

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME (BEELIAR WETLANDS) BILL 2018

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

Clause 2: Commencement —

Debate was interrupted after the amendment moved by Dr M.D. Nahan had been partly considered.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Infrastructure Western Australia was, as we indicated, recently set up and staffed by John Langoulant, who I think is the inaugural chairman, and Nicole Lockwood, who runs the Westport Taskforce. I would like to explore with the minister how the government believes the issues surrounding the outer harbour and port development issues, and the transport links to them, will be included in the 20-year strategy that is the priority of Infrastructure Western Australia. Obviously, it will need to be a major issue. We all agree that thoughts need to be developed. I also would like to explore whether or not the government has any intention of instructing or hinting to Infrastructure Western Australia that it should or should not include Roe 8 and 9 in its considerations.

When the chairperson of the Westport strategy has gone out and talked to the community, she has been quite enlightening on a range of issues, particularly with regard to the options facing her and the difficulties with the transport links to the port of Fremantle. But she has also said, “Listen, the government has decided not to build Roe 8”, so it basically has been excluded from her consideration. Infrastructure Western Australia was set up by the government to take the politics out of infrastructure planning, to take a holistic, cross-government and cross-industry look, and to have integrated planning from an independent industry perspective. It is beyond me why, if Infrastructure Western Australia were doing its job, it would not explicitly consider the road links to the port of Fremantle. Given what we know, from all the work that has been done on Roe 8 and Roe 9 over the last decade or so by Infrastructure Australia and Main Roads Western Australia, about how Roe 8 and Roe 9 are absolutely necessary, it is beyond me that an independent infrastructure planning organisation would not consider that in detail. Infrastructure Western Australia might not agree with it; I do not know. However, it should explicitly have been included.

That is the why we have moved this amendment. It is not just odd, but I would say almost improper, that the government would seek in this bill to excise a road reserve prior to Infrastructure Western Australia looking at the infrastructure needs in that region, and, also, I might add, prior to the release of the Westport strategy report. That not only pre-empts those necessary reports, but also sends a worrying signal to us, and I think also the community, that the \$20 million Westport strategy is not an objective assessment of the options. If Infrastructure Western Australia, in doing its 20-year plan, will be excluded from considering the road links to the port of Fremantle, it will not be independent. I would like the minister to elucidate how Roe 8 and Roe 9 will be considered by Infrastructure Western Australia if the government is able to instruct it to either exclude or include that issue. Importantly, why would the minister put forward a bill to take out the road reserve when in fact Infrastructure Western Australia is doing long-term planning for something just like that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for Riverton for that question. I note that if the member for Riverton had put that much effort into delivering his commitment on Roe 8 when he was in government, he would have delivered his election commitment, would he not? We have the Westport Taskforce. The member is undermining its objectivity. The chair, Nicole Lockwood, is doing a very good job. She is consulting widely, looking at all the different options, and will provide a report very soon. We will make a decision on the basis of that report. That is what we have set out to do, and that is what we will do. Infrastructure WA will take into account decisions and actions of government as part of this process, which has been an independent process that involves talking to a lot of stakeholders and doing a lot of analysis.

Ms L. METTAM: The process is not independent. I would question the process that has been undertaken to remove the road reserve. This government promised, when in opposition, gold-standard transparency. However, this government has bypassed a consultative process, bypassed going through the Western Australian Planning Commission, and bypassed a process that could have taken up to two years. The minister has talked about the fact that the Westport Taskforce will report soon on the viable options for the east–west corridor and Fremantle port. Keeping in mind that Infrastructure Western Australia is not able to, and has been directed not to, raise the issue of Roe 8 and Roe 9, would it not at least be appropriate to see what the outcomes of the Westport report are?

Further to that, in keeping with the theme of the amendment, would it not at least be suitable that we see how Infrastructure WA would assess the issues facing the east–west corridor, given the importance of this issue to the community in the south west metropolitan area, given the issues facing freight on these roads, given the fact that drivers in this area face congestion that is 20 per cent above average, and given the comments made by John Langoulant and the Premier of this state when, in making the announcement about Infrastructure WA, they spoke about the value of the legislation to ensure that the state’s long-term infrastructure priorities are informed?

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Why is the south west metropolitan area not important enough for this government? Why would the government not take the opportunity to ensure that investment decisions undertaken are done in a clear and transparent way? That is all that this opposition is asking, given that this government is turning its back on investing in Roe 8. That is not what this bill is about. This bill is about removing the opportunity for future generations to see the benefits of a road project, which, when presented to Infrastructure Australia, beat 93 other projects in terms of priority and the great value it would provide to productivity on a national stage. That is why we believe that issues in the south west metropolitan area deserve some level of scrutiny. Why is the minister avoiding any type of scrutiny about this important matter?

Ms R. Saffioti: I'm not.

Ms L. METTAM: Clearly, the minister is because we have seen her obfuscate a clear-cut process. This evening it has been pointed out that it is extraordinary to go through a legislative process instead of a formal Western Australian Planning Commission planning process and not consult with the community before making decisions. It is extraordinary that this government reports on any other issue or solution except Roe 8 and Roe 9; it is doing it in relation to the Westport report as well.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I guess the minister is not going to answer, which is typical. At this time of the night the minister has decided not to answer anything.

Ms S.F. McGurk: There was no question.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, there was.

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes.

As the member for Vasse indicated, this is not about government building, agreeing to build or not building Roe 8 and Roe 9; this is about a road reserve and what we do in the future. One of the things that has changed and that Infrastructure Western Australia might want to consider, but will not be able to consider if the land has changed purpose and is no longer a road reserve, is that the commonwealth government has decided to stump up an additional \$1.2 billion to build Roe 8 and Roe 9, and has indicated to the state as clearly as it can that the money is there. The only condition is that it goes from the Murdoch link to the Stirling–Canning Highways intersection without any lights. Indeed, the federal government has indicated publicly —

Point of Order

Ms S.F. McGURK: I draw your attention to the subject that the member for Riverton is addressing. I am struggling to see what relevance it has to the amendment. The amendment is about the process of the metropolitan region scheme.

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

The SPEAKER: She is just saying the point of order, if you listen.

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

The SPEAKER: We do not go on numbers; otherwise, you would be in trouble all day over there. The point of order is heard in silence. Can you start again, minister, if you want to.

Ms S.F. McGURK: I am asking what the relevance of the member for Riverton's speech is to the amendment before the house.

The SPEAKER: I am sure the member will get back to the words to be inserted.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The amendment states —

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, this Act comes into operation only if and when it is reviewed by Infrastructure WA ...

I was suggesting that Infrastructure Western Australia might want to look at a renewed approach to Roe 8 and Roe 9. That is what it is there to do. The government put it in place and appointed the chair and vice-chair, I guess. That is what they have been instructed to do—look at things differently and coordinate infrastructure planning. Clearly, access to the port is a major issue. I was indicating to the minister, as she will well know, that what has changed and what Infrastructure WA will undoubtedly want to look at is how we can get an additional \$1.2 billion spent on infrastructure in this state and create the thousands of jobs that would go with it. I might add that that \$1.2 billion would pay for most of what remains of Roe 8–9, the Perth Freight Link. The government has made it clear that it has welcomed the McGowan government coming back and altering the nature of the road. If they do not like what was done, they should do something different and use the \$1.2 billion to change the design and reduce the impact on the environment, if that is the government's concern. Do something different—feedback. There is \$1.2 billion

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]
p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

of additional investment that the commonwealth government has on offer for this state. Given the unemployment rate, we need it.

The government set up an organisation called Infrastructure Western Australia to look at things like this. The point of this amendment is that the government is preventing Infrastructure WA from doing its job of looking at this issue. It is also highly politicising infrastructure planning in the state, which Infrastructure WA was set up by the government to avoid. By excising this right of way, the government is preventing Infrastructure WA from doing the function this Parliament has just given it. That is why we put the amendment together. It is very reasonable. It should not even have to be put forward.

Why does the minister not wait, put off this bill, and excise the right of way with this bill when Infrastructure WA has looked independently at the issues of port developments, the 20-year plan and the necessary infrastructure involved in the ports and road and rail access? Any government really interested in infrastructure for the future of this state would have done that automatically. We would not be here if the government was interested in that. We are trying to get the minister to act sensibly.

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

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We had disagreement within this chamber about the necessity for Infrastructure WA. I was the Leader of the Opposition at the time and I supported it. I saw how it works in other states. It could be another bureaucratic organisation or it could become a toothless mouthpiece for the government of the day. If it does that, it will not have a long life because the next government will just throw it out. In other words, it could be counterproductive by increasing the politicisation of infrastructure planning in the state, something the Premier said it was supposed to overcome. However, pre-empting the independent consideration of one of the most highly politically contentious, but necessary, infrastructure developments in this state undermines the relevance of Infrastructure Western Australia. If the government is going to tell Infrastructure Western Australia, for this one and others, that it cannot look at things that are now underway—maybe all the Metronet projects, including the outer harbour, for all I know—and that it will make decisions and pre-empt Infrastructure WA, I suggest it should close down the organisation before any money is wasted. By excising part of the Roe 8 reserve in advance of the Westport study, which deals with this explicit issue about the life of the port, just months before the final report from Westport is supposed to come out, the government has basically wasted \$20 million. It has just thrown it up against the wall. I believe that Infrastructure WA is now operating and starting to get on with its 20-year plan, but the minister is excising land and stopping it from fulfilling its function of depoliticising infrastructure development in this state.

