

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES MARINE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION FACILITY

Motion

MR JOHNSON (Hillarys) [4.01 pm]: I move -

That this House condemns the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure for -

- (a) not advising Western Australians that the decision has already been made by the Gallop Labor Government to relocate the Department of Fisheries marine research and education facility to Hillarys marina, regardless of the Premier's election promise;
- (b) failing to present a petition with over 5 000 signatures requesting that the relocation of the facility be suspended for two years until the concerns of businesses and members of the public in relation to car parking and traffic problems are addressed; and
- (c) instructing Sinclair Knight Merz to specifically report on the introduction of paid car parking in contravention of the Premier's previously stated opposition to beachfront parking fees.

This is a serious motion, obviously.

Ms MacTiernan: You have discovered your electorate. That is why it is serious. This is the first time in eight years that you have worked out you have constituents. It's a miracle.

Mr JOHNSON: Jeepers, the minister does not take long to get started, does she? She will have her chance to say something in a minute.

Mr Sweetman: I did not think she was here.

Mr JOHNSON: I did not either. This is a serious motion. I do not move it lightly. I quite like the member for Armadale, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure. She is quite a jolly sort of person, and I normally get on with her. However, on behalf of the people in not only my electorate but also surrounding electorates, I must bring forward this motion.

Ms MacTiernan: More in sorrow than in anger.

Mr JOHNSON: Absolutely; more in sorrow than in anger. However, I must put the facts before Parliament for it to decide on this motion.

I will give a brief history of this facility, because not all members are aware of what a wonderful facility it is. Hillarys marina, including Sorrento Quay, is a fantastic facility. There is no question about that. I give credit to the previous Labor Government for doing the work and putting it in place, in the face of a great deal of public opposition at the time. When I first arrived in Western Australia in September or October 1986, I went to that area. The ocean was being reclaimed.

Mr O'Gorman: It was a sad day for Western Australia.

Mr JOHNSON: It was a good day for Western Australia. It was to try to balance the presence of my friend and colleague, the member for Peel. We do not blame the member for Peel for coming to Western Australia; we blame the bloke who lent him £10 to come here. That is where we have a problem. I will get back to the issue. I know that some members opposite love interjecting on me, and I normally love it because I feed off their interjections. However, I have many good things to say today that are important. When I came to Western Australia in 1986 -

Several members interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: That rabble on the other side of the House is an unruly lot. It is disgraceful behaviour.

As I said, in 1986 I went to look at the work being done at Hillarys marina. The ocean was being reclaimed. People could drive along a road built on that reclaimed ocean. Big rocks were being put down there. I made inquiries about the development when I was there, because I was thinking about emigrating to Western Australia. Some people told me exactly what was happening. I thought that it sounded like a great idea and that it would be a lovely facility for people. However, I know that there was a tremendous amount of opposition at the time. I am told that one of the most vociferous opponents of the development has now agreed that he was probably wrong and that it is one of the best developments Western Australia has had for a long time.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

On the one hand, I am praising the previous Labor Government. However, on the other hand, it did not have enough foresight, because when it developed that marina and Sorrento Quay area, it did it on the basis of one million visitors a year. If the number of visitors were at that level, that would be fine. There would be no parking or traffic problems; everything would be fine. However, that area is very popular and now enjoys three and a half million visitors a year. It is an important tourist attraction for overseas and interstate visitors. Umpteen wonderful restaurants are there, as is the facility known as Underwater World. It is probably the safest family beach in Western Australia, which is to some extent man made. The area was developed so that the sand would gradually go down under the water, and no waves would knock down little children. My grandchildren have certainly spent many happy hours on the family beach there.

That is the history of the area. However, as I said, the previous Labor Government did not have enough foresight to allow extra space for what would become one of Western Australia's most popular tourist attractions; therefore, it offered a bouquet in one hand and a bunch of bananas in the other, because it did not get it completely right. I cannot blame the previous Labor Government for that. However, notwithstanding all that, it is a superb development and a great attraction that is enjoyed by three and a half million people a year who visit the area. That is a little potted history of how it started. I will now give a little history of the election campaign.

Ms MacTiernan: Give us some history of when you were a cabinet minister and you made a decision to put the Department of Fisheries there. That is an important part of this debate.

Mr JOHNSON: I will come to that, my friend; I promise.

Ms MacTiernan: Why don't you do it in a logical order?

Mr JOHNSON: Okay. I will take on board what the minister says.

Mr Marlborough: The only thing that happened when you were in office was that you killed three dolphins - I hold you personally responsible for it - and you had a shonky Liberal headquarters above the cafe in Hillarys.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr JOHNSON: What the member for Peel has just said is against the standing orders of this House. He has accused me of killing three dolphins.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: I think you ate them!

Mr JOHNSON: That is a disgraceful thing for him to say, and I ask, Madam Deputy Speaker, that you ask him to withdraw that comment. It is a disgraceful thing to say and is unparliamentary.

Mr MARLBOROUGH: Not even I can hold down three dolphins. I withdraw.

Debate Resumed

Mr JOHNSON: The member has a better chance of doing that than I would!

Mr Marlborough: Was the member saying unkind things about me when I was outside the House?

Mr JOHNSON: Nothing I have not said before! The member normally laughs at my jokes. I always laugh at his.

What the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure said is true. The approval was given in May 2000 by the then Cabinet of the Liberal coalition Government.

Ms MacTiernan: Of which you were a member.

Mr JOHNSON: I accept that. The minister is so impatient. She has already had a briefing, and I will refer to that in a moment. She had a very interesting person at her table.

Ms MacTiernan: Was the member spying on me?

Mr JOHNSON: I was just walking past and happened to see the person.

I accept that the previous Government approved the location of the Department of Fisheries building. I was a member of the Cabinet at the time. I aired my concerns as the local member and explained that I did not have a problem with the facility provided the car parking and traffic problems were addressed before the building was constructed. The Minister for Transport of the day also had those concerns. He will confirm that, at my invitation, he went to the Hillarys marina because of my concerns. I showed him the car parking problems and the traffic problems. Even the present minister will admit that it takes up to one and a half hours to get out of the facility on a busy weekend or holiday. It is absolutely true. The previous minister was aware of that. He was not prepared to sign off on it. We are told that the present minister will also not sign off on it. The only

difference is that it was not signed off when Labor took government. The problem now belongs to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

Ms MacTiernan: It was not signed off?

Mr JOHNSON: No; not by the then Minister for Transport. The minister has all the records.

Ms MacTiernan: What does the member mean by “sign off”?

Mr JOHNSON: The same as the minister means: sign the approval for another agency to have that land. The minister is the landlord; I accept that and the minister accepts that.

The previous Minister for Transport did not sign this off. He had responsibility for the Department of Marine and Harbours. He hoped that the traffic issues would be addressed in the next term of government. We hoped to be returned to government so we could address the problems. Then what happened?

Mr Marlborough interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: The member for Peel does not even know where Hillarys is! He is a Rockingham man and that is it.

I want to refer to the timeframe of the election campaign. When the Premier was the Leader of the Opposition -

Mr Marlborough interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: Come on! This is a bit too much. I do not mind some interjections when they are sensible.

