

PORT KENNEDY DEVELOPMENT BILL 2017

Second Reading

Resumed from 28 June.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.50 pm]: I rise on behalf of the opposition to support the Port Kennedy Development Bill 2017. We think it is a very sensible piece of legislation. I understand that a lot of work had been done by the previous Minister for Planning, Hon Donna Faragher from the other place, in preparing the contractual arrangements with the developer in this instance, and also preparing the drafting instructions for the legislation that we find before us in Parliament today. The Port Kennedy Development Bill 2017 will create some opportunities for the development to progress in a more normalised fashion in the Port Kennedy development area. It will provide somewhat of a win-win in that it will also prevent the developer in this instance from walking away from what has been a very difficult project to achieve.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr T.J. Healy): Member, are you the lead speaker?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Yes, I am.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: It will prevent the developer from walking away from what has been a very difficult project to prosecute. If the developer had walked away from the project because of the agreement that had been put in place and the legislative arrangements, the government of the day would have had no choice but to progress to litigation.

We are very pleased to see that the negotiation for public infrastructure sits with a contract with the developer in this instance. That will ensure that community infrastructure that underpinned the heart of this agreement when it was first established will be developed for the benefit of Western Australians. Port Kennedy is unique. Indeed, the beach in the vicinity of the development zone is one of the few north-facing beaches in Western Australia. Being north-facing, it possesses particularly favourable amenity and will provide a beautiful, well-protected beach for the residents of the southern suburbs around Baldivis and Jandakot et cetera to access and use for their recreational purposes.

I understand an agreement has been reached on the value of the investment already sunk into the project. The problem with this development is that subsequent legislative and regulatory changes made to the original development of this agreement plan have rendered around about 30 per cent of the land that previously formed part of the agreement undevelopable because of the changes in coastal planning policies et cetera. That was part of the problem the developer, Western Australian Beach and Golf Resort, had in being able to prosecute and fulfil the full agenda. I understand that \$20 million of costs have been sunk into the project, and the previous government, under the direction of Hon Donna Faragher as Minister for Planning, negotiated a contract with WABGR, but the contract was not to be binding on an incumbent government, should the election change the government with whom the project developer needed to deal.

That contract was a very good negotiation. Effectively, the contract puts in place a bank guarantee to ensure that the taxpayers of Western Australia are protected with respect to the investment that we expect from Western Australian Beach Golf Resort into the public infrastructure projects that the community really values, such as regional beach works, boat moorings and a public jetty. There is a surf club storage facility and access to beachfront car parks. As I understand it, there is a golf course down in the Port Kennedy area. I have not been there, but as a result of changes to the coastal planning policy, the agreement will require about nine holes of that golf course to be relocated.

It is a very clever contract that recognises the original intent of the project and the agreement between the state and the developer at the time. The proponent and the owner of the project has changed a number of times while this act has been in force. However, the community can expect that the public infrastructure will be delivered. The nine holes of the golf course will be relocated, but regular visitors will still have the amenity of a golf course in that area and access to a very good facility for those people who enjoy that form of recreation. The ecotourism and short-term accommodation sites that were to be available as part of the tourism offering for the precinct are valued at about \$4 million. They will still be developed and will still be available for the use of Western Australian taxpayers. Hopefully, we will see people from Asia and other states of Australia also coming here to take advantage of what will be a beautiful precinct once it finally reaches its full development potential. As I said previously, it is a very rare north-facing and protected cove that provides a wonderful beach environment, particularly for families with small children.

I am certainly looking forward to the project's completion. As I have been advised, around 800 lots will be available for sale and development once this legislation goes through and the act is repealed, and the contract then becomes the point of negotiation between the government and the developer. I think that 800 lots in a prime coastal location would receive very enthusiastic uptake by the community of Western Australia. Most people in Western Australia like the idea of being near an area of high amenity such as the coast, the river or, indeed, the hills. This provides a unique opportunity for people in the Port Kennedy corridor to access prime beachfront lots, and I look forward to seeing that develop.

I also welcome the transition to a normal planning process with the development of the structure plan. Once this act has been repealed, the City of Rockingham will commence a community engagement process for the development of a structure plan to cover this area that was previously inhibited and prohibited from development because of the constraints of this act of Parliament, which really made it impossible for the developer to achieve a desirable planning and development outcome.