This agreement is just simply to say, “Listen, you made a serious error here. You’re playing politics with people’s jobs and infrastructure, and good infrastructure in the state, and the linkage to a port.” It is undermining productivity in agriculture and across all industries. The government set up an institution called Infrastructure Western Australia to avoid that. Why does the minister not wait a while or, more importantly, why not provide that this bill does not commence until Infrastructure Western Australia has taken a look at it? It is very sensible. That the minister is not agreeing to this or, more importantly, did not do it in the first place, shows we have a problem here. The government is not really interested in infrastructure development and the efficient transmission of not only cars through that area but also trucks to the port; it is interested, solely and exclusively, in playing politics with certain groups in that area.

Infrastructure Western Australia was explicitly designed by this government to overcome what this government has done and is doing here. Think about it. Go back. If the government sets up a standard like this, future governments will do the same thing that this government is doing. It is a waste of money and it is causing chaos. That is what the minister is driving here. If Nicole Lockwood’s alternative proposal keeps the port of Fremantle going and turns Leach Highway into a truck corridor, as she is telling people, the government will see revolts in the southern suburbs. The Labor Party will lose safe seats because it is stupid.

I ask the minister to reconsider and accept this amendment to hold off this bill; do not commence it until Infrastructure Western Australia does its job and looks at it in an objective manner.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I want to ask a couple of questions about the proposed amendment. Does the minister support and value the work of Infrastructure WA?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, and I also support the excellent work being done by the Westport Taskforce.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Considering the minister supports the work undertaken by Infrastructure WA, did the minister run the changes in this legislation at all by Infrastructure WA during the drafting?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In case the member for Darling Range has not been in this Parliament today or the previous days we have debated this bill, this has been an election commitment. If anyone had not noticed, it is an election commitment.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Does that mean you don’t have to follow due process?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The questions are repetitive. For example, would the member put Roe 8–9 to Infrastructure WA?

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Dr M.D. Nahan: Yes.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So the member is committing to it subject to Infrastructure Western Australia approving it? Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman, you have an opportunity to ask a question. No discipline.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is the Tonkin Highway extension subject to Infrastructure Western Australia approving it?

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So it would be subject to Infrastructure WA?

Dr M.D. Nahan: Yes. That is what we are asking here.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So at the election, you will say Roe 8–9 is subject to Infrastructure WA—is that what the member is saying?

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Can you answer my question, please?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am answering.

Dr M.D. Nahan: I will get up after her.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Oh, thanks.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Oh, well, you guys have a discussion between yourselves and I will go back to what I was doing!

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman, if you want to ask a question, get up, like everyone else does.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I am going to assume that the minister did not understand my question. I am asking: did the minister run this legislation past Infrastructure WA, whose work she just said she supports? Did the minister run this past Infrastructure WA?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Member, I do not run every metropolitan region scheme amendment past Infrastructure WA.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Yes or no?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Seriously.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: The fact that the minister will not answer the question leads me to assume that that is a no. She has not taken this legislation, while drafting it and working it together, past Infrastructure WA.

Ms S.F. McGurk: It is a scheme amendment for an environmental reserve.

The SPEAKER: Members, it is on the amendment.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Noting the fact that the minister has refused to answer the question, it is a no, unless she wants to rectify the record. I will say that it is a no. Given that the answer to my first question was that she actually supports and understands the important work of Infrastructure WA, can the minister let us know why she believes a project of this scale does not deserve to go through Infrastructure WA?

Ms S.F. McGurk: It is a scheme amendment for an environmental park.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: You're not the minister.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: To echo the member for Fremantle, it is a scheme amendment about changing a road reservation to an environmental reservation.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I want to highlight the principal objectives of Infrastructure WA. Section 7 of the Infrastructure Western Australia Act 2019 reads —

Infrastructure WA's principal objects are —

- (a) to provide advice and assistance to the Government on matters relating to infrastructure;

We are dealing with a road reserve on which an essential piece of infrastructure will be built. The section continues —

- (b) to assist in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of infrastructure planning and coordination;

The issue that we are dealing with deals with the planning and coordination of infrastructure. The section continues —

- (c) to promote the adoption and use of policies, practices, information and analysis to support sound decision-making in relation to infrastructure.

A body that is taking an action that will affect major pieces of infrastructure would, I think, go to its newly established infrastructure adviser, in this case Infrastructure WA, in the process of considering its decisions. The minister is telling us—we think, because she is not talking—that she did not do that. I ask her why. We sat and debated the Infrastructure WA Bill at length. The Premier went on and on about how it was going to transform,

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

depoliticise and coordinate infrastructure. One of the major projects that has been a bone of contention in this state for decades will be affected by this decision, and the minister did not talk to Infrastructure WA about it and did not get its advice. Why?

Ms R. Saffioti: I have answered it.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: It is very bizarre that the minister just does not answer questions, but we will keep asking, and hopefully we might get there. The Infrastructure Western Australia Bill was brought in by the Premier, and his own media release stated how important Infrastructure WA is. It is about improving infrastructure coordination and planning, encouraging investment and supporting job creation. The media release goes on to state that the authority will advise government on state infrastructure needs and priorities to ensure maximum value from every dollar spent by government agencies on major proposals. I believe, and I believe the opposition believes, that the road infrastructure that was going to be the next connection on Roe 8 is a major proposal, which the government is now seeking to alter. It has been in the plans for many years. I would have thought that the minister would run it past Infrastructure WA—the government’s own creation—and make sure that it passed the test.

If the minister is not going to run it past Infrastructure Western Australia, will she just choose which infrastructure planning projects she will run past Infrastructure WA? Is it really just a bogus set-up? Will she just pick and choose which projects she deems to be important or will all projects, planning changes and major proposals go through Infrastructure WA? What is the intent of the government and the minister?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Infrastructure WA is not bogus. The Infrastructure Western Australia Bill was debated in this house. I understand that the member did not contribute at all to that debate. If she wanted to contribute to that debate, she should have been here.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, do not fight over it. I know I am a popular Speaker, but do not fight over me!

Ms L. METTAM: Members on this side of the house certainly supported the Infrastructure Western Australia Bill. We also supported the intent of the bill, which was about greater transparency and looking at the infrastructure needs of this state through a consultative process. It is also worth pointing out that —

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I will raise the point of order. Member, you are supposed to be talking about the words to be inserted, but you are not. It is not a speech. It has to be on the amendment.

Ms L. METTAM: It is.

The SPEAKER: No, it has not been so far.

Ms L. METTAM: You have not heard what is coming.

The SPEAKER: Are you querying my decision, member?

Ms L. METTAM: No.

The SPEAKER: You can keep going, but just refer to the clause.

Debate Resumed

Ms L. METTAM: Referring to the clause and to the amendment that has been presented, I wonder whether the minister has considered that there is \$1.2 billion of infrastructure funding on the table. Surely that is another argument for at least allowing this decision to remove a road reserve to be considered by a body such as Infrastructure WA.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Vasse seems pretty keen on this \$1.2 billion. Given that we are not doing Roe 8 and 9, does she think that it should be redirected to the Bussell Highway duplication? Does she think that \$1.2 billion should be redirected to the Bussell Highway duplication? The member for Vasse saw this as the number one priority a few months ago and now she has dropped the Bussell Highway project just like that. She does not care about it anymore. She said that it was the number one priority. She said that there is \$1.2 billion of infrastructure funding on the table. Given that we are not building Roe 8 and 9—she understands that—should that money go to Bussell Highway?

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Should that money go to Bussell Highway?

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Should some of that money go to Bussell Highway—let us say \$100 million? Should that go to Bussell Highway? The member for Vasse will not stand up for her electorate in this chamber.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]
p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Point of Order

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Standing order 179, “Relevancy of debate”, states —

Debate will be confined to the clause or amendment before the Assembly and no general debate will take place on any clause.

I believe the minister is trying to canvass the member for Vasse —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The minister was trying to canvass the member for Vasse when we are trying to speak to the specific clause.

The SPEAKER: This side has gone very close to not debating the clauses, so I will give everyone the benefit of the doubt. Minister, you will get back to the clause.

Debate Resumed

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When we allowed the member for Vasse to go on sort of a walk through other matters, she brought up the \$1.2 billion. It does not relate to the amendment, but she brought it up. She said that there is \$1.2 billion. Does she think that should go to Bussell Highway?

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Does she think it should go to Bussell Highway?

The SPEAKER: Minister!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Does the member for Vasse think it should go to Bussell Highway?

The SPEAKER: Minister!

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Will she stand up for Bussell Highway in this chamber tonight?

The SPEAKER: Minister, back to the clause, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Vasse raised the \$1.2 billion.

Mr B.S. Wyatt interjected.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Will the member stand up for her electorate tonight?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Will she stand up for her electorate tonight?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Point of Order

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I have heard the minister canvass the member for Vasse about a dozen times. This is not relevant to the clause that is being debated. Under standing order 179, I ask —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Excuse me. You have taken over as Speaker, have you?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: — members to return to the relevant issue.