When the Premier was the Leader of the Opposition he went all over the State making all sorts of promises. He won the election but, unfortunately, did not keep his promises. That is what people are annoyed about. During the election campaign the then Leader of the Opposition visited my electorate. The local Labor candidate, Lorraine Allen, made promises that, in government, Labor would suspend the relocation of the Department of Fisheries facility until a full feasibility study had been undertaken. It was to look at ways of addressing the car parking and traffic problems.

Mr Marlborough interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: I would be very happy for the member for Peel to stand up later and say his piece.

Greg Poland owns quite a large chunk of Sorrento Quay, including Portofinos Restaurant, Pot Black and the nightclub - which I am not very happy about, but that is another matter. Greg Poland and Sorrento Quay management were not very happy with our Government because it had done this, even though I said I was not happy and that I would work to ensure that all the parking problems would be fixed.

Ms MacTiernan: Even then you were a totally useless member.

Mr JOHNSON: I will take that interjection. The minister has just called me a totally useless member. Because she has said that, she gives me the opportunity to tell her that she is a totally useless minister. She is a disgrace as a minister. She cannot even drive her car unless it is at 98 kilometres an hour in a 60 kilometre an hour zone! She has been done for drink-driving and does not warrant holding the high office that she holds. If she wants to make nasty, snide interjections she can do so as much as she likes because I will put the truth on the table about her. I thought we were to be friendly about this issue, but if she wants to be a nasty pasty it is entirely up to her; I will come down to that level.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr JOHNSON: The business people believed the local Labor candidate, Lorraine Allen. They also believed Geoff Gallop. It was a big mistake. What did they do? They got behind her campaign and started working against me. That is fine; they have every right to do that. They did so because they believed that Geoff Gallop, the then Leader of the Opposition, would keep his election promise and suspend the issue until the car parking and traffic problems were addressed. The Labor candidate now admits that Geoff Gallop has broken that election promise. I know that because she attended a recent meeting in Hon Graham Giffard's electorate office in Craigie with two people from the Sorrento Quay action group. One was the general manager of Sorrento Quay and the other was Greg Poland. They were so worried that the promise would be broken that they arranged to have a petition signed by 5 000 people. To be honest, I did not sign the petition. I could have done, but I did not. These people raised funds for what they thought would be a Labor election victory in my electorate. It was to be held on top of Sorrento Quay. I was aware of everything going on, as I have friends at Sorrento Quay. I know many of the smaller tenants and business people. Some smaller tenants actually believed the Labor Party promise that the project would not go ahead until such time as a full analysis had taken place and the problems

were addressed. That is all they were asking for. They have become totally disillusioned. I am told on good authority that the Labor candidate said that Geoff Gallop had broken his promise. When asked what people should do about it, she said that people had better speak to Rob Johnson, as he could take it up. Even the local candidate was not very happy that the election promise was broken.

Before the minister came into the House she had a meeting. I noticed that one person at her table was Lorraine Allen's campaign manager. She is a young lady who used to work in the opposition office. She was very active. I know that the Labor Party tried to pull a dirty trick on me. They tried to dig up as much dirt as they could during the election campaign. They made three attempts and failed dismally on two. One attempt was when she went to the general manager's office and said that she had dirt on Rob Johnson. She tried to run a story. It even involved phone calls to the United Kingdom. Some members opposite know what I am talking about. I will not go into details today. I will save it for another day.

Mr Kucera: Tell us.

Mr JOHNSON: I will tell the House one day about dirty tricks. Members on the other side of the House are past masters at dirty tricks. I will tell the House one day when it is appropriate and when it will be most effective. The only story they got into a newspaper was based on a false statutory declaration. How desperate must Labor be to rely on a false statutory declaration to get a dirty story in a newspaper about me? Pretty desperate I would say. I will come back to that another day when it is more appropriate. I will speak when it is most effective and when it suits me. These people got behind the local Labor candidate and now they feel they have been shafted, not by the local candidate but by the Premier - as he now is - and the Labor Party for not keeping their election promises. Last week I asked four questions of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure.

Mr Marlborough interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: I was interested in her response. I am not against the relocation of the Department of Fisheries facility. However, I want to ensure that all the traffic problems and the car parking issues are dealt with before it is located at Hillarys Boat Harbour. I have some difficulty in seeing how the traffic problems can be addressed. There is no room to make larger roads or to provide more roads in and out of the main part of the facility, so there are inherent car parking problems.

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members on my right, the member for Hillarys has the call.

Mr JOHNSON: I think the member for Peel has verbal diarrhoea at the moment.

Mr Marlborough interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: There he goes again! Maybe the solution they could come up with is a multistorey car park. I would not agree with that because it would be unsightly and would not be conducive to the area.

Mr Marlborough: What about underground parking?

Mr JOHNSON: I have always said that the facility was getting overdeveloped and we have to draw a halt somewhere. In reality, unless the Government can cure those car parking problems, it should honour its commitment, do the feasibility study, take note of it, and take the appropriate action.

Ms MacTiernan: That is what we are doing.

Mr JOHNSON: The minister has already made the decision. This is the point I am making: the decision has already been made by the Labor Government to relocate this building. The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure is paying lip service to the leaseholders, the tenants and the 5 000-odd members of the public who signed that petition, by saying that the Government is carrying out a feasibility study.

I wish to refer to two areas of the feasibility study. First, I will quote from an article from yesterday's *Community* newspaper in which the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure was reported to have said the idea for charging for car parking down at Sorrento Quay came from the leaseholders. I spoke to one of the main players down there yesterday -

Mr Kucera: There is more than one, surely.

Mr JOHNSON: The one who is coordinating the information; he has spoken to a lot of the tenants. He asked me to ask the minister to provide the names of any tenants who asked for paid parking. He said, "Ask her to give you the name of one tenant who asked the minister for paid car parking," because he does not believe there are any. He has spoken to virtually all the tenants and none of them is in favour of paid car parking.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

Mr Marlborough: It is not unusual to have paid car parking on the ocean front in the metropolitan area. We have it in Fremantle. Fishing Boat Harbour is full of paid car parking.

Mr JOHNSON: That is okay. If the member believes that, he can come forward with that as his policy. It is not our policy and it was not the policy of the Premier in 1997. I will quote exactly what he said in 1997.

Mr Marlborough: It was in regard to Cottesloe. Mayor Hammond wanted the ratepayers of Perth to help offset the \$700 000 -

Mr JOHNSON: I will quote what the Premier said on 26 June 1997 in relation to the Local Government (Foreshore Parking) Amendment Bill, which he introduced as a private member's Bill to ensure beach parking remained free. The member for Peel should not go before he listens to this because it is very important. The Premier stated -

The Australian Labor Party vigorously opposes the introduction of beachfront parking fees. Our view is that requiring people to pay to park at the beach would be a tax on the Australian way of life.

Mr Marlborough: That is what he said.

Mr JOHNSON: The member is obviously happy for people to pay for beachfront car parking now. I am sure a lot of people will be interested to know that that is the new Labor Party policy.

Mr Kucera: You are misleading the House.

Mr JOHNSON: That is what he said.

Mr Kucera: He did not say that at all.

