

CLIMATE CHANGE

Motion

HON DR BRAD PETTITT (South Metropolitan) [10.17 am] — without notice: I move —

That this house notes —

- (a) the Paris agreement, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports, and implications for climate here in Western Australia and globally;
- (b) the opportunities that an ambitious transition to a low carbon economy creates for Western Australia; and
- (c) that Western Australia is one of the few states not to have legislated targets for reducing carbon emissions and calls on the government to —
 - (i) develop as a priority, and bring back to this Parliament —

Does the Deputy President want me to continue? I realise that I should be reading this —

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Member, I have just noticed there are a few irregularities between what you are reading versus what you have given notice of. It may be better for you to move the motion standing in your name and then I will read the motion.

Hon Dr BRAD PETTITT: I move the motion standing in my name.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Hon Dr Brad Pettitt has moved —

That this house notes —

- (a) the Paris climate agreement, the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports, other associated climate science, and the implications of their recommendations for addressing climate changes here in Western Australia and across the globe;
- (b) the economic opportunities that an ambitious transition to a low carbon economy creates for Western Australia; and
- (c) that Western Australia is the only Australian state with rising carbon emissions and one of the few Australian states to not have legislated targets for reducing carbon emissions and calls on the Western Australian government to —
 - (i) develop as a priority, and bring back to this Parliament, a legislated target for reaching net zero carbon emissions and an interim target for 2030 that is consistent with the latest IPCC report and associated climate science; and
 - (ii) set up a climate expert panel to advise government with transparent and regular reporting mechanisms to the Parliament.

Hon Dr BRAD PETTITT: I am realistic and pragmatic enough to know that given the Labor Party's majority in both houses, the 2030 climate action bill that I introduced is unlikely to become law any time soon. What I do hope is that it becomes a useful template for action that will increase WA's climate ambition this decade. There is a huge opportunity here. Climate change is an environmental issue, as we are well aware, but it is also a moral issue. Importantly, it is an economic and social issue as well. I will go through each of those issues; let us start with the science. The environmental implications of climate change are extremely clear. We saw just this August the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change bring down its latest report, reinforcing the importance of 1.5 degrees as the basis for a safe climate. This is now unequivocal, but to do that there is a very important consensus emerging that globally we need to get our emissions down to 50 per cent by 2030 if we are going to continue to keep 1.5 degrees alive and have a safe climate.

The impacts of climate change have already been felt in Western Australia and around the world. I will not go on about this too much because I know that people in this house know this very well, but I will give some examples from the CSIRO and Bureau of Meteorology's most recent *State of the climate 2020* report. It shows that Australia's climate has warmed on average by 1.4 degrees since national records began in 1910. There has been a 20 per cent decline in winter rainfall in the southwest since 1970, a 75 per cent decline in water flowing into our water catchment dams, an increase in extreme fire weather and the length of the fire season, and oceans around Australia are acidifying and have warmed by around one degree since 1910. Members might have seen the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network report that came out this week that showed that WA reefs had been impacted with coral bleaching more than the Great Barrier Reef. Sea levels are rising around the state as well.

No doubt climate change is a huge environmental challenge; that is becoming increasingly clear. I do not think there is any debate amongst sensible people about the implications of this. But our response to that is also a moral question. Kevin Rudd was right when he called climate change the greatest moral challenge of this generation. It is a uniquely wicked problem because those who create the problem are not often the ones who are impacted by it. The impacts are dispersed. It is clear that the solution to climate change is that every state, every nation and every person must play their part to get to net zero emissions. No doubt the federal government has been failing. I think we are all probably quite frustrated at the lack of federal action. I was pleased to see on the front page of *The West Australian* today the heading “What on earth are you waiting for?” pointed at Scott Morrison, asking why we are not doing anything. That is on the back of a United Nations report that came out earlier this year that said that out of 170 nations around the world, Australia is coming last for its action on climate change. That is not something that Western Australia needs to be part of. Our job as a state is to push the federal government for greater ambition and I think that we can do that. Unfortunately, at the moment, rather than pushing the federal government for greater ambition, Western Australia is in danger of being the laggard state of a recalcitrant nation. That is not to say that there are not good initiatives.

