cowper; Mr Chris Tallentire; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr David Templeman; Ms Mia Davies

---

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr I.M. Britza) casting his vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (18)

Dr A.D. Buti  
Mr R.H. Cook  
Ms J.M. Freeman  
Mr W.J. Johnston  
Mr D.J. Kelly

Mr F.M. Logan  
Ms S.F. McGurk  
Mr M.P. Murray  
Mr P. Papalia  
Mr J.R. Quigley

Ms M.M. Quirk  
Mrs M.H. Roberts  
Ms R. Saffioti  
Mr C.J. Tallentire  
Mr P.C. Tinley

Mr P.B. Watson  
Mr B.S. Wyatt  
Mr D.A. Templeman (*Teller*)

Noes (34)

Mr P. Abetz  
Mr F.A. Alban  
Mr C.J. Barnett  
Mr I.C. Blayney  
Mr I.M. Britza  
Mr G.M. Castrilli  
Mr V.A. Catania  
Mr M.J. Cowper  
Ms M.J. Davies

Mr J.H.D. Day  
Ms E. Evangel  
Mr J.M. Francis  
Mrs G.J. Godfrey  
Mr B.J. Grylls  
Dr K.D. Hames  
Mrs L.M. Harvey  
Mr C.D. Hatton  
Mr A.P. Jacob

Dr G.G. Jacobs  
Mr S.K. L'Estrange  
Mr R.S. Love  
Mr J.E. McGrath  
Ms L. Mettam  
Mr P.T. Miles  
Ms A.R. Mitchell  
Mr N.W. Morton  
Dr M.D. Nahan

Mr D.C. Nalder  
Mr J. Norberger  
Mr D.T. Redman  
Mr A.J. Simpson  
Mr M.H. Taylor  
Mr T.K. Waldron  
Mr A. Krsticevic (*Teller*)

---

Pairs

Ms J. Farrer  
Ms L.L. Baker  
Mr M. McGowan

Mr R.F. Johnson  
Ms W.M. Duncan  
Mr W.R. Marmion

Question thus negatived.