Mr JOHNSON: The member can get up and have his say in a moment. He has misled the House many times. The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has misled this House and the people of Western Australia through the article in the *Community* newspaper yesterday, in which she is reported to have said that the idea for paid parking came from the tenants and the leaseholders. That is blatantly untrue.

Ms MacTiernan: We will give you the names.

Mr JOHNSON: They would appreciate that. If the minister is taking about Aqua and Hillarys Yacht Club, which have their own car parking areas where other people cannot park, they may think paid car parking is okay. It would not affect them, but the tenants and the business people are totally opposed to it. I was told yesterday that no leaseholders have asked for paid parking and that the minister has either been misled or it is a complete untruth. I prefer to think it was the former rather than the latter, because if it were the latter, the minister would have misled Parliament. That is what the minister is reported to have said in the *Community* newspaper. I will be interested to hear what the minister has to say about that article. I hope she has the names of some tenants who are keen to have paid car parking, because I do not know of any. I know many of the tenants and many of the big leaseholders.

I think I have established that the minister has broken the Labor Party's election promise because she has gone out to tender -

Ms MacTiernan: Will you clarify that? What have we gone out to tender for?

Mr JOHNSON: For the project management. I think the minister gave me the answer.

Ms MacTiernan: Who has gone out to tender for that?

Mr JOHNSON: I will tell the minister when it was. It was taken off the web page. I seem to have misplaced it. I think it was in March. Is the minister aware that the tender is under evaluation at the moment?

Ms MacTiernan: The member said we have gone out to tender. I want to know what we have gone out to tender for.

Mr JOHNSON: For the project management. The Department of Fisheries wrote back to the chairman of the Hillarys Boat Harbour leaseholders advisory committee on 18 March and said -

... we hope to have earthworks started in May.

The minister should bear that in mind. He goes on to say -

For the building itself, we have called tenders for the overall Project Manager, who will be appointed in late April.

That is from the Department of Fisheries; I accept that it is not from the minister's department.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

Ms MacTiernan: Are you condemning me for something that happened in the Department of Fisheries? I want to see the chain of ministerial responsibility. If you are condemning me for my conduct as minister -

Mr JOHNSON: I am condemning you -

Ms MacTiernan: Let me get this straight.

Mr JOHNSON: I am condemning you for not presenting the petition until the last minute today.

Ms MacTiernan: You are condemning me for the Government's having breached its promise.

Mr JOHNSON: Yes.

Ms MacTiernan: You are condemning me for approving this proposal. You have not produced one shred of evidence that I have approved anything. Give us the evidence. Where is the evidence?

Mr JOHNSON: The minister should wait until I have finished.

Ms MacTiernan: You said, "I think I have proved my point."

Mr JOHNSON: The minister is impatient.

Ms MacTiernan: Provide the evidence of how I, as the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, have not honoured the election commitment.

Mr JOHNSON: I am coming to that; the minister should not be impatient. The minister is a member of Cabinet, so she knows what is going on. She condemned me a minute ago for being in Cabinet when the initial decision was made. I accept that I was a minister at that time.

Ms MacTiernan: If you thought it was wrong -

Mr JOHNSON: I have always expressed concerns about it and said that it should not go ahead until those areas of concern have been addressed.

Ms MacTiernan: Did you vote for it in Cabinet?

Mr JOHNSON: Liberal Party ministers do not vote in Cabinet.

Ms MacTiernan: Is it like a papal meeting? Do you have little bits of paper?

Mr JOHNSON: We do things differently. I said that I would accept it, but that I would like the car parking and traffic problems to be addressed. Does the minister understand that?

Ms MacTiernan: You expressed your concerns.

Mr Hyde: Where is the tender from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure you are talking about? Can you produce that?

Mr JOHNSON: It is on the web site.

Mr Hyde: Is it a Department for Planning and Infrastructure tender?

Mr JOHNSON: It is a Department of Fisheries tender.

Mr Hyde: You are not talking to the Minister for Fisheries.

Mr JOHNSON: I know that! The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure works hand in glove with the Minister for Fisheries. She has been talking to him regularly. Why did she not tell him to postpone calling for tenders?

Ms MacTiernan: What is your evidence?

Mr JOHNSON: She is the landlord; she is responsible for the land. I do not blame the Minister for Fisheries for trying to get this up and running. From his point of view, it would be a fantastic facility. I blame the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure for not reminding him of the Premier's election promise. I condemn this minister for not holding down the Minister for Fisheries.

Ms MacTiernan: He is a bit bigger than me.

Mr JOHNSON: I am told the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure can tackle anyone.

It is clear from the letter from the Department of Fisheries that the tenders have been called.

Ms MacTiernan: Tenders for what?

Mr JOHNSON: How many times do I need to explain it?

Ms MacTiernan: You keep saying “tenders”.

Mr JOHNSON: I am referring to the tender for the overall project manager. They are talking about starting earthworks in May. That is only two weeks away.

Ms MacTiernan: Have any tenders been called for earthworks?

Mr JOHNSON: I am not aware of any having been called. I imagine that the Department of Fisheries has been told not to call the tender because the Government has a problem with the bloke from Hillarys, who is causing aggravation. The tender process closed in March and the tenders are being evaluated.

Ms MacTiernan: The tenders for what?

Mr JOHNSON: Oh, for goodness sake! I have read it out.

Mr Hyde: It says they intend to; it does not say they will do it now. Where was it advertised?

Mr JOHNSON: On the government web page detailing tenders. The tenders have closed and are being evaluated. In the past, the Department of Contract and Management Services undertook that process for all government agencies. I assume that the Department of Fisheries is doing it in-house. It must evaluate the tenders. Is that not premature until the analysis has been completed? Of course it is.

Mr Kucera: Of course it isn't.

Mr JOHNSON: The minister is saying that the Government will do an analysis involving all interested parties to work out the problems with car parking and traffic, and that that constitutes honouring the Premier's election promise. That is only lip service, because the process is continuing.

Mr Kucera: What if the tender came in at twice the cost that you anticipated when you agreed to this? What would you expect the Government to do then?

Mr JOHNSON: That is a really stupid comment. The Minister for Health might reflect on that silly comment after he has been around this place for a while.

Mr Kucera: You are making a nonsense out of the whole tender process.

Mr JOHNSON: The minister should not be silly; he does not know what he is talking about.

The Department of Fisheries has been told to suspend the tender process. It must not let the tender until the Government has completed an analysis of the parking problems. If the department were to continue, it would expose the fact that the Government is paying lip service.

Ms MacTiernan: Can't you see the contradiction in your position? Two minutes ago you were saying that I should tell the Department of Fisheries to put everything on hold. Now you are saying that I should be condemned because I told the department to put everything on hold.

Mr JOHNSON: Has the minister told the department to put it on hold?

Ms MacTiernan: I will provide a full response. I am trying to use the Socratic method to educate the member a little.

Mr JOHNSON: That is very kind and patronising.

Ms MacTiernan: I am drawing your attention to the fact that you are being logically inconsistent.

Mr JOHNSON: I move 100 miles from the minister's logic. That interjection is irrelevant and did not get us anywhere. The minister is being patronising and silly.