I want to acknowledge the work of Hon Alannah MacTiernan and the recent \$61 million boost for WA’s renewable hydrogen industry. Those kind of initiatives, as well as those in the carbon and agricultural space, show that there are good things happening, but they are not at the scale and not wide enough across the way that we are dealing with this issue here. To summarise it, I feel like sometimes WA has its foot on the hose of climate action and we need to do so much more. I will give an example. New South Wales recently committed to transition its entire fleet of 8 000 buses to electric buses. It has already ordered the first 89 of those, and 22 of them are already in service across Sydney. In WA, for some reason, we are feeling to need to trial two of them that we are waiting to arrive in Joondalup. This is not a technology that needs to be trialled anymore. We just need to get on and do this. South Australia is already building its second big battery after the first \$91 million big battery by Tesla paid for itself in less than three years. WA is still going through the procurement for the first, with no second battery on the horizon. In Victoria we are seeing several billion dollars of new large-scale renewable energy projects in development. Disappointingly, the state, in its last budget, is not funding any new large-scale renewable energy projects. It is a huge opportunity for us to get above the 24 per cent renewables that we are at now. In fact, the target I talked about in my bill is to be at 50 per cent renewables by 2025, and 90 per cent by 2030.

On electric vehicles, the Australian Capital Territory is offering zero-interest loans of up to \$15 000, no stamp duty and two years of free registration to encourage a greater uptake of electric vehicles. WA is the only state offering no incentives to get more electric vehicles on the road. It is time for WA to get a move on. When we look at these kinds of examples, it all adds up to WA being the only state in which carbon emissions are rising. The Northern Territory’s emissions are also rising, but we are the only state, and we need to get on top of this. At the heart of this is targets. That is why I made targets the heart of my bill and this motion. Victoria’s target is for its state emissions to drop by 45 per cent to 50 per cent by 2030, pretty well in line with what I talked about in my bill. New South Wales recently committed to a 50 per cent reduction in emissions by 2030, compared with 2005 levels—the same as in my bill. South Australia has already reduced emissions and is now aiming for 100 per cent renewable energy by 2030, which is even more ambitious than what I have in my bill. There are targets in Queensland, in Tasmania and in the ACT. WA is not on this list because we have only an aspiration for 2050, and that is it, with no interim targets in between. This is the problem. WA ends up following and not leading. We are playing catch-up when it comes to climate change.

At the heart of it, this is a major issue. If we were to take WA as a country, we would have some of the highest emissions per person of anywhere in the world. It is over 35 tonnes per person. To put that in context, that is almost double that of the United States per person—the gas guzzling US. That is four times that of China, more than five times the world average. To find anywhere nearly as polluting as Western Australia we have to look at places like Qatar and Brunei. Just think about that. When the world is clearly facing a climate crisis, Western Australia on a per capita basis is doing more to warm this planet than anywhere else. That should spur us into action and acknowledge that we need to step up more than anywhere else. We need a plan to do that. At the moment, all we have is a climate policy, and the climate policy, which some members would have seen released last year, is meant to be a plan to get us to net zero, but it does not do that. It is largely a bit of a grab bag of what we are already doing rather than a serious plan. The policy even acknowledges that under business as usual, emissions will keep going up for the next four years.

We did an analysis to ask where that plan would take us across this decade, if those things in it were implemented. Interestingly, the emissions in it drop by about only 12 per cent to 13 per cent. To put that in context, WA’s ambition in its own climate policy is half the federal government’s underwhelming ambition of 26 per cent to 28 per cent by 2030. It is a quarter of what the IPCC says we need to be doing. It is extraordinary. We are not doing our bit to make sure that we have a safe climate, meet the Paris Agreement and keep 1.5 degrees alive. That is why we are seeing that our emissions have gone up by over 20 per cent since 2005, whilst all other states’ emissions have fallen. Queensland’s has fallen by 13.7 per cent, New South Wales’ by 17 per cent, Victoria’s by 25 per cent and

South Australia's by 33 per cent. Tasmania has dropped its emissions by 108 per cent and that state is now largely carbon neutral. If all others were to follow this level of ambition by Australia and WA, the planet would warm by three degrees or more. I think we need to understand that that is where we are currently going. The level of ambition currently in this state will result in a planet that will not be safe for our children.

If environmental arguments and the moral argument for why we need to do more to do our part do not persuade members, I hope the economic arguments will. Imagine a plan from which Western Australia could reap a dividend of thousands of jobs and tens of billions of dollars' worth of investment? Imagine a plan in which we could seize the first-mover advantage. I quote —

“Preparing for the future means Australia must be more ambitious in the short term ...

...

“Setting a more ambitious interim target ... will drive new investment and bring forward action in sectors such as electricity where we can deploy commercially viable technology at scale. ...