The SPEAKER: The member for Vasse brought up the \$1.2 billion.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Does the member want to make a comment?

Mr D.C. Nalder: I’m making a comment to him. She’s asking the questions.

The SPEAKER: The figure of \$1.2 billion was raised by the member so it has come into the conversation. Minister, have you finished? Do not ask again.

Debate Resumed

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will not ask the question because the member for Vasse will not answer it. It is a very easy question to answer. The local member has stated that the Bussell Highway duplication should be a priority. She has gone out multiple times, talking about the safety issues on Bussell Highway.

Mrs R.M.J. Clarke: I'll have it in my region.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for Murray–Wellington. She wants it in her region. She is standing up for her electorate. The member for Pilbara wants it too.

The SPEAKER: Excuse me. I wanted some. I think we will get back to the clause.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Vasse alluded to the \$1.2 billion when discussing an amendment that does not refer to the \$1.2 billion. Tonight, the member for Vasse will not stand up for her electorate. If we are not building Roe 8 and Roe 9, why can we not spend that \$1.2 billion on Bussell Highway?

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Excuse me, member. Your minister is on her feet.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I recall, we were elected on a clear package of measures and we are implementing those measures.

The federal government wants to play a bit of politics; it wants to pull a political stunt on the side of the road. Western Australians do not like Canberra politicians trying to hijack press conferences.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They do not like Canberra politicians coming to hijack. There is \$1.2 billion available. The member for Vasse should stand with me and ask the federal government to redirect those funds to the Bussell Highway duplication. She should stand with me and say, "We're not spending the \$1.2 billion on Roe 8 and Roe 9." The member for Vasse raised some concerns earlier. The irony of this whole issue is that before the member for Vasse was the shadow spokesperson for transport, she was raising Bussell Highway, and now that she is the shadow Minister for Transport, she is not raising Bussell Highway. That is quite bizarre. She has not raised that issue, even though \$1.2 billion is sitting there. She should join with me. Let us get that \$1.2 billion. We can do that Bussell Highway duplication before she knows it. She should stand with me as we go to the federal government and take a bipartisan approach. We are not going ahead with the project. I know the opposition does not agree with that. Let us park that. Let us get the funding for the duplication of Bussell Highway. I ask the member for Vasse one last time: will she stand with me and get that funding for the duplication of Bussell Highway? Is that silence?

The SPEAKER: Members, we have diverted. If we want to be here for 48 hours, we can keep bringing up stuff.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The SPEAKER: Does the member want to stay for 48 hours? She will be on her own. Let us get to the question that the words to be inserted be inserted.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I will return to my question, which still has not been answered. The minister seems to find a voice when she wants to talk about political pointscoring. Let us see if we can get an answer to a real question. Why is the minister picking and choosing which important projects—major proposals that this government will be undertaking—will go through the Infrastructure WA organisation that she created and that she has said here tonight is important? Why is she picking and choosing which ones and why has this not gone through?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I reject the premise of the question. As I said, this is a scheme amendment, so the premise of the member's question is completely wrong. I do not know why the member was not here for the Infrastructure Western Australia debate. Maybe the member could have asked the Premier about the operations of IWA. I understand that the member for Darling Range did not contribute to it at all. As I understand it, the member for Vasse did not raise Roe 8 at all in the IWA debate. I do not know why the member for Darling Range was not there; I do not know why she was not interested in IWA then, but she is now. I answered her question.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I have not had an answer to the question. I do not know what is coming out of her mouth, but it is all just verbal rubbish. Regardless of what I have or have not debated, we are sitting here right now in Parliament, and all we are being shown again is what we saw last night—contempt of Parliament and contempt of process.

The SPEAKER: Member, can you get to the point, please.

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: Mr Speaker, the behaviour of opposition members tonight in consideration in detail has been deplorable. They have moved an amendment that states —

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Notwithstanding anything in this act, this act comes into operation only if and when it is reviewed by Infrastructure WA, and a report of the review is tabled in both houses of Parliament.

They are not speaking to that amendment. If they are not speaking to that amendment, that amendment should be put to the chamber, and we should vote on it. It is just deplorable behaviour.

The SPEAKER: It is a good point of order. I am sure the opposition will get to the point. They are the ones who have put it up. They obviously want to get it passed—if they do.

Debate Resumed

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Absolutely. I will explain my question again, because obviously it is very difficult to understand. I suggest that those members who do not have the amendment get a copy. The amendment is that this act be referred to Infrastructure WA. Members might want to read what Infrastructure WA is. I did read it out earlier, but obviously no-one was listening. Infrastructure WA will maximise value from every dollar spent by government agencies on major proposals. What is contained in this bill is a major proposal—a major change to the infrastructure plan for Western Australia. If government members do not think that, my lord, they are actually more out of touch than I thought. Infrastructure WA should review all major proposals under the government's implementation. Can the minister please advise why—the minister has still not told us—this has not gone past Infrastructure WA? It is a simple question.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have answered the question a couple of times. It is a scheme amendment to expand a parks and recreation reserve.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I draw the minister's mind back to February 2019, when the Premier announced the introduction of the Infrastructure WA legislation into this Parliament, which forms the premise for the amendment that the opposition has brought forward to Parliament today. The media release at the time stated —

Infrastructure WA Bill next step to growing the economy and creating jobs

...

The legislation will ensure the State's long-term infrastructure priorities are informed —

The SPEAKER: Member, can you keep going with your question, please.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It is a bit hard. Is the minister obliged to actually listen?

The SPEAKER: Do you want me to sit you down? Just ask your question and the minister will answer it.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Okay. It states —

The legislation will ensure the State's long-term infrastructure priorities are informed by robust independent advice, and will foster a bipartisan approach and greater collaboration between the Government, community and industry.

Further on in the media release are comments from the Premier, Mark McGowan, which state —

“In the past, governments have been too short-sighted and only focused on the election cycle.

...

“For years, business and industry have been calling for a long-term infrastructure strategy, that's why the immediate priority for IWA will be to develop a 20-year plan.

...

“Infrastructure WA will work collaboratively with Government, the community and industry to adopt a bipartisan approach to forward planning to achieve long-term benefits for WA.

Clearly, the opposition and the government have a difference of opinion on the need for the Roe 8 and 9 project. The road reservation that the government is seeking to extinguish by an act of Parliament, as opposed to the usual process, is what we are considering today. In the context of the Infrastructure WA legislation and the fact that the Premier brought it to this place to provide a bipartisan approach to infrastructure planning for the state, it would seem to us a not unreasonable amendment for the minister and the government to accept. It is saying that the Liberals have a policy about the need for this road reservation and the government has a policy about the need for this road reservation. The Premier has said he wants a bipartisan approach, so why not let Infrastructure WA assess the need for the abolition of the road reservation that is being considered by the Parliament? Why not hold in abeyance the destruction of any opportunity in the future to construct this road, which would thereby negate any attempt at bipartisanship on this matter? Why not take this on and agree to the opposition's amendment, which basically says that once this legislation is passed, Infrastructure WA will consider it and table a report in Parliament? That report might say, “Yes, the road reservation might be required in the future and should be kept”, or, “No, the road reservation will never be needed. Infrastructure WA has looked at the 20 to 50-year needs of metropolitan

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Perth and determined that this road reservation will never be needed in the future of Western Australia.” That is what Infrastructure WA has been set up to do. Why would we not hold off the gazettal of the legislation, which is the final act that would remove this road reservation from being in play for any road ever again in the future, and at least allow Infrastructure WA to put together its structure plan for the needs of the state, consider whether this road reservation might be needed and make a recommendation to Parliament? If the independent Infrastructure WA, which is taking a bipartisan approach to the future infrastructure planning needs of metropolitan Perth, tables in Parliament a report that says that this road reservation will never be needed in the future of the state, the opposition will accept that direction from Infrastructure WA. If it tables a report in Parliament that says that Roe 8 and Roe 9 will never be needed no matter what happens with infill in Western Australia, no matter where our population goes, no matter what happens with Fremantle port and the outer harbour with freight container traffic, and no matter what happens with any infrastructure in the future of the state, the opposition will accept that direction from Infrastructure WA.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Leader of the Opposition obviously wants us to put all scheme amendments through Infrastructure WA. That would create a lot of red tape. Every scheme amendment that touches a road reservation would have to go through IWA. I refer to the Stirling Highway reservation that was rationalised just before an election. How did that work? It was the one that went through the former member for Cottesloe’s backyard. Remember the rationalisation of that road reserve in Stirling Highway? The former government rushed that through just before an election. I remember that when I was elected, I was going, “Jeez, did we have to rationalise that?” Too late. It is done. It is all gone. As was said on about four occasions, this is a scheme amendment. If the Leader of the Opposition’s position is that all scheme amendments need to go through IWA, she is introducing a lot of red tape and delays.

Dr A.D. Buti: That will be the headline in *The West* tomorrow.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It will be “More red tape from the Liberal Party”. It is a scheme amendment. The Liberal opposition’s position may be that we put all scheme amendments through IWA, but we do not have that policy. We have a policy of implementing our election commitments.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The minister is trying to trivialise what we are doing here today. This is not a normal scheme amendment. In response to what the minister said, no, I do not believe that every scheme amendment should go through Infrastructure WA. What a ridiculous thing to say. But this is not a normal MRS amendment and it has not been through the normal MRS amendment process.