I do not have a lot to add. As I said, the Liberal opposition is very supportive of this legislation. It will remove red tape and restrictions on development in an area that provides a prime development opportunity. It will allow a beautiful coastal hamlet to be opened up for Western Australians and others either to visit as tourists or to settle in. It will help us to further develop that unique Western Australian coastal lifestyle that we have become so fond of and create an opportunity for potentially 800 or more taxpayers of Western Australia to take full advantage of. On that note, I conclude my comments.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro — Minister for Tourism) [5.00 pm]: I want to make a contribution on the Port Kennedy Development Bill 2017 because it relates to my electorate. Both the Port Kennedy Scientific Park and Kennedy Bay development are within my electorate and will be impacted by the bill. I was first elected in February 2007. I think you were there, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Correct.

Mr P. PAPALIA: From that moment forward at different times throughout my tenure in office, I have been engaged in deliberations or discussions about the Kennedy Bay development, which was already an old project at that time. It had been under consideration and in progress for decades. The act was implemented at a time when, apparently, that was the norm for a development of this nature. I believe initially, in the dim past, this development included a marina and significant development that we would not impose on either Warnbro Sound or Port Kennedy these days, but that is why there was an act. Over the years, some poor constituents of mine were caught in a process whereby one iteration of the project would progress to a certain point and then be delayed and then the proponents would drop the whole project and move on, and then another iteration would be imposed on the people who had either bought or bought and built in the initial development. Over the years, some of those people have sold at a loss and moved on and others have moved in. All of them have been awaiting further development so that they can see an ultimate outcome from the original proposal.

The outcome will not look like the original proposal. I feel that we will end up with a much more enlightened and contemporary development. There is no reason it should not be a normal property development. I say this on behalf of my constituents who have expressed their concerns to me over the years. The people who live in the area or own property in the adjacent suburbs are part of the process, and they need to be consulted thoroughly and have their concerns addressed and their issues heard. That has been part of the problem. Over the years, the project has progressed for short periods and then lapsed and then recommenced. There has been a breakdown in communication, and people naturally get concerned when they are not heard and not consulted.

There are some particular issues I would like to put on the record on behalf of various groups. I know the minister has received correspondence from representatives of the Kennedy Bay community association, who are very supportive of the bill going ahead. They are the people who I think largely reside in the original development. Apart from their own homes, the area is pretty much bare and is a wasteland. It is subject to some antisocial behaviour as a consequence of the development not going ahead and there not being a great deal of activity in what is, in effect, a cul-de-sac that ends at the beach. There is a lot of hooning on Port Kennedy Drive, and a lot of antisocial activity in the form of people dragging away boulders that were placed to inhibit access to the beach and protect the scientific park and the sensitive dunes. People regularly go there and insist upon shoving aside obstacles and driving onto the beach, damaging the dunes and what is pretty unique geomorphology along the foreshore. Through driving vehicles on what should not be a thoroughfare for vehicles, they potentially hurt people on the beach; that is a problem there. People clearly recognise that if the development goes ahead, there will be more activity and more people there, resulting in far less antisocial behaviour, so they are very supportive of it. It is good to see that people have contacted the minister and notified her; Alison Knibbs has been in contact via correspondence.

Other people reside in the older, more established part of Port Kennedy immediately to the east of the golf course. Part of that land that will be subject to part of this new development. The people who reside there are concerned, because by necessity the new development will have an additional access point. What is currently a cul-de-sac ending in a walk down to Warnbro Sound will become a through road as an alternative exit point from the development site and from the Kennedy Bay area. They are concerned about the impact on their lifestyle and the amenity of through traffic. As long as that is considered and addressed—perhaps through some very effective calming measures or other action that might result in it not being seen as a rat route, effectively—I think they will be satisfied. However, they are concerned and I must air their grievances because I have heard them say on many occasions that they have not been consulted, they do not know where the development is going and they would like to know. That is a reasonable concern and request.