“The best thing we can do for workers and for regional communities is to avoid playing costly and damaging catchup with a plan to prepare for inevitable change.

...

“Early action puts us in the box seat to take advantage of our world class skills, abundant resources and proximity to markets to secure existing jobs and create new ones.

...net-zero emissions ... must be done in a way that harnesses Australia's abundant natural resources to boost exports, drives investment in new technologies and delivers a stronger economy with more jobs.”

Those are not my words; they are the words of the Business Council of Australia, which recently put out a report saying that we should be pushing for a target of between 46 and 50 per cent below 2005 levels by 2030—interestingly, the same target that I presented in my climate bill this morning.

The truth is that WA is in an extraordinary position. We have more land, more sunlight, more wind and more of the right minerals than anywhere else in the world. We are so well placed to benefit from the necessary clean energy transition ahead of us. But to quote the now New South Wales Liberal Treasurer, who was the Minister for Energy and Environment —

An economic arms race to capture the next generation of investment, resource projects, exports, jobs and innovation is unfolding across the world.

NSW wants to be at the front of the queue, positioning our state as both a renewable energy superpower and an economic powerhouse for the decades ahead.

They are the words of a Liberal minister. Does WA want it as much as New South Wales? NSW has set a target and has an ambition; is WA going to do as much as NSW? This is about jobs. According to an Ernst and Young report, a renewables-led recovery will create three times as many jobs as a fossil fuel-led one.

Clean State has done some great work in this space to show how the south west interconnected system powered by 90 per cent renewable energy—again, that is the target set in my bill—would create more than 8 600 jobs. There would be another 4 000 jobs if we could decarbonise LNG production and transition to renewable hydrogen. But we need a target—a target that can give certainty to investors. As the \$2 trillion Investor Group on Climate Change said —

“We have to be able to invest with certainty for the long term if we're going to invest billions of dollars in capital.”

Only legislative targets can provide the certainty that industry requires. Of course, the other side of the economic argument is that these changes could save households money. Some really great work has been done showing that if we got this right, we could save households \$5 000 a year in energy bills.

That brings me to the question of just transition and how we can do this. Some really great work has been done on that. I acknowledge the work that Ms Sharan Burrow, a former Labor Party representative and now general secretary of the International Trade Confederation, has been doing on climate-proofing and employment-proofing a just transition. That is absolutely what needs to happen. It should be happening not only in industry, but also in agriculture. I appreciate that I am an urbanite and do not really know as much about farming as my esteemed colleagues, but WA agriculture has a huge amount to lose from our drying climate; it also has a lot to gain from building climate-resilient systems. WA already has some of the most innovative and efficient farming practices in the world, but now we need to provide the right support to see a net zero transition in the farming sector. Of course, there is a 40 000-year unbroken Aboriginal culture around caring for country as well. There is a huge appetite to create restoration around the WA economy that I think could be quite transformative.

The other side of the economic argument is the cost of not acting. According to a study by Deloitte Access Economics, climate change-related disasters will cost Australia \$94 billion a year by 2060 if nothing is done to tackle climate change. Let me say again: the cost of not acting is far greater than the cost of acting. This is at the heart of what we need to do. We need to start acting and, in parallel, we need to start talking about how we will adapt to climate change and what needs to happen to make ourselves more resilient. We need to get in front of this. The idea that we do nothing on climate change is no longer an option.

In conclusion, I want to start with a quote by Professor Ian Lowe, an esteemed professor in this space, who said —

Reaching net-zero emissions will require intense policy focus, private investment and clear accountability—conditions only a firm numerical target can provide.

That is not an aspiration, especially for two or three decades in the future; we need clear targets for this decade. The world is changing. There will be huge risks for this state if we do not act, but there will also be huge opportunities if we do. All the world's advanced economies have set bold targets. The UK, USA and Germany have set interim emissions targets above 50 per cent. Fourteen of our largest 20 trading partners, covering 83 per cent of our exports, have signed up to net zero emissions targets by the middle of this century. The world is changing and the question is: is WA changing along with it? We cannot afford to be a rust-bucket state in a world that is moving quickly. It has been said that this is WA's Kodak moment. Will we continue to back industries that are not only morally wrong but also stranded in the tide that is coming? Kodak was extremely profitable in 2007, but by 2012 it had filed for bankruptcy. Things move quickly. Our future cannot be based on investing in more fossil fuels and more gas; it has to be about investing in clean energy and leaving fossil fuels in the ground.