For members in this place who may not understand what happens with scheme amendments, I will explain the main steps. First, the Western Australian Planning Commission resolves to amend the Metropolitan Region Scheme and refers it to the Environmental Protection Authority. The EPA determines the level of environmental assessment and an environmental review is prepared, if required. The WAPC submits to the minister for consent to advertise, and an amendment is advertised seeking public comment. The WAPC considers the submissions and makes a recommendation. Environmental conditions are then incorporated if required and it is approved by the Governor. Once the scheme amendment has been considered by the Parliament, the amendment takes effect in the Metropolitan Region Scheme. We are not considering a normal MRS amendment. We are considering an act of Parliament that will circumvent the entire process of consultation. The government is taking an unusual step in making a scheme amendment by circumventing all the steps and going directly to an act of Parliament. This specific act of Parliament—this road reservation removal and conversion into parks and recreation—is a most unusual way to implement a scheme amendment. For members who have not been here long, MRS amendments normally get tabled by way of regulation —

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The member for Wanneroo should listen and learn, because she has not been here very long. Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Scheme amendments are normally tabled and there is an opportunity —

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: There is an opportunity in the Legislative Council for a disallowance motion. In this case the opportunity for a disallowance motion is not available because of the process the minister has taken. The minister has removed all the steps that are the usual process in this state and wants to use an act of Parliament to amend the scheme. The normal consultation process has not occurred.

Several members interjected.

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The minister is going against the words and position of Premier Mark McGowan when he introduced Infrastructure Western Australia. IWA was to provide an environment that is precisely the reverse of what the minister is creating right now. The minister is making a planning strategy and deleting future planning opportunities for future roads that might be needed in 50 years. She is circumventing the normal process and jumping across 10 steps of consultation in bringing this legislation to Parliament. She will not even consider this amendment. We are not saying that the government should hold this in abeyance —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The opposition is not saying the government should hold this in abeyance until Infrastructure Western Australia has made its plan for the metropolitan region and its road, freight and rail infrastructure. We are not saying this should be held in abeyance until that is all done. We are saying that the government should hold the removal of this important road reservation in abeyance until Infrastructure Western Australia has considered it and has tabled a report in Parliament as per the legislation that when —

Ms L. METTAM: Can I hear more from the Leader of the Opposition?

The SPEAKER: She has not finished yet. You have just taken 20 seconds off her time.

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Goodness me, the member for Wanneroo is very noisy over there. Why does she not seek the call?

We are not saying, as the minister is trying to assert—a ridiculous assertion—that every single metropolitan region scheme amendment should be subject to Infrastructure Western Australia. The minister does not like it; we in this chamber all voted for Infrastructure Western Australia because it was to take a bipartisan approach to infrastructure planning for the state that would be separate from electoral cycles. What the minister is doing is the antithesis of the intent of the Infrastructure Western Australia legislation. She is basically using an election cycle to remove this road reservation forever, to never have it considered by Infrastructure Western Australia and to never need to have it considered by Infrastructure Western Australia, because she believes that she has a mandate from the electorate to remove the scheme.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: This is the same old nonsense that we get.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, this is a serious bill. I want to hear it, please.

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

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

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Whether the government has a mandate or not, it introduced the Infrastructure Western Australia legislation so that infrastructure planning would not be subject to electoral cycles. It is hypocritical for the minister to now circumvent a standardised MRS process through legislation, and she will not even hold the removal of this reservation in abeyance while the body her government created to remove political interference in infrastructure planning has an opportunity to consider it.

I think I have made the point—I not going to labour it, because it is really clear —

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I am glad that government members are all here this evening. Last night this place was like a ghost town.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I know we are not going to get the minister to agree, but I think we have made the point, and I will conclude: we do not want Infrastructure Western Australia to consider every scheme amendment; that would be ridiculous. This is not a normal scheme amendment. This is a political decision that could hobble future infrastructure requirements of the metropolitan area.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

A member interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister, are you in your seat?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: All we are asking of the minister is to stand in the spirit of the Infrastructure Western Australia legislation, which passed through both houses of Parliament, and allow it to assess whether we should keep this road reservation in our back pocket for the future. Let Infrastructure Western Australia, that independent, bipartisan body, assess whether this will never be needed or whether we should keep it in our back pocket for future generations. After it has made its assessment, let it table its report in the Parliament, and if that independent body reports to this Parliament, “Absolutely delete it; it’ll never be needed”, I will sit down and not speak of it again.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am a big fan of Dr Seuss, but I did not think the Leader of the Opposition would be using that as her script to debate this bill!

I will go through the issues. Other MRS amendments have disallowance provisions. Members can vote against this bill. It is not as if we are not letting people vote; there is actually a vote in this house. The member was not in the chamber, but this bill was modelled on a bill relating to a reservation that was passed in 1994 by the Court government, so it is not unprecedented; it was actually modelled on a bill put forward by the late Richard Lewis. It is very clear from the Leader of the Opposition’s contribution that the opposition does not believe in election commitments at all—the concept of mandates and commitments. The Liberal Party makes commitments, but it does not keep them. That is why it failed to deliver its own commitment to Roe 8. It was elected in 2008 and never kept that commitment; nor did it deliver the Ellenbrook rail line or MAX light rail.

This is a scheme amendment, being delivered through legislation that exists in this state. The opposition is saying that it believes certain scheme amendments will need to go to Infrastructure Western Australia. I do not believe the role of IWA —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I am saying this one.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are members opposite going to pick and choose?

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, do you want to go home early? Yes, you do, but you are not going to.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Members opposite use the words “pick and choose” against this government. Is the member picking and choosing which scheme amendments will go to IWA? That is a lot of red tape, and we are into cutting red tape. I know members opposite want more red tape. If that is what the member is proposing for all the scheme amendments that affect parks and recreation or road reserves, I think that would be an issue.

As I have said, the member’s Dr Seuss contribution was interesting to listen to. The member has repeated the same argument of other members. It is not as though we are not letting members vote on this amendment. There is precedent in relation to this process. The member used the words “mandate or not”. Members opposite throw around words, “Yes, it was an election commitment, but, you know.” That is how members opposite view election commitments. We view them seriously.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are you choking, mate?

Mr D.C. Nalder: Yes, I am choking.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: He swallowed on his maths!

The SPEAKER: Members! Very funny, Treasurer, but let us get on with it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, the SmartRider!

We take our election commitments seriously.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am quite enjoying this. I am enjoying our government delivering our election commitment. I am enjoying the opposition not standing up for Bussell Highway, and the Leader of the Opposition talking in

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

riddles. The fact is that we are very proud of our commitment to the people of Western Australia. We are very proud that we can deliver it.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I was up in my office tonight, listening to this debate on the monitor, and felt the need — Several members interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I was working, as I am sure a lot of members were doing Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members! Thank you. I want to hear this.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I was up in my office, doing some work, thank you, minister, and felt the need to make a comment. The comment reflects the particular amendment that is before the house. That is the notion of putting this project, which, as I understand it, meets the threshold of IWA —

Ms R. Saffioti: Which project?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am talking about a bill that will potentially change the outcomes of a pathway into Fremantle port under Roe 8. If the minister is talking about infrastructure investments in Western Australia, a project of that scale would meet the prerequisites of Infrastructure WA.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale! I call you to order for the second time. You are not going home early either.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: This bill has been on the notice paper for a long time. During the second reading debate, the Nationals moved what was, from memory, a reasoned amendment, basically saying, “Don’t touch this until you put the Roe 8 project through Infrastructure WA.” At that time, the lead argument from this minister was that Infrastructure WA is not in place, and she waded around the bill and said that the government is not going to hold up progress in Western Australia on the back of not having Infrastructure WA in place. Infrastructure WA is now in place. That was the lead argument that was put to counter the amendment that was put up by the Nationals during the second reading debate. That is how long this bill has been on the notice paper. This bill has come on today only because of the circus that happened last night. We are now back onto that debate. Yes, it is an election commitment. However, I would not have thought it would be a big step for this bill to be part of the government’s other election commitment, which was Infrastructure WA. The objective behind the establishment of Infrastructure WA was that it would have a level of independence about infrastructure investment in Western Australia for significant projects. Roe 8 and Roe 9, and the transport routes into Fremantle, are significant projects. So, what is the government frightened of?

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, I have got your message. You are not going through it, okay?

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Why is the government frightened of putting it through Infrastructure Western Australia? What is the government frightened of? It is the government’s own initiative; it is its own commitment. What is the government frightened of? Why is the government scared about that? The government is worried that if there is any objective assessment of this issue, its position will not come out on top. That is the issue. The whole point of Infrastructure Western Australia, which was couched when the Premier put the legislation up in this place, was the notion of bringing a level of independence to the assessment of major infrastructure projects in Western Australia.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Armadale, it does not matter.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Why does the government not put something as fundamental as access to the Fremantle port through that process?

The SPEAKER: Talk through the Chair.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: Mr Speaker, he is goading me!

The SPEAKER: I have quietened him down.