I want to represent another party today: the Wetlands Research Association. Members of the association came to see me with a proposal for a Becher science park, which is an opportunity to establish an interpretive centre and a proper scientific study of the Port Kennedy Scientific Park. The area has been neglected and is fenced off. There is access though and over the years there have been a number of bushfires, some of which were lit in a crazy manner just to inflict damage and others as a consequence of a lightning strike or the like. Over the years this area has been neglected, and when we look at it in ignorance, as I did, because I was not aware of the qualities that this particular park possessed, it does not look like much. It looks like scrubby dune hinterland, but apparently there are unique wetlands at this site that enable a very detailed study to be made of long past history on the coast. There are also layers of coastline that can be identified clearly and studied. That opportunity does not, as I understand it, occur anywhere else in the world to this extent. This is a perfect site for the study of this type of geography and history of our coastline and the ancient past. A foundation has been established and a group, led by the Wetlands Research Association, would at its own expense—not at the government’s expense—and using its own resources, establish a proper interpretive centre for the public to access and be educated about the unique nature of these wetlands.

I have asked them and I think my office has arranged for them to meet with the Minister for Environment to explain what they are proposing. When members of the group came to see me most recently, they were of the view that they would not be allowed access to the Port Kennedy Scientific Park and would have to try to establish their interpretive centre over Warnbro Sound Avenue in Lark Hill, which would not be a very good outcome at all. I believe that there is an opportunity to give the group some land in the degraded part of the park. It would also establish a more constant presence that would diminish the likelihood of people driving onto the beach and breaking through barriers and damaging the wetlands, the sand dunes and the beach. I think that would be a great outcome and I encourage the minister to ensure that that group is engaged with as well in this process and its members get access to support in their discussions with DPaW or the latest iteration, whatever the acronym is for the department, to ensure that the group’s proposal and offer to create a unique interpretive centre is supported if possible.

I was looking at the direct public works that will arise as a consequence of the development going ahead, and they all look good to me. I can tell members that the golf course clubhouse is pretty much a demountable building. That golf course was very popular. It is well designed and quite a well-known course—I am not a golfer—that people travelled to play. Although the course will change—nine holes will be moved—I believe it will be very attractive for golfers still. It will be good for them and the surrounding community to get a suitable clubhouse to match the scale and the quality of the course.

The only observation I would make about the other works, like the regional beach works, boat moorings and public jetty—I applaud the intent of providing additional services; I am sure the boating community will welcome the boat moorings and the jetty—is that last time this development was moving ahead and the state government provided some facilities at the beach in the form of a boat ramp, there was a great deal of consternation and angst within conservation circles that Kennedy Bay is a feeding ground for fairy penguins that reside on Penguin Island and Garden Island at the Navy base. The rookeries are on those islands and the penguins travel south to feed in the shallows around the Kennedy Bay development. I just urge the department, the council and anyone undertaking these works to ensure that they are done in a sensitive manner with full awareness of the potential impact on the fairy penguin population.

It is good to see that there will be a surf club storage facility. The facility will be used by the Secret Harbour Life Saving Club that services an enormous area, spanning from Golden Bay to the short shallows leading across to Penguin Island. The club patrols the shallows in the summer months to try to protect people from themselves; people walk across the shallows and end up trying to drown themselves when the tide comes in. That will be good because it will provide the club the opportunity to provide further services north of the club rooms, which are located in Secret Harbour.

Beyond that, I commend the minister for getting on with this project. It has been decades in the making. Providing it is done in consultation with surrounding communities, it will be welcomed and it will mark a significant moment

in time when not only Western Australia will see the completion of the development that has taken decades, but also the electorate of Warnbro, and that is a good thing.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning) [5.14 pm] — in reply: I thank my colleague the member for Warnbro, and I thank the opposition for its support for the Port Kennedy Development Bill 2017. I apologise for not having had the briefing earlier, but we organised the briefing today and I know a number of opposition members attended it. In future we will make sure that briefings are held well before legislation is debated in this house.

The bill has a long history. When we won government, this bill, and the agreement executed under the previous government, was one of the first things put to me. I asked for some history about the project and was told that the first Port Kennedy development project agreement was signed in February 1992 and it has since gone through a number of forms. Its initial form included a marina, but there were some environmental issues and that was then taken away from the project. Then, as a result of the coastal setback policy brought in around 2010, the project again had to change. When I asked for the history, I was also told about the different planning ministers involved, and we can go through some of them: Richard Lewis, Graham Kierath, Alannah MacTiernan, John Day and Donna Faragher. I hope I am the last planning minister to have to deal with this project!