I hope that this climate bill and motion will be the first step towards WA acting in this decade. It will be consistent with the science, consistent with WA's fair contribution, consistent with WA realising the economic opportunities that climate action will create for this state and consistent with reducing the living costs of Western Australians. It was very pleasing to see a report recently state that seven out of 10 Western Australians think that we should be setting targets and implementing domestic action to limit global warming by 1.5 to two degrees and to achieve net zero emissions.

I want to finish with a sort of misquote from Saul Griffith, who said, when he was talking about Australia, that WA, the laggard state of the recalcitrant nation, could easily lead the world. I hope that this motion is the first step to doing so, because this is exactly the change of mindset that is needed here in WA.

HON DR BRIAN WALKER (East Metropolitan) [10.38 am]: I would like to rise not just to support this motion but also to shout out vigorously for this motion. There is no alternative than to accept this motion. The science is more than clear. I am talking as a scientific person, for whom science is very important. Science will always demand that we examine the evidence and change our opinions based on the results of science—it is not actually static; otherwise, we would still be thinking that the sun revolves around the earth. The warming of the earth is coming to an imminent crisis and nothing has been done. It irritates me personally that people are still speaking about 2050. I think 2030 is too far in the future; we need to act now.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: Are you seriously saying that nothing is being done?

Hon Dr BRIAN WALKER: No, I am not saying that.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: You just said that; you sounded a bit like Greta Thunberg.

Hon Dr BRIAN WALKER: Maybe I will modify my words: I appreciate that action is being taken, but it is not nearly enough. When I listen to what Morrison is saying, I think we have a problem. Would you agree with that, honourable member?

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: I would agree that the federal government has been appalling.

Hon Dr BRIAN WALKER: Thank you.

We can move on to the idea that we have three pillars of society: agriculture, education and health. I am reminded of the science that is involved in these areas and thinking about the way that the human mind works. Historically, we can look at the very clear evidence from 1933 that things were not going well in the state of Germany, yet there was prevarication in the Parliaments of the world, particularly England, which attempted to manage the situation with appeasement measures and trying this and that. Well-meaning people on both sides decided to follow the best advice at the time, but, in the end, nothing adequate was done. Yes, preparations for war had been made, but not many, and then war broke out and millions died. Had action been taken in 1933, those millions of deaths and the destruction of the environment could have been averted.

I am thinking in my lifetime of the arguments for smoking. When it became absolutely clear that smoking was a good way of killing half the smokers in their middle years, anti-smoking measures were opposed by people who espoused pseudoscience to demand that smoking be allowed to continue as part of normal, civilised life. Even now

that is normal in some countries. Millions have died because of the inaction when prevaricating about the science. We see it now with COVID-19. The actions of the vested interests—I do not know on which side—has resulted in inaction because we have been prevaricating: Is the science proven? Is the vaccine proven? Shall we implement vaccination policies? What about quarantine? The huge amount of misinformation and disinformation has allowed us to be sitting here still at risk because we have not taken appropriate action yet, although I will acknowledge that a lot has been done in Australia, but we are behind the curve, and that is caused by inaction due to the human mind being led astray.

There is a pattern here and we can see it. We see the same pattern of inaction on the science of climate change. We are looking at the evidence, taking a back step and allowing for different points of view, as we rightly should, but the vested interests are then able to stop progress from being made. I thank the government for taking the action that it has. I can heartily stand behind that, but we need more action now.

This morning I listened to the ABC news with great horror because the Liberal National Party in Queensland and the Liberal and National Parties in other states are determined to not vote in favour of climate action because it will impact on the voters in their regions and in Queensland, as if votes equate to life. We are indeed talking about life. I put it to members that it is not about getting votes or losing votes if we follow the climate science. If that is what members believe, I say loudly and clearly that they do not belong in Parliament. It is about the people.

We have looked at the economic argument that was very clearly made here and the potential losses due to inaction. I looked again with envy at a Tesla as I walked in this morning, thinking that I would be well advised to invest in an electric vehicle, but also realising that Western Australia is perhaps the only state that does not give any assistance or rebates for people who wish to buy an electric vehicle. I wondered why we are not capable of supporting such technology. Is it because we see innovation coming and think that we can take a back seat and wait until other people have proven the technology before considering doing something? Are we so backward? I would hope not. The state would benefit if we invested in innovation surrounding climate science, especially in agriculture. I was speaking only this morning about the benefits that could be achieved if we simply focused on producing clean food environmentally rather than resorting to chemicals that are polluting our environment and causing—I can speak with absolute certainty—a number of the cancer cases that I have seen due to the chemicals that we use in the environment.