Mr D.T. REDMAN: I am making the point that this argument was put up prior to Infrastructure WA being in place. The lead argument from this minister was that the government was not going to hold up the progress of the state and this legislation through this place on the back of Infrastructure Western Australia not being there. It is

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]
p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

there now; here is the chance for the minister to support it. The government should wait until it goes through that process so that the decision has a level of independence, which is the very position the Labor Party took to the last election. What is the government frightened of? Let it happen. I support this amendment.

Question to be Put

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I move —

That the question be now put.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (32)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr T.J. Healy	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms A. Sanderson
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr M. Hughes	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Ms J.J. Shaw
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr S.J. Price	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.H. Cook	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms J. Farrer	Mr K.J.J. Michel	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Ms S.E. Winton
Mr M.J. Folkard	Mr S.A. Millman	Ms C.M. Rowe	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms E.L. Hamilton	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (13)

Mr V.A. Catania	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Dr M.D. Nahan	Mrs A.K. Hayden (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr D.C. Nalder	
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr K. O'Donnell	
Dr D.J. Honey	Ms L. Mettam	Mr D.T. Redman	

Pairs

Mr M. McGowan	Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr R.S. Love
Mr D.A. Templeman	Mr P.J. Rundle
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr J.E. McGrath

Question thus passed.

Consideration in Detail Resumed

Division

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (13)

Mr V.A. Catania	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Dr M.D. Nahan	Mrs A.K. Hayden (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr D.C. Nalder	
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr K. O'Donnell	
Dr D.J. Honey	Ms L. Mettam	Mr D.T. Redman	

Noes (32)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr T.J. Healy	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms A. Sanderson
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr M. Hughes	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Ms J.J. Shaw
Mr J.N. Carey	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr S.J. Price	Mr P.C. Tinley
Mr R.H. Cook	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms J. Farrer	Mr K.J.J. Michel	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Ms S.E. Winton
Mr M.J. Folkard	Mr S.A. Millman	Ms C.M. Rowe	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Ms E.L. Hamilton	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms R. Saffioti	Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>)

Pairs

Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr M. McGowan
Mr P.A. Katsambanis	Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr R.S. Love	Mr J.R. Quigley

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]
p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Mr P.J. Rundle
Mr J.E. McGrath

Mr D.A. Templeman
Ms J.M. Freeman

Amendment thus negatived.

Question to be Put

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: I move —

That the question be now put.

Division

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (32)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Mr J.N. Carey
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J. Farrer
Mr M.J. Folkard
Ms E.L. Hamilton

Mr T.J. Healy
Mr M. Hughes
Mr D.J. Kelly
Mr F.M. Logan
Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr K.J.J. Michel
Mr S.A. Millman
Mr Y. Mubarakai

Mr M.P. Murray
Mrs L.M. O'Malley
Mr P. Papalia
Mr S.J. Price
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms C.M. Rowe
Ms R. Saffioti

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

Noes (13)

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

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mrs S.K. L'Estrange
Ms L. Mettam

Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr K. O'Donnell
Mr D.T. Redman

Mrs A.K. Hayden (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr M. McGowan
Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr J.R. Quigley
Mr D.A. Templeman
Ms J.M. Freeman

Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr R.S. Love
Mr P.J. Rundle
Mr J.E. McGrath

Question thus passed.

Consideration in Detail Resumed

The SPEAKER: Members, the question now is that clause 2 stand as printed.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Mr Speaker, I wish to speak to clause 2.

The SPEAKER: No, you cannot. The question has been put.

Mr M.P. Murray interjected.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry to wake you up, Minister for Sport and Recreation. There is no need to be grumpy!

Division

Clause put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (32)

Ms L.L. Baker
Dr A.D. Buti
Mr J.N. Carey
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms J. Farrer
Mr M.J. Folkard
Ms E.L. Hamilton

Mr T.J. Healy
Mr M. Hughes
Mr D.J. Kelly
Mr F.M. Logan
Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr K.J.J. Michel
Mr S.A. Millman
Mr Y. Mubarakai

Mr M.P. Murray
Mrs L.M. O'Malley
Mr P. Papalia
Mr S.J. Price
Ms M.M. Quirk
Mrs M.H. Roberts
Ms C.M. Rowe
Ms R. Saffioti

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

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]
p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Noes (13)

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

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup
Mr A. Krsticevic
Mr S.K. L'Estrange
Ms L. Mettam

Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder
Mr K. O'Donnell
Mr D.T. Redman

Mrs A.K. Hayden (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr M. McGowan
Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr J.R. Quigley
Mr D.A. Templeman
Ms J.M. Freeman

Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr R.S. Love
Mr P.J. Rundle
Mr J.E. McGrath

Clause thus passed.

Clause 3: Terms used —

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: As I commented in my earlier remarks, “Metropolitan Region Scheme”, “Plan” and “Planning Act” are the definitions that we are looking at in clause 3. The opposition raised earlier that generally quite a process is involved with an MRS amendment. That plan—members can look it up if they like on the WAPC site—outlines a process for amending the metropolitan region scheme —

The process of a major amendment to the MRS includes the following steps:

- Formulation of the amendment by the WAPC.
- Referral of the proposed amendment to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) to set the level of environmental assessment. Where the EPA requires an environmental review, this is carried out before the amendment is advertised.
- Consent by the Minister for Planning to call for submissions.

Point of Order

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I was getting to my question

The SPEAKER: No; it is a point of order.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: My point of order is on repetition. This is exactly the same preamble the member gave before the votes. It is exactly the same, I think, word for word. She is repeating an MRS process. We understand the process, and the Leader of the Opposition is absolutely repeating word for word what she said about half an hour ago.

The SPEAKER: Member, you must be careful about repetition; there is a standing order against that, so I am sure you will get on with the question.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I am well aware of the standing order on repetition. I invite —

Ms R. Saffioti: Are you challenging the Speaker?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I invite the minister to check *Hansard* tomorrow. She will see it is not word for word, because I am actually referring to a different part. My question to the Minister for Planning refers to the next stage.

Several members interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Members can trivialise this process, but I take it very seriously. The next step reads —

- Advertising the amendment for public inspection and inviting submissions.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, I want to hear this in silence, please.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I know this is a touchy point, because this is the key point —

- Advertising the amendment for public inspection and inviting submissions. Advertisements are placed in local and statewide newspapers and information is made available on the PlanningWA website. Landowners whose property is directly affected by a proposed change are contacted in writing. Where there is an environmental review, this is also made available for comment.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]
p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Can the minister please explain to the house why she did not put this amendment out for comment, why she did not call for submissions from the broader community, why she did not advertise it as per the usual process and why she declined to get feedback from the various industry groups that see this as an act of planning vandalism?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: First of all, this bill is modelled on an act that was brought in by the Court government in relation to process. Second, did we go out for consultation? Yes, we did—on 11 March 2017. It was pretty heavily consulted on at the time, when we put forward our plan to the people of Western Australia. That was everybody.

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Bateman said, “Is an election a justification for delivering this type of —

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman. You have had the opportunity to speak, but you have not yet.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We put forward a plan.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You’re misleading the house.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Move a substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman, I call you to order for the first time; I have warned you three times.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We put forward a plan and we are implementing that plan. I know—shock, horror—that the Liberal Party says and does anything at an election and then walks away from it. We deliver on our election commitments. The bill in front of members is an election commitment. It was very clear at the election what we intended to do. We are implementing that. We consulted very heavily and the community responded by electing Labor and people like the member for Bicton. Members will remember that the member for Bateman would not run for the seat of Bicton because he was afraid of the impact of the decision made by the Liberal Party. We put forward a plan, we had an election, the plan was endorsed and now we are implementing that plan.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The reason I ask this is that when a metropolitan region scheme amendment is put out to the community, anyone can go to the Western Australian Planning Commission website and look at a long list of minor and major MRS amendments that have been through the standard process. One of the amendments was for a proposal from the City of Swan to rezone —

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: We are dealing with clause 3, are we not?

The SPEAKER: Yes, we are.

Several members interjected.

Mr S.J. PRICE: I am talking about relevance to the question. Clause 3 refers to three terms that are given a meaning.

Several members interjected.

Mr S.J. PRICE: It is about relevance. The member is talking about clause 4, which refers to the MRS being amended. She is not saying anything about the three terms that are given a meaning under clause 3.

The SPEAKER: It is relevant, but I think the member will get back to the point.

Debate Resumed

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The interjections and the attempts to shut down debate on this issue are really interesting. To give members an idea of why the opposition is highlighting the unusualness of the process that the minister has taken, there is a metropolitan region scheme amendment for a proposal to rezone approximately 0.65 hectares, being a portion of lot 1 Clayton Street, Bellevue, from rural zone to industrial zone to align the MRS zoning to the cadastral boundaries of the lot.

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: Once again, it is about relevance. Clause 3 refers to the meaning of “metropolitan region scheme”, the “plan” and the “planning act”. It is not about the MRS amendment that the member keeps talking about.

The SPEAKER: I think the member for Forrestfield has a good point. Can the member for Scarborough get on to what clause 3 says; that is, that the term has the meaning given in the planning act or means a plan held at the office of the Western Australian Planning Commission. You are getting off the mark.