Many members of the community want to see this project completed because a very small community has been built there without the amenity that its members thought would be there when they moved to that area. They want access to many of the civil works that have been proposed. Of course, this is not the end of the planning process, and there are the issues raised by my colleague the member for Warnbro. We will be going through a structure plan phase in which the council will work with the community to make sure that the structure plan suits community needs and that the project moves forward.

This bill has been a long time coming. I am happy that I have been able to secure some legislative time early on to put this issue to rest. As I said, the previous government executed the sale and development agreement. It was non-binding on this government, but we believe that the course of action proposed by the previous government was the right one, and as a result we agreed to and adopted it. As I said, this has been a long time coming. Hopefully, this legislation gives some certainty to the landowners and the investment community. This project is happening in a very nice part of the world and I think there will be a lot of demand for purchases there because of that. It is in close proximity to the ocean and the facilities that come with it. I am happy we have been able to bring this bill to this place. Someone told me that eight planning ministers have been involved. I cannot name all eight, but I know it is a number of planning ministers! The project started a very long time ago. I remember it being around when I was in the previous Labor government, but I never thought I would be the one who finished it off at the metropolitan region scheme and local planning stage. In a sense, that is what this bill does; it gives MRS and local planning certainty. Of course, it will then move to the structure plan.

I turn to some of the issues that the opposition outlined. The member for Scarborough outlined many of the civil works and their benefits to the local community. In being briefed on this proposal I wanted to satisfy myself that using legislation to vary the MRS and local planning scheme had been done before, and I found that it had been done before on a number of occasions, most recently with the Sunset Reserve Transformation Act 2014. This has been undertaken before. This is not the normal way that metropolitan region schemes are varied and it is probably not the way we will do it for other projects, but this bill is the finalisation of a lot of uncertainty involved in this project. It reduces the exposure of the state. When I was briefed on these issues, I asked myself what the cost to the state would be if we did not do this. That would involve financial and legal exposure. In the aim of providing good certainty for the development and some satisfaction to local landowners who have been wanting the amenity, and also to limit exposure to the state, there is a requirement to have some certainty by a certain date. Given the progress, enough steps will have been taken to ensure that we are no longer legally exposed. I commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Third Reading

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning) [5.21 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

This is my third reading contribution after just making a very important second reading contribution. As I said, we are very keen to proceed with the Port Kennedy Development Bill 2017. Hopefully we can get some certainty. We want to get the public works constructed for the community. We want to give investment certainty. We also want to reduce and limit any exposure to the state government by not proceeding with the works. Hopefully I am the

last planning minister to deal with this issue, although we never know in politics. Hopefully the project will go ahead. As I said, the council and the community will be involved, particularly in the local structure plan, and we can really drill down into the planning requirements in the area. This is a strong proposal.

I thank the opposition for supporting the bill and letting it go through this place, and also for receiving the briefing today.