I ask all members to support this motion to the maximum that we can, because it is not just about what is right; it is about our very life and the fabric of society. Inaction will equate to a loss of income, jobs, life and quality of life. It is intolerable to stand here and allow that to happen. I refuse to be part of that. I ask that we support this very valid and worthy motion. I stand side by side with the member on this, and I hope that all members of this esteemed house will do the same.

HON ALANNAH MacTIERNAN (South West — Minister for Regional Development) [10.44 am]: I am providing the government's response to this motion. I think it is very evident that in Western Australia it is Labor governments that have consistently been the first to accept the reality of climate change and then take action to deal with it. The Labor Party has no problem with its record. We will continue to accelerate our efforts, as it is very evident that the nature of the potential catastrophic affects is accelerating. We also absolutely understand that it is important to see the economic opportunities that lie before us in responding to climate change. I am very confident that our government has been taking the lead in many of these areas and that members will see rolled out over the next few years more initiatives in the climate change space. We have created a new ministry. Minister Amber-Jade Sanderson is now Minister for Climate Action. We are very much sending the message that we not only are focused on accepting that climate change exists, but also that need to take action and we need to continue the work that we have been doing, and accelerate that work.

We have made a clear commitment to reach net zero emissions by 2050. We are looking at how we can structure getting to that point, what needs to be done to set interim targets and the way in which we can best entrench those interim and final targets to ensure that we have created an investment ecosystem that will see companies make the investments that are needed. As Minister Sanderson said on the radio this morning, we are looking at various legislative models. We want to set up a system that has the flexibility to increase targets, as necessary. We do not want this process to be ossified if, in the future, we have a more, shall we say, adverse upper house. We are looking at how to develop that system. We want to create an environment of legal certainty and we are working through the various options on that. Obviously, the United Nations Climate Change Conference—COP26—is coming up. The work that comes out of that forum will impact on our interim targets.

As a matter of interest, I will provide an example of how rapidly these things are changing. Within 18 months of launching our hydrogen strategy in 2019, we brought forward many of those targets by a decade because of the rate at which the technology was developing and the rate at which we saw the markets changing to embed within them a requirement to decarbonise. In a sense we are seeing this even in industries that do not respond to the moral imperative. We have always agreed on this side of the house that this is a grave moral challenge that we face. It has become very evident that those who do not share that moral compunction nevertheless are seeing very clearly in

the marketplace, including in the marketplace for investment dollars, that a democratisation is going on, in a sense, in superannuation funds and shareholder activism, and that is really putting pressure on companies to act. As an interesting aside, in talking to some chief executive officers of big hydrocarbon companies, I found that at a personal level one of the things that is driving them is that they want their kids to be proud of them. Their kids no longer feel proud that their mother or father works in the hydrocarbon industry. We are seeing this groundswell. As demonstrated in this morning's paper, that 80 per cent of Western Australians and around 70 per cent of Australians want action is impacting on every level of life.

When we first came into government we were absolutely committed to responding to climate change. We took the position at that point that the target should be embraced by the federal government so we would have a national framework. I guess no-one anticipated that once Tony Abbott had been got out of the way, the inability to take action at a federal level would be sustained for such a long period. We have seen in this state and federally the inherent instability of that coalition, in which there are the green-on-blue wars that act against the broader interest of Australians. We like to think that we are the party that can put forward a coherent policy.

I do not want to spend too much time on this because I recognise that Hon Dr Brad Pettitt has brought forward this motion in a somewhat positive way. However, it is important to always remember that it was the absolutely absurd decision of the Greens back in 2009 that sank carbon pricing and created a political divide in this country. Two Liberals crossed the floor and voted with that bill, but unfortunately the Greens voted against us. That led to this extraordinary situation that we have here in Australia, unlike places such as Germany and the United Kingdom where there is true bipartisanship on the nature of the response to climate change and pricing carbon. Unfortunately, the Greens were the Trojan Horse that allowed Tony Abbott to move forward and create a sequelae that has led to a decade of disadvantage for this country. We saw a similar thing happen in the last Parliament with the plastic bag ban, when the Greens sought to disallow it because it did not go far enough: we were not going to make progress because they wanted to make more progress.

Hon Tjorn Sibma: A net zero approach!

Hon ALANNAH MacTIERNAN: Yes, a zero approach—no progress, and just sit there on their moral high horse.