Debate Resumed

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The metropolitan region scheme is a very important planning document. It is a planning framework. That is what the metropolitan region scheme is. The metropolitan region scheme comes with a set of rules on how to appropriately make changes to it. This is the point that we are trying to make ad nauseam in this place and the minister does not want to contemplate it. She has chosen an unusual process. There might be a precedent. There is one precedent in the history of the Parliament. That means that this might have happened twice. That is an unusual process.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I do not think you are talking about clause 3. Clause 3 states —

(1) In this Act —

Metropolitan Region Scheme has the meaning given in the Planning Act ...

Plan means Plan Number 4.1651 held at the office of the Western Australian Planning Commission ...

...

(2) An indicative depiction of the Plan is in Schedule 1.

The member cannot talk about the metropolitan region scheme. There is nothing about that in the clause that she can talk about.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I have a question for the member.

Ms L. Mettam interjected.

The SPEAKER: I beg your pardon, member for Vasse. Did you say I am gagging? No; I am just looking at the standing orders. I am sure you would be much better at that than I am.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Can the minister please explain to the house the importance of the metropolitan region scheme and why there is such a significant process involved in making any changes to it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The Planning and Development Act 2005 outlines a number of ways of changing the MRS, including this way, and that is what we are doing. The member was not in the house earlier, but not only do we have the 1994 example, but also, in many instances, we introduce legislation to deal with planning matters relating to a particular area that is economically or environmentally significant. Sorry for the repetition, but the member was not here earlier when we were discussing that. For example, the Hope Valley–Wattleup Redevelopment Act 2000 deals with particular planning issues. The initial Swan Valley Planning Act 1995, the revised legislation that the former government introduced just before the election and the legislation that we will soon introduce deal with planning issues in a particular geographical area. There are many instances in which legislation is used to deal with planning issues that have either environmental or economic significance. This is a way of amending the MRS, and that is what we are doing.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I refer to subclause (2), which refers to schedule 1. I note that there is a small section marked up in orange, which has been excluded and will be included in an urban zone. Is it correct that it will become an urban zone, and what is the plan for that parcel of land?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This land is being rezoned for consistency with the surrounding urban zone for the local road and suburban area.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Can the minister please advise us of the size of this land parcel?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We have that information but we are trying to find it for the member. I commit to providing the answer before the final vote on the bill.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: While the minister is looking for that information, I am happy to ask another question. I appreciate the minister looking for that information.

Can the minister please advise how many existing homes about that urban zone?

Point of Order

Mrs M.H. ROBERTS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to standing order 94, “Relevance”, which states —

(1) A member’s speech must be relevant to the question under discussion.

There is plenty of opportunity during the second reading stage for members to speak fairly widely. The only question under discussion at the moment is clause 3, “Terms used”, as the member for Forrestfield correctly pointed out, so it is about the terms “metropolitan region scheme”, “plan” and “planning act”. The member is asking questions that are nothing to do with clause 3. I would question the relevance and ask Mr Speaker to enforce standing order 94.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

The SPEAKER: Members, looking at the bill, this is all in clause 4(2). Members can ask it now, but if they look at the bill, they will see that all the information we are talking about now is in clause 4(2).

Debate Resumed

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Further to that, because the minister referred to schedule 1, I assumed that I was able to ask questions on that. If the minister is happy that I ask these questions on clause 4 and I do not get shut down in that space, I am happy to move on to clause 4. Can Mr Speaker please clarify: if clause 3(2) refers to schedule 1, am I able to speak about schedule 1?

The SPEAKER: You can ask the question on clause 4(2). I would prefer that you did that under the proper clause.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Just for clarification, as there was a point of order: am I entitled to continue my line of questioning under this clause?

The SPEAKER: I did that because I was advised that that was already in there. As the minister said, there is nothing in clause 3 that enables you to ask that there, but there is an opportunity to ask it on clause 4.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Thank you. I am just seeking clarification: am I not entitled to ask it right now?

The SPEAKER: No.

Several members interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: We are on schedule 1. A point of order has been raised to say that I am not able to ask my question on this clause. On clause 3(2), am I not entitled to ask those questions?

The SPEAKER: I am advised that it is best to put clause 3 to the vote, and then you can ask the questions under clause 4. Are you happy with that?

Several members interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Unlike the awful banter coming from behind, I will listen to you and take your advice.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4: Metropolitan Region Scheme amended —

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I will start again on schedule 1. At the back of the bill is schedule 1, which is a map that shows the urban zone. We have been trying to find out how large that parcel of land is. I have been trying to ask how many existing residences actually abut that zone or are on the roads in that zone, which are Parkway Road, Bibra Drive and Ingvarson Way. How many residences are located on those roads?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Just to clarify, the section of urban shown on the map is actually Bibra Drive. What we are doing as part of this process is cleaning up that existing usage, which is currently Bibra Drive. That is why it has been changed to urban—to clean up the reservation in that place. Approximately eight or nine homes abut it, but they abut the existing road. All this does is change that road's classification to urban for administrative reasons. It is just basically cleaning up that reservation in that area.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Thank you, minister. So eight or nine homes abut that road, but that does not include all the homes on those streets. Were residents consulted about the MRS change, and about the land that is not currently urban being made urban with the option of building housing there?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are not changing the use of the land, so it is going from a road to a road. We are not changing the fundamental use or nature of what is there. There will not be any impact on the residents because it is already a road and continues to be a road.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: It is becoming urban. Can the minister explain whether that urban strip can have residential properties added in that area; and, if so, has the surrounding neighbourhood been consulted? With any MRS change, the area is consulted.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is a gazetted road, so we cannot put houses on it.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: The second part of my question was: was anyone consulted such as would happen normally under an MRS amendment?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Bibra Drive is staying as Bibra Drive. There is no change in the nature of the use of that area. It is just a reservation. This happens many, many times when, for administrative reasons, the maps do not reflect the use that is occurring. That occurs in many instances.

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: Obviously, the minister is confirming that there has been no consultation. Will that become a mandate for any other MRS amendment—that the Labor government can make any amendment without consultation? We follow the lead of governments, so I am asking whether it will be a policy change that we do not consult when we make MRS amendments.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not understand the question.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: The answer is no.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have been advised that the answer is no.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Could the minister please advise which sections of the Planning and Development Act allow for this process to amend the MRS?

Mrs M.H. Roberts interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Police!

Mrs L.M. Harvey: You get so grumpy at night. It's funny.

Mrs M.H. Roberts: I am a night owl and I'm enjoying it.

The SPEAKER: It's a hoot! Still got it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is the primary legislation and it was modelled on legislation that was brought in in 1994.

Ms L. METTAM: What process or consultation schedule was undertaken to make the decision to amend the metropolitan region scheme on the plan for parks and recreation?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I outlined that before under clause 1. I outlined that the department undertook consultation with relevant councils and the relevant departments. As I said, this was a key commitment. There are community groups there every weekend replanting in that corridor. It is a key commitment. I outlined all the people who were consulted previously.

Ms L. METTAM: Can the minister provide a list of the local governments and the local groups outside those that she believes provided support throughout the election process?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I did before. It is in *Hansard*. I provided the list. I read it out before.

Ms L. METTAM: Can the minister provide some information on the sort of feedback that she received? Obviously, it is a big deal with a lot of Western Australians. The government is removing a road reserve. Can the minister provide the opposition some feedback on that?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think we can see the feedback in the community newspapers and on Facebook and in particular councils' positions. I note it is coming up to council elections and the Liberal Party is working hard to get domination in a couple of councils. I know this is part of what it is doing. Good luck to members opposite. I provided the information before. The member knows the position of the councils and I know what the Liberal Party is trying to do in Melville and Cockburn to keep some control and gain control in another. I know this is part of the Ben Morton play for gaining control of the councils in that area.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I refer to my previous question. Did the minister say that the Planning and Development Act had a section that allowed for this process of amendment, or is it some other statute?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I said before that it was under that act, but my legal adviser tells me that this is separate legislation. It will be the primary act. We are allowed to introduce this type of legislation to amend the metropolitan region scheme.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Just to be clear, the Planning and Development Act, which is the act that covers the way we manage planning and development in the state, has been circumvented and the government has introduced its own act of Parliament that is completely separate from the planning framework that has previously been legislated in this place.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I have said a few times, not only was there the 1994 example, but also governments of the day have brought in specific legislation that deals with planning matters of significant economic or environmental substance in many instances. For example, the Hope Valley–Wattleup Redevelopment Act deals with a similar issue through legislation; the draft Kwinana Mandogalup legislation would have had a similar impact; and, of course, there is the Swan Valley legislation. In many instances, specific legislation has been introduced to deal with planning matters in areas that are of economic or social consequence. The previous government brought in legislation that affected a number of homes in the Swan Valley, which it did not consult on. That is what it did. Similar things have happened on a number of occasions. This is just a democratically elected government bringing in legislation to facilitate an election commitment.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Ms L. METTAM: Will clause 4 of this bill trigger the government to provide any compensation or land acquisition for any landowners in the surrounding areas?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No. It is all government-owned land. I hasten to say that it will probably increase the value of the land of adjacent landowners because we will not be putting a massive road through the area.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Is this a precedent that the government will apply going forward, particularly for Metronet? It is a major development that the government is committed to —

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: I refer to standing order 179, “Relevance of debate”. It states —

Debate will be confined to the clause or amendment before the Assembly and no general debate will take place on any clause.

The member for Riverton is asking what is going to happen in the future.