I want to move on to the second part of the motion, because it is important. These people thought the minister would help them given the Premier's election promise. They thought the Government would take some notice of a petition signed by more than 5 000 people. Foolishly, they delivered it to the minister's office on 14 February 2002. They were hoping she would table it in this place and that it would encourage the Labor Government to think about the problem and to keep its election promise before building the facility. They have realised that their plea has fallen on deaf ears. They are disgusted that, as a minister of the Crown, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has held on to a petition that she was asked to present in this place for more than two months.

The minister replied to Mr Allison on 27 March, and stated -

I will seek to have a member table the petition . . .

She did not want to do it herself; she wanted to find some dummy on her side to present it. The most important part of the letter states -

. . . although I hope at the end of the day we can get agreement on this proposal.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

The minister was made fully aware of the problems and that the people of Hillarys were not happy that the building would be commenced before the full analysis had been completed. The minister's letter suggested that, if an agreement could be reached, she would not need to present the petition. That is disgraceful. She is ignoring the concerns these people have raised and their genuine desire for her to table a petition bearing more than 5 000 signatures. I have a copy of the petition with me; it is huge. Typically, the minister has ignored it. That is why I condemned the minister for not tabling the petition earlier. I know the minister has presented it today, but I suggest it is because she saw yesterday that today I would be moving a motion to condemn her. What did she do? She thought she would be a good little girl, bring the petition in today and present it because she could not find anybody else on her side of the House to do it. She has been dragged screaming and kicking to this Chamber to present a petition on behalf of over 5 000 people. For that I condemn her, particularly when I offered to present it. The minister did not want me to present it. Why did she not want me to present it? I will tell members. The petitioners had faith in the minister and her Premier that the development would not go ahead until the analysis and the car parking problems were addressed.

Mr Hyde: The petition went to the right person. Is this the most important event in the whole State that the Liberal Party has to deal with?

Mr JOHNSON: Obviously the member is not thinking sufficiently about this. It is about various things. It is about the new Labor policy of paying for beachfront car parking.

Mr Hyde: No, it is not.

Mr JOHNSON: Yes, it is. That is what the Government wants to do at Hillarys.

Ms MacTiernan: Member for Hillarys, you quoted the article from the local paper. Did you read the full article or did you read just the first paragraph?

Mr JOHNSON: I read the lot.

Ms MacTiernan: Did you miss the bit where I said that we would not have fees for beach parking?

Mr JOHNSON: Where did the minister say that?

Ms MacTiernan: It reads, "However, Ms MacTiernan said Hillarys beach users would not have to pay . . ."

Mr JOHNSON: Why is the minister talking about beaches? Is the minister talking about people who use the family beach?

Ms MacTiernan: People who use the beach - the ones you said should not pay.

Mr JOHNSON: I am glad that the minister has raised that. I am a bit worried about how bright she is. What the minister is saying, and what she said in answer to the question the other day, is that car parking fees may well be charged for people who use the ferry and other facilities at Hillarys marina, but if they use the beach they will not have to pay. How does the minister differentiate in her wonderful brain between people who use the beach and people who use other facilities? If people who use the ferries, restaurants or other facilities do not want to pay, they will park in the area that is allocated for people who want to use the beach. People who use the beach during the day may go for a meal in the evening. How will the minister differentiate between who is doing what? She has no idea.

Mr Hyde interjected.

Ms Hodson-Thomas: You will have your opportunity.

Mr Hyde: He said that he would only speak for five minutes.

Mr JOHNSON: I am being bullied by the member for Perth.

Another reason I am condemning the minister today is that in the second to last paragraph of the article to which I have referred it states -

. . . the department considered the petition misleading because it stated that the site was 1.2ha instead of 1ha . . .

Therefore, one of the reasons that the minister said she did not want to present the petition was that it was misleading. Is that correct?

Ms MacTiernan: The petition is misleading, as I understand it.

Mr JOHNSON: Why is it?

Ms MacTiernan: When you sit down, I will set out the reasons.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

Mr JOHNSON: The minister had better have a look at them, because the petition states “approximately 1.2 hectares”, so the minister is trying to split hairs and use some silly furphy for not presenting the petition in Parliament so that people might at least know that Parliament is aware of the problem at Hillarys which the minister is not dealing with.

Ms MacTiernan: You think the best way for a minister to deal with a problem is to table a petition, do you? You think that if I table the petition, that will be it, do you?

Mr JOHNSON: I think the minister is disgraceful for not presenting the petition when asked to and it has been gathering dust for two months in her office.

Ms MacTiernan: I explained to you that I have been writing to them on the subject, which I would have thought was a much more constructive way of dealing with the matter.

Mr JOHNSON: To whom was the minister writing?

Ms MacTiernan: I was writing to the person who organised the petition and sent it in.

Mr JOHNSON: Who was that?

Ms MacTiernan: Mr D. Allison, Chairman of the Hillarys Boat Harbour Leaseholders Advisory Committee.

Mr JOHNSON: What did the minister write to him?

Ms MacTiernan: I will read it out when I reply.

Mr JOHNSON: I know what the minister wrote to him, because I have already quoted some of it.

Ms MacTiernan: Why are you asking me then?

Mr JOHNSON: I am asking the minister because I do not think she understands.

Ms MacTiernan: You do not think that I understand what I wrote?

Mr JOHNSON: I do not think that the minister understands how she has misled people and what a stupid, harebrained excuse she gave for not presenting the petition because she said it contained inaccuracies. I have pointed out what the petition says quite clearly.

Ms Hodson-Thomas: It is not our place to judge whether there are inaccuracies in a petition. We present them all the time.

Ms MacTiernan: The petition is lodged. The member would prefer that I had lodged it earlier. My way of dealing with it was to try to deal with the substance of the problem. If you think it is more important to go through the process, that is appalling.

Mr JOHNSON: As a member of Parliament and a minister in particular, the minister has certain standards and ethics that she is supposed to keep. The minister has fallen short in certain areas until now, but I will not keep referring to them. However, in this instance she has fallen short again, because she is misleading people. She did not want to present the petition. She spoke to one of her advisers, probably because she was desperate to find out what was happening with the contracts and whether they had been let.

Ms MacTiernan: I knew what was happening.

Mr JOHNSON: I can sense a bit of panic.

Ms MacTiernan: I am quivering because of the powerfulness of this debate! You have really socked it to us!

Mr JOHNSON: Can the minister explain what she meant and what her intention was when she said to Mr Allison, “I will seek to have a member table the petition, although I hope at the end of the day we can get agreement on this proposal”? Did that mean that she did not want to present the petition and that she was hoping she could get Mr Allison to agree?

Ms MacTiernan: I was hoping to resolve the problem. The reason people lodge a petition is that they have a problem they want solved. They want members of Parliament with a bit more imagination than simply and only tabling the petition. As a minister I had a responsibility to try to resolve the problem. That is what I am trying to do. That is what I was conveying in my letter to Mr Allison. The most important thing I could do for Mr Allison and his group was to resolve the problem.

Mr JOHNSON: It certainly does not read that way; it reads as though the minister would prefer not to table the petition and she was trying to get an agreement.

Ms MacTiernan: I did think it was inaccurate.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

Mr JOHNSON: Is that because it said “approximately 1.2 hectares” instead of exactly one hectare?