In speaking to this motion, Hon Dr Brad Pettitt did not recognise that we are doing more than tinkering at the edges; that we are making significant inroads. Some of these things will take time. If we consider what we have been able to do, it is clear that when we came into government, the Barnett government had dismantled all the infrastructure around climate change. We had to rebuild capability in everything in energy policy right across government because all of that had been disbanded. The focus had been on reopening a coal-fired power plant that we had closed. It is an inaccuracy to say that we are not doing anything in battery policy.

There are different levers. We are investing \$21 million to provide up to 95 fast-charging stations across the state. We have made clear commitments on the number of light vehicles that the state government will put in place. We have been making very significant investments in hydrogen. The member mentioned the \$61 million in the last budget, which brings our total to over \$90 million. In addition to that are significant funds, around an additional \$150 million, for the continuation of the development of strategic industrial land for new industries, and in excess of \$200 million for renewable energy projects. Additionally, we have a critical minerals task force and investment in developing a battery industry here. These things are slow when we have to start from the ground floor up, but under Minister Bill Johnston we are making real progress in that regard.

We are also on the path to developing a wind turbine manufacturing capability. Notwithstanding the decisions of Fortescue Future Industries, we are still committed to developing an electrolyser facility in Western Australia. We have 30 very active projects across Western Australia. We have the land, solar, wind, wave and resources to make this state a real boon for the decarbonisation of fuel. I hope the member will celebrate when we open the first hydrogen microgrid in Denham at the end of the year. We have been working very hard with Horizon Power. It is doing a great job getting that project up.

In addition, one of the things we need to focus on—I look at the people on the member's support list and I am sure some of them will understand this—is the impact land clearing has had on climate change. The story is not entirely one of carbon pollution. An emerging body of science tells us that this is a more complex thing that is happening, particularly in the south west of this state. The government is investing in a climate resilience fund and a land restoration fund. It has permitted carbon farming to be started.

[Member's time expired.]

HON TJORN SIBMA (North Metropolitan) [10.59 am]: At the outset I would like to signal my appreciation for Hon Dr Brad Pettitt for bringing this motion to the house, for discussing it in the terms that he has done and for the presentation of his draft private member's bill. He is obviously a genuine advocate in this space. I listened to his contribution with some interest, as I did to Hon Dr Brian Walker and to Minister Alannah MacTiernan. In a strange breakout of bipartisanship on a Thursday morning in this chamber, I may well disappoint the mover

of the motion in expressing my similarity of view to the Minister for Environment; Climate Action in this state, Amber-Jade Sanderson, when I talk specifically about the essence of this motion—the introduction of legislative targets at the level of a state jurisdiction. This is not without its pitfalls. I will quote from the minister today because I think she holds a reasonable position that is in accord with mine. She states —

“The government is considering legislation around targets and climate action ... but legislation can be a really blunt and inflexible instrument,” ...

“These targets will need to change over time and every time we need to change the target, we’d have to go back to the parliament to change [it].

“There are mechanisms in place that we’re examining that have more flexibility but are enforceable.”

That comes from an ABC online article that was posted this morning. I will provide Hansard with the relevant information when it is required.

Although the minister and I might disagree on the details, the means and the mechanisms, it is completely inaccurate to say that there is absolutely no momentum for change. It is unfair to accuse even the government of Western Australia of doing nothing around carbon abatement or moving forward on the reduction of carbon emissions. One can disagree on its methods and progress, but it is an unfair categorisation. It is also somewhat ill-advised to overestimate—I mean this in the most charitable way—the capacity of a Western Australian Parliament to provide any sort of meaningful contribution to carbon abatement at a global level. We need to read what is proposed in the member’s bill and in the motion in the context of broader global movements. Adaptation is occurring in Western Australia and Australia more generally, particularly in the corporate sector. The member mentioned the Business Council of Australia document, which I think was released earlier this week, that established quite clearly a net zero target by 2050 and I think a 50 per cent reduction, or thereabouts, by 2030. It is important to read through that document. I found it to be a very interesting and meaningful document, but it put into context the consequences of targets, because they are not consequence-free. A commitment even to net zero by 2050 comes with the consequence of a fundamental reordering of the Australian economic structure, and the Business Council of Australia recognises that. For someone like me, that is not necessarily cause for alarm, but it is absolutely something that we need to be alert to.