MR P. PAPALIA (Warnbro — Minister for Tourism) [5.22 pm]: I rise again to contribute to the third reading of the Port Kennedy Development Bill 2017. It is appropriate that I reflect a little at this time, like the minister, on the extent of the duration of this project and this process and the impact it has had on people who have been caught up in the extended nature of the development and its multiple iterations and versions. This project has had generational impact. I know that people who have proceeded through middle age and into their retirement years—I know a few of them—are fully impacted by this development because they began in the very early days. It is not necessarily the people who purchased land or built a property in one of the earlier versions of the development but also people in surrounding suburbs. Those people in surrounding suburbs initially bought their block and built their home with a frontage onto bushland in many cases that were essentially long reaches of dune that stretch back from Warnbro Sound towards the suburb of Port Kennedy with only a few fairways and greens between them and the beach. In many cases, pathways allowed them to walk directly from their home across the road through the bushland and make their way to the beach for a pleasant walk, often punctuated by sightings of kangaroos. Plenty of kangaroos live in the bushland around the area. There are some magnificent wetlands that in some cases form obstacles on the golf course but add to the ambience and beauty of the walk ruined by the game of golf. People who reside in the nearby suburb have over the years had some degree of uncertainty about what would happen next. There have been various development proposals. The most recent development proposal included—although I did not hear all the minister’s contribution, I am sure that she touched on this—a 100-metre setback in anticipation of future seawater rising, which had a significant impact. It really made the proposal before this one untenable and had a huge impact. At the time people were anticipating a significant development. They had reassured themselves about the benefits from the development going ahead. Even though they were not in the development site—they were in the nearby suburbs—they managed to identify potential benefits to the community in the form of an interpretive centre, which was going to be funded from the development. I also recall that there was a proposal for an eco-camping site at Long Point. Much of the site was impacted by the 100-metre setback and they were not able to plan on that going ahead. Unfortunately for the developers, a number of property sites would have been impacted upon by the 100-metre setback in the last proposal, all of which had to be abandoned. That meant that, naturally, there would be an impact on the return to the community in the form of developer contributions and other outcomes as a result of the development. The list of public amenity to be funded through this development is still significant—in the order of \$14 million. That is nothing to be sneezed at. There was a range of additional infrastructure to improve the amenity and support the boating community in particular. This site is popular with the boating community. There are not many boat ramps around Rockingham—this is one of the better sites—so some moorings, another jetty and facilities of that nature would make the place even more attractive.

As I said in my second reading contribution, if the Becher Point scientific park proposal goes ahead, it would need the support of the agency under the Minister for Environment’s purview. It will probably be the Minister for Environment’s responsibility in the end. I hope it can be supported. If it is possible to put it on the Port Kennedy Scientific Park land in part of the area that has been degraded, we will end up with one of the key elements of the last development proposal, which had to be abandoned but which had been well supported in the community—that is, an interpretive centre that is accessible and provides educational opportunities for not only schools in the region but also university academics and researchers from around the world. An extensive niche sector of the tourism industry is associated with ecotourism, and within that are opportunities to conduct scientific studies and to support research. People will travel to participate in those opportunities. The member for Bunbury would know that people come from all over the world to Bunbury to volunteer at the Discovery Centre during their holidays, to conduct research and studies on the dolphins and to provide support for that fantastic tourism attraction on Koombana Bay.

Mr D.T. Punch interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: A free plug!

There is just as much interest within the educated circles of those who study this type of geography and geomorphology, and wetlands of this nature —

Ms R. Saffioti: What’s that word again?

Mr P. PAPALIA: If I say it again I will get in trouble because they ridiculed me for not fully understanding it, and they were right!

People interested in these matters will travel to this site because I am told by people who know that it is of that calibre. There is therefore an opportunity for us to realise a bit of a tourism attraction, but it is very much also an educational opportunity. Interestingly, as has already been identified by the community, the end of Port Kennedy Drive is often unpopulated at night and at weekends and, as a consequence, antisocial behaviour takes place there. In the event that we are able to locate an interpretive centre in the degraded part of the scientific park, it will in all likelihood be in close proximity to that area. It will be on the north western end of the scientific park, and I understand that it is the intention of the Wetlands Research Association, in its Becher Point proposal, to have a live-in caretaker on site. If that were to be the case, it could resolve a lot of the issues surrounding antisocial behaviour and threats to the environment from people who insist on accessing places that they should not access and driving their vehicles through vulnerable sand dunes, threatening the bird species that nest there and people on the beach —

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms S.E. Winton): Minister, I have given you some latitude, but I must remind you that the third reading debate is restricted to the content of the bill and is not as wide-ranging as debate on the second reading. Keep that in mind. Thank you, minister.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. You are making it incredibly challenging for me to continue to make my contribution on behalf of the electorate and in assistance to the Minister for Planning and, more importantly, I guess, the Leader of the House—but, that aside, I will continue on!