Ms MacTiernan: No, not at all.

Mr JOHNSON: Yes, it is. How can the minister argue that it said “approximately 1.2 hectares” when it was only one hectare? That is set out in the newspaper article of yesterday. The minister should read it for goodness sake.

Ms MacTiernan: That article has nothing to do with me.

Mr JOHNSON: It came from the minister and the minister’s office.

Ms MacTiernan: Perhaps you will explain to me -

Mr JOHNSON: I will not explain, because the minister is taking up my time and is not addressing the questions that I am putting to her. Because she is not answering them in any meaningful way, I am wasting my time by accepting questions from her. I know a bit of panic is going on at the moment because the minister has been caught short.

Ms MacTiernan: We are terrified. Bring in the mogadon!

Mr JOHNSON: The point is that the minister is the landlord for that area.

Ms MacTiernan: I agree with you. That is the only good thing you have said all day.

Mr JOHNSON: Has the minister been there and had a good look around?

Ms MacTiernan: Yes I have, many times.

Mr JOHNSON: Whereabouts will be the Department of Fisheries building?

Ms MacTiernan: It will be on the northern side.

Mr JOHNSON: The northern side of what? Whereabouts on the northern side?

Ms MacTiernan: Come off it!

Mr JOHNSON: Whereabouts on the northern side?

Ms MacTiernan: I will not waste the member’s time by making interjections.

Mr JOHNSON: The minister cannot answer me. On what bit of land?

Ms MacTiernan: Of course I can answer you. I have been to the Hillarys marina on many occasions.

Mr JOHNSON: The minister should tell me; what area will it take up? What will be lost when the building goes up? The minister has had a briefing.

Ms MacTiernan: Let me get this right. If you had a motion that came on in private members’ time, you do not think that ministers should get briefings. Is that what you are saying?

Mr JOHNSON: I think the minister should have another briefing. She obviously did not get a good briefing.

Ms MacTiernan: You are suggesting that I should come in here without having had a briefing. That’s an extraordinary proposition.

Mr JOHNSON: Exactly.

She has even taken the campaign manager of Lorraine Allen to Hillarys Boat Harbour.

Ms MacTiernan: She is someone with whom I have visited the Hillarys marina on many occasions.

Mr JOHNSON: What will be lost? What is on the land that has been designated for use for the Department of Fisheries building? The minister has been there. She does not want to answer the question.

Ms MacTiernan: You told me two minutes ago that I was wasting your time with interjections.

Mr JOHNSON: The minister cannot answer the question. She does not even know the land on which the building will be located. She is hardly across that problem. From the sound of it, she does not give a stuff about what goes on. The leaseholders, the tenants and the 5 000-odd people who had serious concerns about the parking problems and who signed the petition will now be concerned that the minister does not give a stuff about what is going on there. She does not know. She is the landlord. If I were the minister, I would want to know every bit of land that I owned, particularly if there were problems. She tells me she has been to the marina. She has probably been to some of the restaurants and enjoyed herself; however, she has not had a good look around. She does not even know the bit of land on which the building will be located. I will tell her, because she obviously does not know.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

The minister is desperately reading through her briefing paper to see if she can find out where the building will be. Her colleagues in the Speaker's gallery have sent her a note. The attendant is giving the minister a note that lets her know exactly the bit of land on which the building will be. She will know now exactly which bit of land it is. If the minister quickly reads that note, she might be able to interject and tell me on which bit of land the building will be located.

Ms MacTiernan: I know perfectly well which area of land it is. You should get on with the debate.

Mr JOHNSON: The minister said it will be built to the north of Hillarys Boat Harbour. Will it encroach into the nodes?

Ms MacTiernan: You tell me.

Mr JOHNSON: She is the minister. It is her land; she should tell me. Will it encroach into the nodes? She is now getting signs from the people in the Speaker's gallery. This is incompetent behaviour. The minister does not even know on which bit of land the building will be constructed. I will help her as she obviously does not have a clue. The building will take up roughly one-third of the boat and trailer park area. She did not know that.

Mr Kucera: She said it.

Mr JOHNSON: She did not say that.

Mr Kucera: She just said it.

Mr JOHNSON: She got a note from the gallery.

Mr Kucera: She had said it before.

Mr JOHNSON: She did not say that at all. She did not know because she does not have a clue what is north of the restaurants. Yet, she is the landlord. The minister does not have a clue what is going on at the harbour, but she makes inane comments. She and the Premier have let down the main leaseholders and tenants. They were given a promise and I suggest that they came up with some cash for the local campaign. I know Greg Poland was very keen to help Lorraine Allen, the local candidate.

Mr Kucera: Your hypocrisy is breathtaking.

Mr JOHNSON: I wish the Minister for Health would go back to sleep.

Mr Kucera: I am enjoying the comedy.

Mr JOHNSON: That is good. He should sit back and enjoy it because I have another nine minutes left. I am dying to hear what the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has to say. She is reading her notes very quickly so that she can get across this problem. She knows now, because I have told her, exactly where the building will go. She is now a little more abreast of the issue. The building will take up one-third of the boat and trailer park area. I accept that the boat and trailer park area is very rarely full, even in the peak season.

The peak season is another point. The minister, in answer to a question, said that she wanted to carry out the survey during the peak season so that she could establish what the problems were. She said she did not do it last year because she came into government only last February. The peak season runs from December to February. She started her analysis in March. That is the autumn period, not the peak season. She does not have a clue.

Mr Barnett: She is always behind.

Mr JOHNSON: As the Leader of the Opposition said, she is always behind the eight ball. She is certainly behind the eight ball on this occasion. The company the minister has instructed to do the analysis is conducting it now. It is the off season. How accurate will that analysis be? The main problems occur during the peak season - November, December, January and February. The problems occur in the hot months when it is school holidays. Further, they do not occur on only Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. When schoolchildren are on summer holidays, the harbour is busy all the time. The minister does not want to interject and tell me why she as the landlord ordered the analysis to be conducted in the off season. It was not the Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries who ordered the analysis. Does she believe she will get an accurate response?

Mr Barnett: The Minister for Fisheries is so embarrassed that he has gone to Tasmania to drive racing cars.

Mr JOHNSON: I do not blame him. I think the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure would be good at driving racing cars. I hear she is a fast driver. The minister will not, by way of interjection, respond to any of the things I have said. It is a shame -

Mr Kucera interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: She does not need the Minister for Police's help.

Mr Kucera: I am not the Minister for Police.

Mr JOHNSON: I keep thinking of him as the old-time copper. I am sorry, he is the Minister for Health.

Mr Kucera: Like the old-time barrow boy, he has a lovely bunch of bananas.

Mr JOHNSON: That is what he says. I think he would fit that description better than I would. How many major crimes did the minister solve when he was a copper?

Mr Kucera: A lot more than you did.

Mr JOHNSON: I was not a copper, so I could not have solved any! That is very difficult to argue.

Several members interjected.

Mr Kucera: How many did you commit?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr JOHNSON: None at all.