The SPEAKER: It is a point of order. I agree with you. Member for Riverton, can you return to clause 4, please?

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Clause 4 states that the metropolitan region scheme will be amended by reserving the shaded green area as “parks and recreation” and the shaded red-brown area as “urban”. This bill will amend that. The minister said that this has been done repeatedly in the past and she is following up on an election commitment. The government made a large number of election commitments about Metronet. Is the government going to use the same process of unilateral change —

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: I return to standing order 179. What might happen with Metronet is not relevant to the clause that we are debating at the moment.

The SPEAKER: I agree. Member for Riverton, that is not part of the clause.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I will come at it again. I know the government does not want to answer this.

The SPEAKER: Member, you have to speak to the clause. You cannot make up your own rules.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Is this now a standard process of the McGowan government—that is, to implement planning changes through dictates such as this? Is this the method the government will use in implementing Metronet?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am not sure how the member thinks we build rail lines, but we bring in legislation to get the power to build rail lines, just like we did with the Forrestfield–Airport Link and like we did last year to facilitate Metronet stage 1, Yanchep and Thornlie. We brought in legislation, in a sense, to get the control to build a rail line; that is what we need to do. Are we going to bring in legislation to facilitate Metronet? Yes. Do we currently have planning instruments for the planning control areas we are implementing to facilitate, for example, Bayswater station and other stations? Yes. We need legislation to build rail lines.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I thank the minister for answering that. That is right; you do need planning. Is the minister going to apply the same decision-making process of approving one or another on a similar basis as she has done this?

The SPEAKER: Member, that is not part of this clause. If you keep bringing it up, I will have to sit you down.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The question I am trying to ask is: is the government of the day going to apply the same standards it has applied in this bill —

The SPEAKER: No, this is just repetition and it has nothing to do with the clause, so I am sitting you down.

Dr D.J. HONEY: How much of the green hatched area on the schedule 1 plan is coincident with the existing powerline easement?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: In relation to how much is directly under the powerline, we will try to get the member that information, but there can be parks and recreation under powerlines. Actually, there should be parks and recreation under powerlines.

Mr B.S. Wyatt: As opposed to residential areas.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. I aim to get the member that information, but in respect of the idea that powerlines somehow completely sterilise the land underneath them, they sterilise them from a residential point of view and a permanent accommodation point of view, but not from a wetland or parks and recreation point of view.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman; Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Dr D.J. HONEY: One of the comments that has been made in the debate on this bill is that that area will be rehabilitated. I have observed in that area that the powerline easement has been cleared of trees, and in fact that is common with high-voltage powerline easements. There cannot be bush under powerlines because a bushfire could cause damage to the powerlines. Is it the government's intention to re-tree the powerline easement that was cleared, or will it remain clear?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will take further advice, but it is my understanding that all land under powerlines is completely bulldozed.

Mr P. Papalia: It's a different spot.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. I will get further advice on the revegetation, but the revegetation is ongoing and, given that this land was bulldozed —

Mrs L.M. O'Malley interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was vegetated before it was bulldozed a few months before the election, so obviously they are revegetating the land that had vegetation on it before the Liberal Party bulldozed it. We are not revegetating things that were not bulldozed. Obviously there was vegetation there, the previous government bulldozed it, and it is being revegetated by local community groups. People were happy with the type and level of vegetation that existed before. Western Power was happy with the vegetation that occurred under powerlines, if it did. I think the whole concept is that this was not pastoral land; it was actually vegetated land that the previous government bulldozed, and now it is being revegetated by a bunch of volunteers.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Hope Road intersects the green hatched area that the government is excising in two different spots: one east and one west. Hope Road is an existing road. It is, of course, not odd to have a road through a park reserve. The whole purpose of this exercise is to protect this area from traffic. There was an existing road; it is often denied that it exists, but I understand it is going to continue. Can the minister tell us whether she is going to excise Hope Road where it intersects this green area, or will Hope Road remain as it has for some period of time?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Sorry; I was being asked something else. My understanding is that Hope Road is a parks and recreation reservation, so Hope Road will be treated consistently throughout that area.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The whole purpose of this was to protect the environment from a road. This is a road reserve, with an existing road on it. The whole purpose was to change this from a road reserve to parks and recreation. However, the minister has said that the existing road will continue to be there. The whole purpose is to excise a road reserve.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister! Do you want us to be here all night, like last night?

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: Mr Speaker, I once again refer to standing order 179. This should not be used as a general debate. This is meant to be the consideration of a particular clause or amendment, not a general debate, and that is what the member for Riverton is engaging in.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, but, member, do not err.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We are asking questions about clause 4, which states in subclause (1) —

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

I am pointing out the fact that this is already a road reserve. There is a road through it. The minister wants to change that to parks and recreation. The whole purpose is to excise a road reserve. However, the minister wants to continue to keep the existing road.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The Minister is not the responsible minister. He botched yesterday. I say he should sit and watch how things are done. He is a junior minister. He should sit and be a junior.

The SPEAKER: Member, get onto the clause, please.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The question is: will the minister allow the traffic on Hope Road to continue to grow; and, if so, what impact will that have on the objective of this exercise, which is to reduce car traffic through this area?

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is a local road. Local roads co-exist in all different types of reservations. Is the member asking us to shut Hope Road? Is that what the member is doing? Local roads exist in a number of different reservations. We are not shutting Hope Road, if that is what the member wants.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The evidence from the EPA was that in its assessment, closing Roe 8 would not result in a substantial increase in traffic on Hope Road. I thought the whole objective of this bill was to protect from traffic the area that is shaded dark green on the plan. If we do not have Roe 8, the existing road will potentially continue to expand. I might add that the whole purpose of this exercise is to protect the environment. The evidence is that particularly long-necked turtles are dying in large numbers on Hope Road. The females come out of the swamp and cross Hope Road to lay their eggs, and large numbers are killed by traffic on Hope Road. The evidence is there. The minister will continue to have Hope Road. That seems to me to defy the whole purpose of this exercise.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not believe that is the case. I do not believe that keeping Hope Road defies the whole purpose of this exercise. I do not agree with the member for Riverton's assertion on that point.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Is the minister going to monitor the volume of traffic on Hope Road, and, I might add, Bibra Lake Road? If the minister is proposing to change the zoning of this area from road reserve, and therefore from its current use, to parks and recreation, and an existing road goes through that area, the evidence is that in the absence of Roe 8, there will be a substantial increase in traffic on Hope Road. The evidence was that Hope Road was causing damage to some fauna, particularly certain types of turtles, and that Roe 8 would overcome that.

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I know the member does not want to hear it, but we are trying to point out a flaw in the government's process. I admit that traffic going down Hope Road is not going to be as significant as the 81 000 cars that would be taken off other roads along Roe 8, but it seems to me that if the government is going to go through this extreme measure to protect this area from roads, it would consider doing something about the existing roads. I take it that Hope Road exists in this right of way and therefore there will continue to be a powerline and a road going through the road reserve. The zoning will be changed, but there will continue to be an increasing amount of traffic in this area. Is that the case?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: While the member was on his feet, I spoke to the member for Fremantle, who knows a little bit about the environment in that area, as, of course, does the member for Bicton, and they are fully supportive of our proposal to keep Hope Road and not build Roe 8–Roe 9.

Ms L. O'Malley interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is pretty much where they are at and they have a lot of experience in the area. As much as I now believe the member for Riverton is a conservationist —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton has now become an environmental activist in this debate, as we move later into the night! Goodness knows what else he will become! Even though the member is now an environmental activist, I am sorry, but I will take my advice about all the environmental issues from the experts in the field, including my colleagues the member for Bicton and the member for Fremantle and probably the thousands of people who turned out to lobby the previous government not to bulldoze the land—even though it did. I will take my advice from these members and the experts. I also reject much of the premise of the member's question.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: They do not live anywhere near there or know anything about the issue except for their activism. It is the Environmental Protection Authority. The EPA report on this was really clear: there is a significant problem and, indeed, the EPA assessment required Main Roads, the proponent for Roe 8, to address a whole bunch of existing problems that would affect flora and fauna and, I might add, water. One of the reasons that the EPA approved the Roe 8 design was that Main Roads did that. One of the issues was turtles and other animals that walk on the existing road and get killed in large numbers. It is not me that saying that. The problem we have is that it is a reality. The evidence indicates it, but the minister is denying the reality of it. The minister says this whole excision is based on, as I think has been claimed at least, environmental reasons. One of the issues that exists with the land as it is currently is the death of a large number of endangered turtles, and Roe 8–Roe 9 was going to minimise that. When Roe 8 is excised, this problem is going to continue. Government members might laugh at it, but it perhaps highlights their motivation. They really do not care about the environment, they do not care about the turtles —

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Member, your last four or five questions have all been the same. That is called repetition. I warn you that there is a standing order against that, and if you keep it up, I will sit you down again.

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffiotti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The evidence is that Hope Road will be retained. The evidence from the EPA was that there is a significant problem—the City of Cockburn has highlighted this extensively—of the deaths of large numbers of turtles crossing Hope Road. The evidence from the EPA is that the volume of traffic on Hope Road without Roe 8 will increase, and therefore the incidence of these turtle deaths will increase. What is the minister going to do about it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: I do not accept the assertion. I have said on numerous occasions that there are primarily economic arguments against Roe 8–9.

Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: I have always said it.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member, you have just had four goes. Now, just listen to the minister and you might not have to have another one.

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: I have spoken about the economic arguments about 100 times, I think. There are economic and environmental reasons. I have debated primarily the economic.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister, your own minister is on her feet and I cannot hear her.

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: I reject the assertion and the claims the member has made.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister now says that the primary reason for this decision is economics. In her second reading speech the minister makes it quite clear that the primary purpose of this excision at this time—this Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill—is to in fact facilitate the Beeliar Regional Park, which has cultural significance to Aboriginal people. The second reading also states —

As any use and development of land reserved for parks and recreation must preserve the natural environment and provide recreational opportunities ...

The whole purpose of this bill, at least in terms of its timing, is to protect the environment from future road use. That is what the minister's second reading speech states. I am pointing out that one of the problems with the reserve remaining as it is, is that the fauna are being impacted by existing road use.

Point of Order

Dr A.D. BUTI: I raise this point of order under two standing orders. One is standing order 97 on repetition and the other is standing order 179 on relevance to the debate. This is not an opportunity for a general debate.

The SPEAKER: It is a point of order, member for Riverton.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: When this area is excised, Roe 8 cannot be built. As the Environmental Protection Authority pointed out, there are a whole range of design factors to protect flora and fauna and water movement. What will happen when this is excised? Roe 8 will be ruled out in the future.

The SPEAKER: Roe 8 is not in this clause.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I know that. It is the decision —

The SPEAKER: I will not warn you again.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes. What will the minister do to fix the problems in the area concerning flora, fauna and water movement?

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: I again reject the claims. It is not what my colleagues tell me is the case. We made a clear commitment at the election and we are delivering that commitment.

Ms L. METTAM: Has the government undertaken a flora and fauna assessment to inform the minister of the parks and recreation area?

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Ms R. SAFFIOTTI: I thank the member for her question. The Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions was consulted in preparing these maps.

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Ms L. METTAM: What percentage of this area contains native vegetation?

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

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

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Was that before or after it was cleared?

The SPEAKER: If you continue to disrupt Parliament, I will send you home.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: All of it contains native vegetation but the member's government cleared it. Now it does not and it is being revegetated.

Ms L. METTAM: Can the minister provide some detail on the advice she received from the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions and when she received it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The advice is that the department and the Minister for Environment very much support this legislation.

Dr M.D. Nahan: What about the department?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Does the member think the department would reject classifying this as parks and recreation?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Do they really think the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions would reject this? Sometimes departmental advice is a bit weird, but I do not think the department would reject this. In particular, this is something well supported by the Minister for Environment.

Ms L. METTAM: How much funding has been set aside for parks and recreation to restore the area?

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether that is part of the clause.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I can provide that information before the third reading stage. The important point, and one that I have highlighted a few times, is the number of volunteers who are out there on the weekends. There are families, kiddies, young mums, new mums —

Mrs L.M. O'Malley: I've been there a couple of times!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There are lots of good family types out there.

Mr M. Hughes: Why do they have to do it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because the Liberal government bulldozed it a few months before the election.

There are a lot of volunteers out there. Some funding has been allocated. I will provide that information. The other great thing is this has really galvanised the community. Through the Facebook feed, I see those community groups out every weekend undertaking massive planting exercises. I know the member for Bicton has been there. I think I have seen the member for Willagee out there, and probably the member for Fremantle.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: The member for Fremantle!

The SPEAKER: Some people get their hands dirty!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: She has been there in spirit. It has been a positive exercise. A lot of volunteers are keen to be involved.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I am still waiting for an answer to the question on the land parcel. I do not know whether the minister was going to come back to that.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We will provide it by the third reading stage. We have land parcels, but we do not think we have got that bit. I will get that information for the member by the third reading.

Division

Clause put and a division taken with the following result —

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]
p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

Ayes (29)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr S.J. Price	Mr R.R. Whitby
Mr J.N. Carey	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms M.M. Quirk	Ms S.E. Winton
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr K.J.J. Michel	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr S.A. Millman	Ms C.M. Rowe	Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms J. Farrer	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms R. Saffioti	
Mr M.J. Folkard	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms A. Sanderson	
Mr M. Hughes	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Ms J.J. Shaw	

Noes (13)

Mr V.A. Catania	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Dr M.D. Nahan	Mrs A.K. Hayden (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr D.C. Nalder	
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr K. O'Donnell	
Dr D.J. Honey	Ms L. Mettam	Mr D.T. Redman	

Pairs

Mr M. McGowan	Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr R.S. Love
Mr D.A. Templeman	Mr P.J. Rundle
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr J.E. McGrath

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5: Effect of amendments —

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I move —

Page 3, line 1 — To delete “section” and substitute the following —

Act

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We were here until very late last night because we had a flawed piece of legislation, brought to this place by the Minister for Small Business, that needed amending. This bill has less than five pages of detail, and this minister has an amendment on the notice paper because it was not word-checked properly. I just make that point. It is not that hard to proofread legislation and make sure that the wording is correct before it is brought to this place.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I accept that.

Amendment put and passed.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I want to seek some clarification from the minister. As I understand, should this legislation pass in the other place, which is in no way a done deal, clause 5 basically means that the metropolitan region scheme can be amended in the future to reverse the changes that the government has made with this one piece of legislation.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Just to clarify, minister: it could be amended by an independent piece of legislation with no consultation whatsoever with anybody in the community, any users of the area or people who may be committed to the area. It can just be done as an act of Parliament, because the government of the day decides that that is its will, and it does not need to go through any of the usual MRS amendment processes that would otherwise apply to every other region scheme amendment.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Similar to what the government did in 1994, yes. As I said, this will be an election issue. We understand that. There is no hiding that. Our plan is to reserve this land for future generations, and the opposition's plan is to carve it up with a road. We understand that. When I outlined that this is our plan for future generations, we wanted to give certainty to the people. Basically, I take election commitments very seriously. Some people put a lot of faith in the Labor Party on this issue, and I intend to do what I can to deliver to those people who put their faith in us on this issue. That is why I am doing this. As I said, the opposition's commitment is to build Roe 8 and 9. It will have to come in and change the MRS. Ultimately, that is something that members opposite can take to the election.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Just to be clear, to change it back, all that is required is a metropolitan region scheme amendment to change it from parks and recreation to road reservation. There is no other classification in this

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey

legislation to put it into a higher category, such as a Bush Forever site or a class A reserve, or to give it any other higher protection that would ordinarily be afforded to an environmental area that we want to remain sacrosanct for future generations. Would it just be a standard MRS amendment?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Classification is a separate issue, but this is an act of Parliament to change the MRS. A democratically elected government has the opportunity to bring in legislation. That is Parliament. That is the future. As I said, we made a commitment and people in this chamber, particularly the members for Bicton, Fremantle and Willagee, worked alongside members of the community to preserve this land for future generations. I take that very seriously. I am not like the Liberal Party —

Mr D.C. Nalder interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No; I am going to say this. The Liberal Party makes commitments to groups and when it wins, it just drops them. The member for Riverton wrote to everyone in his electorate and said that he would deliver Roe 8, but the Liberal Party dropped it as soon as it won government.

Dr M.D. Nahan: You ripped up the contract.

The SPEAKER: Member for Riverton!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We made a commitment to the people who campaigned. They were not people on the fringes of society; they were families living in the area—people represented by the members for Bicton and Fremantle.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Riverton!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As the minister of the day, I will do what I can to deliver on the commitments that we made to the people who put faith in us. That is what I intend to do. As I said, this will be another election issue. I am not shying away from that. The opposition has a different position. Take that to the election, but let us get on with delivering the commitments that we made at the election and help us deliver the mandate that we have on this issue.

Division

Clause, as amended, put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (29)

Ms L.L. Baker	Mr D.J. Kelly	Mr P. Papalia	Mr C.J. Tallentire
Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Mr S.J. Price	Mr R.R. Whitby
Mr J.N. Carey	Ms S.F. McGurk	Ms M.M. Quirk	Ms S.E. Winton
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke	Mr K.J.J. Michel	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr R.H. Cook	Mr S.A. Millman	Ms C.M. Rowe	Mr D.R. Michael (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms J. Farrer	Mr Y. Mubarakai	Ms R. Saffioti	
Mr M.J. Folkard	Mr M.P. Murray	Ms A. Sanderson	
Mr M. Hughes	Mrs L.M. O'Malley	Ms J.J. Shaw	

Noes (13)

Mr V.A. Catania	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Dr M.D. Nahan	Mrs A.K. Hayden (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms M.J. Davies	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr D.C. Nalder	
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Mr K. O'Donnell	
Dr D.J. Honey	Ms L. Mettam	Mr D.T. Redman	

Pairs

Mr M. McGowan	Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr W.J. Johnston	Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr R.S. Love
Mr D.A. Templeman	Mr P.J. Rundle
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr J.E. McGrath

Clause, as amended, thus passed.

Schedule 1 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.25 pm

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 14 August 2019]

p5559a-5583a

Dr Mike Nahan; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Libby Mettam; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mrs Liza Harvey; Mr Terry Redman;
Mrs Michelle Roberts; Speaker; Dr David Honey