This development, which is part of the Port Kennedy Development Bill 2017, will potentially enable consideration of the establishment of an interpretive centre, and I feel that will achieve a greater contribution in the form of return to the community than would otherwise be the case. We know that we are in a diabolical financial situation that constrains opportunities for the state to contribute. We know that, of necessity, the extent of the contribution by the developers has had to be diminished because in the course of this process they have had land removed from them, which diminishes their opportunities for development. Therefore, their return has been reduced and they unfortunately have not quite as much to contribute. That aside, if we throw the \$14 million worth of capital works or direct works into the mix and we add the potential of a world-class interpretive centre that does not incur a cost to the state or the community, we will get a pretty good outcome. It is nevertheless not quite what was originally proposed. As I understand it, there were various iterations. At one stage hotels were proposed, along with various town centre proposals. There were designs for shops and the like but I am unsure whether the latest version has a —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I think there is a small retail component to it but it is not anywhere near the scale of what even the last proposal was. It is very much diminished from previous iterations. Categorically, the people who live in the Kennedy Bay development will be wholeheartedly supportive of this bill and enthusiastic about some action finally taking place, and I look forward to that happening and them finally being rewarded for their persistence and patience. Those people who reside on the west-facing extremities of the suburb of Port Kennedy adjacent to the golf course will be most impacted by any change. Provided the government engages in adequate consultation with the wider Port Kennedy community and they are able to be heard and, wherever we can, we accommodate their concerns regarding through traffic, potential site lines and the like, generally the entire proposal will be well received. It will be incumbent upon the council to oversee a lot of that process. I have confidence in the City of Rockingham. It is a good council, it is well led, and I am sure in this particular case it will be very sensitive to the long-term nature of the development and the concerns that have been held by many residents throughout that time. I am sure the council will do all it can to provide residents with the best possible outcome and the best possible process for the development.

I fear that I missed the part of the Minister for Planning's contribution when she listed the number of planning ministers who have overseen this development and named them. I am sure the list was extensive. Even in my time, there must have been five, or perhaps half a dozen, planning ministers who have overseen one version or another.

Ms R. Saffioti: Maybe up to eight.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Possibly up to eight in my time!

Ms R. Saffioti: Hopefully I am the last one.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I hope the minister will be the last one. She can triumphantly visit the electorate of Warnbro to—what is it called when we use a spade?

Mr A. Krsticevic: Sod turning.

Mr P. PAPALIA: Sod turning—that is the one! Triumphant sod turning, to the applause and accolades of the community of Port Kennedy, particularly those in Kennedy Bay.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr P. PAPALIA: I do not think they want a shovel or a golden shovel; they just want it to happen. I am sure they are just over the whole thing. They will be very happy to see something happening.

I hope that the whole development is viable and feasible for the developers. I assume it is, otherwise we would not be at this point. I imagine that the potential return for developers has taken an extensive hit in recent years. That is absolutely the case with this particular development. There have been some unintended consequences of protecting people against building too close to the shoreline in anticipation of sea water rising. There has also been a well-known and quite well publicised collapse in the property market in Western Australia.

Ms R. Saffioti: Green shoots!

Mr P. PAPALIA: Okay, I apologise. I should be optimistic, and I am, but throughout the time this particular developer has been engaged in this project it has suffered a significant impact, I would have thought, on its projected return as a natural consequence of the changes in the property market in Western Australia and significant drops in land and house values. That aside, there are green shoots. Apart from having such a wonderful minister to enable the development to go ahead in a more reasonable and normal fashion, perhaps this is finally the right time for developers to receive an unexpected return through a pick-up in property values hopefully in the near term. As a consequence, perhaps their anticipated return will be exceeded. That would be a good reward for their persistence and patience, because they too have gone through a significantly challenging period, dealing with a number of unanticipated and unexpected hurdles that were not in evidence when they first took on the project. It would be appropriate if the developers got a decent return out of it.

We may have explored just about every possible avenue for discussion around this development, and that has brought us to the point in the debate where I can conclude by congratulating the minister on hopefully being the last minister to have to deal with this development. Providing direction, framework and a pathway ahead is a great thing, and is a key achievement that the minister will be able to recall in future years. When she reflects upon what will doubtless be an outstanding political career, bringing the Port Kennedy redevelopment to its final conclusion may be right up there, achieving what eight other ministers were incapable of doing. That is not a small thing. I thank the minister for the opportunity to be here and congratulate her on that, and I look forward to some real action in the near term.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.