Withdrawal of Remark

Mr BARNETT: I think a quip like that, even made in a humorous manner, is unparliamentary. I ask that the Minister for Health withdraw the comment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Given the level of noise in the Chamber, I was unfortunately unable to hear any comments. In fact, I was asking people to pay attention to the debate. If the Minister for Health has inadvertently made an unparliamentary comment, I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr KUCERA: I was enjoying the repartee between the member for Hillarys and this side of the House until the Leader of the Opposition came into the House and soured the debate, as he usually does. In deference to the member for Hillarys, I withdraw my remark.

Debate Resumed

Mr JOHNSON: Let us get back to the issue we are talking about. We have looked at the three ways in which this motion asks the House to condemn the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure. The first is in not keeping an election promise. She has broken the promise the Premier made when he was the Leader of the Opposition. He told me he would spend \$500 000 sorting out the car parking problems at Hillarys Boat Harbour. How much money has the Government spent? It would have to be administered through the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure's portfolio. How much has she spent in the past 16 months? The Premier said that he would spend \$250 000 in this financial year and \$250 000 in the next financial year. Those figures were in last year's budget estimates. I do not believe that the Government has spent one zack. That is another broken election promise. The Government will not spend \$250 000 on solving car parking problems at Hillarys this year. It will not spend anything. That is yet another broken promise. We know that the Government does not want to spend any money until June because it is desperately trying to come in with a balanced budget. It has a heck of a job. I think that the ministers of the major portfolios - such as health and planning and infrastructure - have been told to not spend any more money this year. They may spend it after June, but not this financial year. If they spend the money in this financial year, the Government will definitely come in with a budget deficit. The Government made promises about all the things it would spend money on. It said it would spend money on various projects and important life-saving machinery in our children's hospital. The previous Government left \$2 million-odd in the budget. The ministers do not want to spend the money this year because they have been told not to. After June, it will be okay to spend it. The money is there but the Government does not want to spend it otherwise it will go into deficit. It is not just this issue, the same thing is happening in every portfolio. That is why the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure is trying to hold on to the budget. She will not spend the \$250 000 this year and it is doubtful whether she will spend it next year because she does not have the money. However, the then Leader of the Opposition made promises to spend that money.

The Government has broken two election promises. The then Opposition also promised to build a skateboard park. It is a long time coming. I have not seen it yet. If it had built one, as the then Opposition promised, we would have seen the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure and the Premier on skateboards while they cut the ribbon. We have not seen a skateboard park and we have not seen the Government spend the \$250 000 this year. The Government has not kept three election promises in my electorate alone.

The second part of the motion condemns the minister for her failure to not present that petition and to try to keep it under wraps.

Mr Barnett: Where was it?

Mr JOHNSON: It was in her office gathering dust next to the bar. It was somewhere around there; I am sure. The only reason she presented it today is that she has been brought screaming and kicking to do something with it. She thinks that presenting it today negates that part of the motion; however, it does not. The minister took more than two months to present the petition and deal with it properly; she misled the people. She said that she would get one of her colleagues to present it. Why did the minister not do that? She could not find a dummy to present a petition that could be construed as being critical of the Government. Although I understand the minister's reasoning, I do not agree with it. The minister had to present it today.

The third area for which I condemn the minister is that she is seriously considering beachfront paid car parking, particularly in my electorate. However, members are warned that if it happens in my electorate, it could happen in their electorates. This is a desperate bid by the Government to raise revenue. The Government has already told us where it will introduce beachfront paid car parking. The leaseholders, the tenants and the general public do not want it. If the Government allows it to occur here, it will allow it anywhere and everywhere in Western Australia. For all those reasons, I must condemn the minister. I will be interested to hear how she will squirm out of this one. The minister has more advisers in the gallery and outside the Chamber than one can wave a stick at. I hope that the minister has enough information to answer the concerns and the condemnation motion I have moved.

MS MacTIERNAN (Armadale - Minister for Planning and Infrastructure) [5.03 pm]: This motion is complete nonsense. The Government has met its election commitments and will continue to meet its election commitments. For the record, the Government's election commitment was to suspend any relocation of the Department of Fisheries facility to the Hillarys Boat Harbour until a full review of the development's impact on parking was undertaken. Has the Department of Fisheries been relocated to Hillarys? No, it has not.

Mr Johnson: You called for tenders.

Ms MacTIERNAN: Have any tenders been let for the construction of the facility for the Department of Fisheries? No.

Mr Barnett: Have you called for tender bids?

Ms MacTIERNAN: No tenders for construction of the facility at the marina have been called. Has a lease agreement been entered into between the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and the Department of Fisheries? No. Has a sale agreement been entered into between the Department of Fisheries and the Department for Planning and Infrastructure? No. The answers to all these questions is no because the Government is committed to honouring that election promise not to proceed or authorise this development until the review has been completed and the Government is confident that it will not negatively impact upon the Hillarys Boat Harbour. That harbour has been a great Labor success. The Government has been scrupulous to ensure that this proposal is not signed off until that study has been completed.

On 31 August 2001, my department expressly wrote to the Department of Fisheries and said that it would not negotiate the lease any further until that review had been undertaken.

Mr Johnson: Will you table that letter?

Ms MacTIERNAN: I will not table that letter at this point.

Mr Johnson: If it is an official letter, I have a right to ask the minister to table it.

Ms MacTIERNAN: It is extraordinary -

The SPEAKER: Under Standing Order No 157, official documents are required to be tabled. The minister is referring to handwritten notes, not to a letter that the member may think she is holding.

Ms MacTIERNAN: Today, the Speaker very clearly stated the issues with regard to official documents and what members are obliged to table. Unfortunately, in his role as the leader of opposition business, the member for Hillarys was not able to grasp the import of what you said, Mr Speaker. Just for the record, I show the member my notes. Those notes refer to the letter that was sent by my agency to the Department of Fisheries on 31 August 2001. That letter pointed out to the Department of Fisheries the undertaking that the Premier had made. It also pointed out that the Government would not enter into negotiations until the review was complete. Since that time, our position has been -

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

Ms MacTIERNAN: The motion is condemning me. I am explaining to the member that, in my position as the landlord for this facility, I and the Government have worked very hard to honour this commitment. We have made it absolutely clear from day one that the Government would not engage in any lease negotiations until it is confident that not only has the review been undertaken but also -

Mr Johnson: That review was taken outside the normal high peak time. You wanted to have a high peak survey done. It was done from March onwards. How can the minister claim that that is high peak time? High peak time is in November, December, January and February. You said you wanted to get the best results, and that is why you did not do it last year when you had just come into government. You have now been in government for 12 months.

Ms MacTIERNAN: This is bordering on tedious repetition. I have no intention of trying to shout down the member for Hillarys. If he wants to hear what I have to say, I will present it. The Government has honoured its election commitment. We are in the process of undertaking the review.

Mr Johnson: I do not believe you.

Ms MacTIERNAN: Which bit does the member not believe?

Mr Johnson: I said that the leaseholders, the tenants and the public do not believe you.

Ms MacTIERNAN: I doubt whether we can take the member's word for it. The member for Hillarys has no credibility on this matter. I will return to some of his propositions. The first was that the Minister for Transport under the previous Government had not authorised the relocation of the Department of Fisheries facility. That is an interesting proposition. A question was put to the then Minister for Transport in the Legislative Council.