On the front page of *The West Australian*, Painted Dog Research, a marketing research company, provided results, which, frankly, were unsurprising. I do not think it is any great surprise that the vast majority of Western Australians want to see action on climate change, as indeed do their counterparts Australia-wide. I do not have the next paper with me, but I was also alerted to a similar study conducted by YouGov Australia polling either at the end of last week or very recently. It provided similar survey results in terms of personal commitment to wanting to see action. But the next series of questions were probably a little more revealing, because although a lot of people want to see action, very few of them want to pay a personal price for it. We cannot set macro targets in isolation from the impacts that they will have on the economic structure or ecosystem that individuals and communities inhabit. Some members of our community will more easily transition to a net zero future. Members can understand who those people might be in generational or educational terms or across any other demographic categorisation that they would like to make. I will put it this way: it is easy to explain to a university student the benefits and the potential economic upside for them personally, and perhaps society collectively over time, but to try to have that same conversation with a 54-year-old manager at a coal-power generation plant in Collie is another thing entirely. When we have these conversations, we need to peel back the macro and appreciate what that means for the micro. With all due respect—this is not meant in any condescending way—if we are to have meaningful conversations in this chamber and in this state about climate change action, we have to explain to people what it will mean for them individually. Sometimes those conversations will be far more difficult undertakings.

I will use this brief opportunity to outline some global trends, but, frankly, if we want to see where action is moving, we should just look at global capital markets. This tells the story. We are going to net zero by 2050 and probably faster, if only for the fact that the world’s largest investment manager BlackRock, which has something like \$8.7 trillion worth of capital that it can throw around the world in any direction it wishes to, has specifically stated that climate change risk is a significant driver in the reallocation of capital.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: The finance markets have made the decision.

Hon TJORN SIBMA: Absolutely. They have made a decision, to a degree. To all those who are going to Glasgow in the next couple of weeks—I say this in the most charitable context—the decision has already been made. Those people might want to reassess their need to travel and to burn that fuel in getting there to have those conversations—that is probably a little bit too gratuitous.

What can we do at a state level? The state government is undertaking some action, but some other areas of concentration would be advisable. It has struck me—perhaps this is a difficult but not an insurmountable challenge—that this state government needs to develop a single point of view, a whole-of-government assessment, of what its carbon footprint is. If we want to see leadership, a state government, whether it be the current government or a future government, has to lead by example. This government is working on it and I think that there will be progressive

action on this over the course of a number of governments, but opportunities abound in terms of deep and vastly more transparent offset markets in Western Australia—that is the priority—and we need to seriously reconfigure and reorganise our approach at a whole state level to land-use planning. That just cuts across the entire board. Do we have a Land Administration Act that permits for land assembly at the scale that someone like “Twiggy” Forrest is after, for example? But it also translates at a more micro and localised level. Are our bushfire planning and land-use planning parameters set appropriately? We have had petitions in this place to suggest that they are not. Those kinds of measures will provide some significant dividends as well. That is where a state government can and should continue to lead.

I have only half a minute left. I note a reference to the blue-on-green wars, apparently at a national level. On this side of the chamber in this particular jurisdiction, we are on a unity ticket. We want to see meaningful action that does not require blunt instrumentalist approaches that are just going to be gamed, unfortunately, because that is the way the world is. Thank you.

HON DR BRAD PETTITT (South Metropolitan) [11.09 am] — in reply: I want to thank each member for their comments. I will start with Hon Dr Brian Walker and the demonstration of leadership that he has shown. There are some amazing opportunities in this space that I know that he is passionate about, such as turning hemp into some amazing products, which will change how we think about building and the like. That is quite exciting and I appreciate the member’s comments and thank him for his support.

To Hon Alannah MacTiernan, I get concerned when this government feels the need to wait for the 26th UN Climate Change Conference of the Parties, or COP26, as though there will be some great surprise —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: No; we are not waiting.

Hon Dr BRAD PETTITT: That is what the minister said. She said that she was waiting until —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: Waiting in terms of establishing an interim target. Now, this is an event that’s going to be held next month, right? So we’re not saying that we’re waiting to do action. But in terms of establishing a series of interim measures, we’ll be looking at those deliberations. It’s not as if we’re not acting. That’s absurd!

Hon Dr BRAD PETTITT: I did not say the minister was not acting. But I think that idea that we wait to set targets is at the heart of this. Targets, especially interim ones, should be linked to the science and evidence, and there will be no surprises coming out of COP26. We know exactly what will be said and what needs to happen. At the heart of this, and this is part of the problem, is one of the things that has clearly emerged in the climate debate in the last few months is that delay is the new denial. No-one can seriously deny climate change anymore, but we are seeing too much inaction and too much delay. I warn the government to not fall into the trap of not acting consistently with the science. The truth of the matter is that we know exactly what COP26 will say and we need to get in front of this and, for me, that is at the heart of this motion. The idea of WA catching up is not the same is not the same as WA leading. I will not go back to rehashing conversations in 2009; we have all moved on since then. We saw the benefits when the Greens and the Australian Labor Party combined under the Gillard government to create a price on carbon. We saw carbon emissions in this country come down. I think we will see the benefits when we in this chamber collaborate across the aisle to make sure they come down again.