Mr Johnson: On what date?

Ms MacTIERNAN: The question was asked on 20 September 2000. The minister said that all planning approvals had been obtained and that he understood a detailed analysis of parking had been carried out. He said he was happy to arrange a briefing for any member on the development application approval, which included the analysis of the impact on parking. The minister also said he was happy with the analysis of parking that had been done; hence, he was prepared to sign off on this arrangement. He was also asked whether any other locations had been considered for the proposed building and why it was necessary for the facility to be moved from its current location. In reply, he states -

All possible sites between Two Rocks and Cockburn Sound were considered against a strict set of criteria, which resulted in the Hillarys site being selected as the only site that met all critical criteria.

In answer to part (6) of the question, the minister states -

The future requirements of the existing facility are beyond its design capacity and are constraining the required research capacity to ensure sustainable management of the State's fish and fish habitat resources. Assessment of the current Western Australian Maritime Research Laboratory site has shown that the redevelopment extensions are not possible owing to the site's physical limitations.

That sounds pretty much like the Minister for Transport had signed off on the proposal. Members should bear in mind that planning approval was obtained in May 2000 under the previous Government. To get that approval, a signature of the landlord was required on the development application. It was signed by a representative of the Department of Transport; the department had endorsed that proposal. We came into government and confronted a situation in which a set of planning approvals had been obtained; the previous Minister for Transport had approved that the facility be relocated. The member for Hillarys is now saying that this relocation will be absolutely diabolical and will be the end of civilisation as we know it. He was, of course, a frontbench member of the previous Government, but not a bleat was heard from him in the Press or the Parliament complaining about the relocation of this facility to Hillarys.

We attended meetings at Hillarys Boat Harbour on several occasions. I have no difficulty with the fact that the campaign manager for our candidate in Hillarys has maintained a continuing interest in this issue. I do not see any problem with that. Indeed, it shows that this Government has a real commitment to these issues. I invited the campaign manager to speak with me today because we attended those meetings together. I wanted to go through the sorts of things that we had discussed during our meetings with the leaseholders. That is perfectly proper.

I take these debates seriously. The Opposition has the right to examine the Government on these sorts of matters. I certainly do not have a problem with bringing in members of my agencies to provide information to me so that I can answer questions in this place. It is a pity that a little more of that was not done under the previous Government. Members would raise serious issues, but the previous Government would provide

absolutely no detail in response. It is my intention to ensure that when questions are asked of me in this place, I will answer them comprehensively. I have no difficulty in instructing my agencies to ensure that we have all the necessary information.

The member for Hillarys asked a legitimate question about why these studies were being done in March and April. I am disappointed that the studies were being conducted so late in the piece. Unfortunately, it was a little out of the Government's control. The tender process for consultants to undertake the car parking study was commenced in November. I know that the member for Hillarys is keen for the Government to observe its probity and call tenders. He was a works and services minister. He knows the importance of going out to tender. The process was commenced in November and the call for initial tenders closed on 10 December.

Mr Johnson: Why did you not go out earlier?

Ms MacTIERNAN: It seemed appropriate to go out in November because we intended the studies to be undertaken in January and February. Unfortunately, the responses were simply unsatisfactory. The tenders failed to provide sufficient information on the proposed parking model or to demonstrate that they had sufficient experience to undertake a study of this magnitude. We modified the brief and recalled tenders in late December. That process closed on 11 January. There was a problem in getting a consensus among the panel members who were assessing the tender applications. This deferred the contract being awarded until 20 February. The on-site surveys were due to commence in January and February. Some volumetric studies were carried out during that period, but most of the surveys were undertaken on Saturdays and Wednesdays - days of high attendance at Hillarys Boat Harbour - in March. I do not shy away from the fact that it is regrettable that it took so long for these proposals to result in a contract and for that contract to result in the commencement of the study. That being said, it is under way. Some volumetric studies were undertaken in late January. They will be fed into the consultant's report. The consultant then undertook further surveys in March. The Government has indicated that it will not tolerate any further delays. It wants a report to be provided by late May. The report will be discussed with all leaseholders before a decision is made about whether the Government is prepared to relocate the fisheries facility to Hillarys Boat Harbour.

I will say to the member for Hillarys that the Department of Fisheries is probably wedded to moving to this site, having been given approval by the previous Government to do so. Notwithstanding that, it is the Government's view, as opposed to the Department of Fisheries' view, that we will not sign off on that until and unless we are satisfied that this jewel in the crown created by the last Labor Government is properly protected.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Ms MacTIERNAN: It is extraordinary. Members opposite should ask the member to describe one thing that he achieved when he was in government. His criticism of the last Labor Administration is that it was more successful than anyone ever dreamed of. We projected one million people a year would visit the marina, but three million people a year visit it, and he is criticising us for that. What a lot of nonsense. The same thing applies to the northern suburbs rail. The Labor Government predicted a certain level of patronage and within one year that level was exceeded by 15 per cent. Members opposite can only condemn the Labor Government for being so successful that its infrastructure projects attracted more usage than ever expected. I contrast that with the belltower. We all know how successful that project has been and how present patronage has comprehensively failed to meet predictions. This Government is rightfully very proud of the Hillarys marina. However, it is rightfully concerned, as are the leaseholders and the community in Hillarys, to ensure that a new facility will not kill the goose that laid the golden egg. We understand that.

I will put on record some of the issues about the development of this facility. It is sizeable and will cover more than a hectare, which will lead to a reduction of 0.7 hectares of the existing car-trailer parking area. The Government accepts that. Some notes prepared for me for this debate indicate that a modification of the remaining trailer car parking area will provide 242 trailer bays to support boat launching. The Government acknowledges that is a reduction of 50 car-trailer bays. However, it will still meet the Australian standards for the provision of car-trailer parking in urban launching facilities. It is acceptable to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure, because the reduction in the land area will not materially affect the operation of the boat ramp.

Mr Johnson: I accept that.

Ms MacTIERNAN: The member for Hillarys accepts that.

Mr Johnson: The point I was trying to make is that you can afford to have a reduction in the boat and trailer area because it is rarely full. However, if there is some spare capacity, it would be better to provide for any overflow of beach car parking on the southern end of the trailer park area. Can I tell you what was going to happen?

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

Ms MacTIERNAN: I am prepared to take some small interjections, but the member for Hillarys has had an enormous amount of time in which to comment. The Government will provide an additional 105 public car parking bays through the construction of additional parking areas on the north side of the harbour. If the proposal proceeds, they will be used by fisheries staff during the week but will be available to the public during the weekends to support peak-parking demands. If this proposal proceeds, approximately 160 Fisheries Department employees will be relocated to the site. By and large, the majority of them will work on weekdays.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Ms MacTIERNAN: There is no doubt that a few fisheries staff will be patrolling the beaches on the weekend. However, by and large the 160 employees will work during the week. During the week, when there is not a lot of business for the leaseholders, 160 new people - potential customers - will be at the site. I suspect that is why, contrary to the protestations of the member for Hillarys, who is once again out of step with his constituency, it is clear from the most recent correspondence that I read in this place the other day that the majority of leaseholders -

Mr Johnson: Which letter?

Ms MacTIERNAN: I quoted it in this House the other day. I am happy to provide a copy of that letter.

Mr Johnson: Surely the minister should have it in her briefing notes.

Ms MacTIERNAN: I expected the member for Hillarys to have a concentration span slightly longer than that of a housefly and would be able to recall the letter I quoted in this place last week. He said that he was passionately interested in this issue. I thought the member would recall the direct quote I read from that letter, so I did not bring it with me today. However, I am more than happy to provide the member with another copy of it.

Mr Johnson: Are you talking about the letter from Mr Allison of the Department of Fisheries?

Ms MacTIERNAN: I am referring to a letter from Mr Allison telling me that it appears that the majority of leaseholders now have no objection to the facility being established at Hillarys and that, in fact, a number of them are very keen for that to happen. I am not in any way, shape or form trying to pretend that parking will not present a problem. The Government would not be undertaking the review if it did not appreciate that it was a potential problem. I would not have met people from the Department of Fisheries and told them that the Government will not enter into a lease arrangement until the study is concluded, when it will decide what is the right way to proceed.

Ms Hodson-Thomas: Will that review examine an evacuation in case there is an emergency in Hillarys?

Ms MacTIERNAN: I am more than happy to have that examined. What other issues did the member for Hillarys raise?

Mr Johnson: One relevant issue is the introduction of paid car parking.

Ms MacTIERNAN: Thank you very much. Before the last election, when I attended meetings with a number of Hillarys leaseholders, although I cannot say which of the people first put their name to it -

Mr Johnson: You were promising things.

Ms MacTIERNAN: We did not have a simplistic approach. We did not say that the then Government was wrong and that we would scrap the relocation of the fisheries facility. We appreciated that a serious issue existed and that it was very difficult for the Opposition to make a determination. However, the Government said, as has been belatedly acknowledged by the member for Hillarys, that it appreciated that parking will be an issue.

Mr Johnson: There has always been a parking issue there, as I tried to tell you.

Ms MacTIERNAN: I accept that. What plan did the Government of the member for Hillarys have on this matter?

Mr Johnson: The then Minister for Transport went to Hillarys, although I cannot remember exactly when, to see for himself concerns about the parking and traffic-flow problems. He agreed that some serious issues needed to be addressed before the fisheries building proceeded. We were not opposed to the relocation of the fisheries facility. There is nothing to stop the Department of Fisheries staying where it is for a few more years. Why does the minister not listen to the 5 000 petitioners? They want the plan suspended for two years.

Ms MacTIERNAN: Is that not what we have done?

Mr Johnson: No; you are calling for tenders.

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

Ms MacTIERNAN: We have been in government for almost 18 months. We have not moved the Department of Fisheries. We have not sought tenders for the construction of the fisheries facility. We have not entered into a lease agreement. I once again point to the answer provided by the then Minister for Transport in September 2000, presumably after he spoke to the member for Hillarys. He said that he had done an analysis and that he had arranged for a briefing. Did he give the member a briefing on the analysis? He made the offer. The previous Government had no intention of doing any further studies. It believed it had done its analysis and was going to go with it.

With regard to paid car parking, it was put to us at the meeting with leaseholders that one problem was the use of the facility by people using the Rottnest ferry service. One view was that such people should be required to pay to leave their vehicles there all day while they visited Rottnest.

Mr Johnson: The previous minister and I looked at the prospect of moving the ferry terminal to the north side and establishing a shuttle service. During the election campaign the minister promised a shuttle service between Whitfords train station and the ferry terminal.

Ms MacTIERNAN: The member is getting off the track. He said he wanted to talk about paid car parking - we are talking about paid car parking. The proposition put by the leaseholders was that some consideration should be given to whether people who park their cars all day in order to go to Rottnest should pay. I do not see anything exceptional about that. People who leave their cars all day while they visit Rottnest cannot be realistically described as beach users. I do not believe the car parking policy we developed for people using beaches extends to people who use the Rottnest ferries. I attended the meeting and this was discussed. There is nothing wrong with the Government looking at this facility, which has a raft of different users. There is nothing wrong with looking at a range of tools to control parking. Far from making explicit directions about looking at car parking, the brief refers to a range of tools including, for example, paid car parking. It is no stronger than that. It is one thing that will be looked at, as will a range of other things such as time-limited car parking. They are all part of the suite of tools available for the management of car parking. It is no great mystery.

Not many people who go to the Hillarys marina use the beach. Only a minority use the beach. The majority of people use the commercial facilities or access the ferries. In that regard, the member is talking a load of nonsense.

The third complaint is that I did not lodge the petition. I disagree with many of the assumptions of the petition. It states that this development will affect the jobs, home values and businesses of more than 500 people, and business and private investment of \$250 million. I could have tabled his petition in Parliament earlier. I have subsequently tabled the petition as the member for Hillarys believes it is such an important issue. I have written to the gentleman who sent me the petition. Subsequent to receiving the petition, members of my staff have met with leaseholders. We recognise that they have a concern. We could have just tabled the petition and the member for Hillarys would have thought that that is all one does. We do not have that approach to government. We have the approach of solving problems. That is what we have tried to do. There is a body of opinion that the movement of the Department of Fisheries facility to this site would be very beneficial for the leaseholders. We recognise that we need to protect Hillarys for the future. We need to ensure that the fabulously successful Labor Party infrastructure program is able to grow and expand in the future.

We reject the condemnation. We have met our election commitment. I acknowledge that the Department of Fisheries has proceeded as though the previous Government were still in office. We have been very clear from August that there will be no lease negotiations; there will be no lease; and there will be no sale until and unless the review is complete and the review determines that we can develop this facility without negatively impacting on that fantastic site. Before any decision is made on that, I guarantee that we will present the leaseholders with a copy of the review. We will seek their comments on the review. The Government's decisions will be made subsequent to that.

Question put and a division taken with the following result -

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY - Wednesday, 17 April 2002]
p9705b-9720a

Mr Rob Johnson; Mr Norm Marlborough; Deputy Speaker; Mr Colin Barnett; Mr Kucera; Ms Alannah MacTiernan

Ayes (16)

Mr Barnett	Mrs Edwardes	Mr McNee	Mr Trenorden
Mr Birney	Mr Edwards	Mr Marshall	Mr Waldron
Mr Board	Ms Hodson-Thomas	Mr Omodei	Ms Sue Walker
Dr Constable	Mr Johnson	Mr Sweetman	Mr Bradshaw (<i>Teller</i>)

Noes (26)

Mr Andrews	Ms Guise	Mr McGinty	Mr Ripper
Mr Brown	Mr Hill	Mr McGowan	Mr Templeman
Mr Carpenter	Mr Hyde	Mr Marlborough	Mr Watson
Mr Dean	Mr Kobelke	Mrs Martin	Mr Whitely
Mr D'Orazio	Mr Kucera	Mr Murray	Ms Quirk (<i>Teller</i>)
Dr Gallop	Mr Logan	Mr O'Gorman	
Mr Graham	Ms MacTiernan	Mr Quigley	

Pairs

Mr Masters	Mr McRae
Mr Day	Mr Bowler
Mr Ainsworth	Ms Radisich
Mr Grylls	Mrs Roberts

Question thus negatived.