This government has failed to act. It has been here for four and a half years. One number I mentioned was that over the last term of government, the government put out over 7 000 media releases. Do members know how many of those were about climate and addressing the climate challenge? There were 13; that is 0.185 per cent. This is the biggest challenge that we are facing as a state and it is not getting the priority it deserves. This is at the heart of why I have moved this motion today.

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: I find that incredibly hard to believe, member.

Hon Dr BRAD PETTITT: It is very true. Go back and check that. There were 7 000 media releases and 13 of them were about climate; that is less than 0.2 per cent. As I said, minister, I think that you have actually been a leader in this space. I think that what you are doing in the green hydrogen space is excellent. But we cannot just have these small pockets of excellence in a sea of underwhelming action. That is why I am here to say: targets drive this.

Hon Tjorn Sibma talked about targets being a blunt instrument. Blunt is good if what we are trying to do is get a target. A hammer is a blunt instrument and it gets the nail in; that is its point! What we are trying to do here is drive climate action. Every other state has targets; many of those are legislative. Most other nations have targets; most of those are legislative. I do not know what makes WA exceptional around not wanting a blunt instrument in this case. I do know that the instruments we currently have a driving up emissions. Again, I repeat this: this state is the only state in which emissions have gone up. Let us judge the effectiveness of the current instruments. Emissions have gone up by 20 per cent, so it is actually not working. I put some targets on the table and some instruments that I know to work across other state and across the globe. I look forward to seeing this government come up with other ones. The importance of a blunt instrument is that it provides certainty for investment. We talked about the many trillions of dollars that are going to drive change. That investment needs certainty, targets and legislation that

will not be moved at a whim. This is really, really important. It is why we are seeing targets being used all around the world.

This motion is also about outcomes. We talked about electric vehicles. It is good that we are doing charging, but the fact that we are doing nothing else means that the outcome for Western Australia is that we have one of the lowest uptakes of electric vehicles of any state in Australia, and Australia has the lowest uptake of pretty much any developed nation in the world. We are getting the outcomes that we deserve because of the policy settings that we are putting forward. Defending that which is clearly not getting as good outcomes is indefensible. That Fortescue Future Industries, or FFI, are moving the first of the green hydrogen plants to Queensland, not WA, is an outcome that I think we should be saying —

Hon Alannah MacTiernan: It is not a green hydrogen plant, right? You do understand that? It's not a green hydrogen plant.

Hon Dr BRAD PETTITT: Creating renewables-based hydrogen is really important. Why are those technologies not here in Western Australia but are going to Queensland instead? The heart of this motion is about outcomes. I agree that the financial markets have made the decision, as Hon Tjorn Sibma said. But the question now is: where will they decide to put their money? They will move it. Will they move it here to Western Australia? Will they get create new jobs here in this state? Will they move it to places that do set targets and have ambition and are serious about the climate? That is my concern. I am passionate about the climate because I can see the environmental consequences that will be terrible for our children and grandchildren. I feel morally outraged about our disproportionate contribution. Equally, the economic opportunity that I feel this state is in danger of missing out on because we are not making the most of this is unforgivable. We could do so well. We should be the leader.

Hon Pierre Yang: Honourable member, I think it is such a shame that you were not leading the federal Greens back in the day. Such a shame.

Hon Dr BRAD PETTITT: Thank you, member. That is very kind.

I put this motion forward in a multi-partisan way because I think the evidence is so strong now and the opportunities are there. I hope this debate coalesces a bit of energy in this space around climate change. I take Hon Pierre Yang's comments on board. I think the danger for the climate is when it becomes a partisan issue. We have seen how broken this issue is at a federal level. I do not think it is as broken as that at a state level at the moment, but I also do not think that we are realising the opportunities that a multi-partisan approach to ambitious climate action, consistent with the science, can do.

I thank everyone for their contributions. I think this has been a really worthwhile discussion. I really hope that on the back of this we can see some real ambition consistent with the climate science going forward.

Motion lapsed, pursuant to standing orders.