

**CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2015**

*Second Reading*

Resumed from 18 June.

**MR D.J. KELLY (Bassendean)** [4.00 pm]: I begin my contribution to debate on the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2015 by saying a little bit about some of the volunteers and active community members who contribute so much to protecting our natural environment. Almost everywhere we look, there is a community group working really hard either protecting their local part of the environment or dealing with a broader statewide issue. These people have no financial interest in what they are doing; they just have a common love of the environment and, in many cases, a common concern that we are not doing enough to protect our environment. These could be people who just do weeding in the local national park or who actively campaign on issues. We would be so much worse off as a community but for the efforts of these people.

Unfortunately, some people—some of them in this house—often try to denigrate the work of these people. It is unfortunate that people who voluntarily give up their time to protect a little bit of the environment or to advocate on a particular issue quite often get vilified, sometimes by people in this place. When advocating for a particular issue, quite often these people come up against not just government but also people with a corporate interest in the other side of the debate. I have nothing against people in business pursuing their corporate objectives. We need to grow as a state, we need jobs, and we need to make sure that our economy is on a stable footing. I have nothing against people who work hard to create jobs, but we need to work as a community to strike an appropriate balance between our economy and protecting our environment. Sometimes we can do both; tourism is a good example of that. However, sometimes a commercial interest, if left unchecked, would do damage to our environment. As a community, we must have the right balance between commercial and environmental interests.

The volunteers who work out there, whether they be in community action groups or in groups campaigning around particular issues, are often the ones who first bring environmental concerns to people's attention. They are very often the people who provide the balance that is necessary in a debate around ensuring that our economic activity does not unnecessarily damage our environment. The campaign in this state around protection of our old-growth forests was fought largely by people who simply loved the environment and wanted to ensure that our south west native forests will still be there thousands of years into the future. The issue was promoted and progressed by people who had no commercial interest in saving those forests; they just had a love of our environment. Ultimately, through that campaign and through a decision of the Gallop Labor government, old-growth forests have largely been protected. These days we would hardly find anyone in the community who would say that we should go back to logging our old-growth forests, but at the time, forest campaigners were vilified by people on the other side of the house.

I hope the minister, in the way he conducts himself as Minister for Environment, does not quickly jump to a position, like so many members on his side of the house, whereby he vilifies voluntary community campaigners working to save our environment. Whether it is the old-growth forest campaigners or, more recently, those opposing the shark cull, they are people who have no financial interest in what they are doing. They are simply expressing a point of view based on their desire to protect the environment. The minister should be nurturing those people, not criticising them, because, probably 80, 85 or even 90 per cent of the time, they are dead right in what they are saying. They do not always get it right, but the vast majority of the time community environmental campaigners are rightly speaking out for the protection of the environment. The Minister for Environment should be nurturing those people, not falling into the trap of vilifying them.

In one sense, the minister has the best job in the government, but he also has the hardest job in the government. It is pretty hard to imagine a more important job in any government than that of protecting the environment. No matter what happens, if we do not have a healthy environment, future generations will look back and ask what the hell we were doing. No matter how much our economy grows, if we do not protect our environment, living standards of future generations will be greatly diminished. The minister has the best job, but it is also one of the hardest. I would like to see a bit more enthusiasm from the minister for what he is doing, rather than him just making some announcements around a few particular projects while not showing a general commitment to what he is doing.

During question time, the member for Gosnells asked the minister a question about the state government's policy on climate change. The minister basically said—I am paraphrasing here, but if this is wrong, the minister can tell me—that tackling climate change is a federal government responsibility. State governments are just here to take action to mitigate the effects of climate change. That, to me, is a really disappointing attitude for any environment minister to have, not just in the state Parliament, but anywhere in the world. The minister has the power and the resources in his office; he should be an absolute champion on the issue of climate change. My shadow portfolio is water. The government has recently released a report on the future of water in the south west. One of the points made in that report is that Western Australia has a drying climate and that that drying climate

is likely to result in more frequent and more intense bushfires. They are the things that affect our natural environment. We cannot divorce caring for the environment and the issue of climate change, unless, of course, people think that climate change does not really exist. If the minister believes that climate change is the big issue that most people think it is, he should not hide his light under a bushel on this issue. He should not say, “Well, I wouldn’t go to Paris to a big meeting like that because it’s a federal government issue.” The minister should be a champion for the environment, and at this stage in our history there is probably no bigger issue than climate change. As I say, take care and nurture those community groups, because most of the time they will be right. I am disappointed—this has already been raised by the member for Gosnells—that a number of community groups sought consultation on this bill but the minister did not find time to give them a briefing. I think the Urban Bushland Council WA and the Wilderness Society have already been mentioned. It does not seem that the minister is doing much nurturing.

One of the purposes of the bill is to combine the two statutory conservation vesting authorities—the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority and the Conservation Commission of Western Australia—to create a single entity, the Conservation and Parks Commission. That single entity will have responsibility for marine parks. The opposition supports the creation of that entity, but I am concerned that the minister is not taking his responsibilities in respect of marine parks as seriously as he should. I want to raise with him in particular the new marine park that he has announced that will include Roebuck Bay. In the draft plan, the minister has excluded any sanctuary zone in that marine park—that is, a no-take zone within the marine park. That seems to be extremely difficult to understand. Recently I was in Broome and had a number of discussions with people about this issue. Members of the community there are arguing that the minister should include in the Roebuck Bay marine park a marine sanctuary zone that will cover at least 11 per cent of Roebuck Bay. My understanding is that the Great Barrier Reef has a 33 per cent sanctuary zone, Ningaloo has a 34 per cent sanctuary zone and Eighty Mile Beach Marine Park, just down the road from Broome, so to speak, has a 24 per cent sanctuary zone. The Eighty Mile Beach Marine Park is one that the minister gazetted and it has a 24 per cent sanctuary zone. People do not understand why, under the minister’s proposal, the marine park that will include Roebuck Bay will have a zero sanctuary zone.

No doubt the minister is aware of a letter addressed to the Premier, signed by 38 different scientists who all argue for the inclusion of a sanctuary zone in the Roebuck Bay marine park. I will quote a little from that letter, dated 16 June 2004. It states —

Imperative to delivering outcomes for this outstanding biodiversity is the inclusion of a significant area of highly protected no-take marine reserve within the marine park. There is clear scientific evidence that no-take reserves are important for biodiversity conservation, generating greater biodiversity outcomes than partially protected general use zones where fishing remains permitted.

There is now extensive evidence that the size, density and numbers of fish and a range of other species increase within marine sanctuaries.

The letter goes on to state —

A marine sanctuary could also contribute to sustainable recreational and cultural fishing, with larger breeding fish within the sanctuary producing recruitment and spill-over into surrounding waters.

The letter continues —

Marine sanctuaries with minimal human impacts are also an important tool for managers and researchers to understand changes over time. There is a paucity of marine sanctuary zones within dynamic, tidally-driven systems, and the Roebuck Bay marine park represents a unique opportunity to study the effects and potential benefits of no-take management zones in such an environment. Highly protected sanctuary zones help us understand the ecological impacts of fishing and help us interpret long-term changes, such as those driven by ocean warming and coastal development.

There are clear benefits provided by marine sanctuaries for the protection of biodiversity which are not produced by other marine park zonings. Increasingly, benefits are also being documented for fisheries in surrounding waters. A well designed marine sanctuary of adequate size within the Roebuck Bay marine park, accompanied by a suitable monitoring program, can be expected to provide significant benefits to the protection of biodiversity and also make a contribution to the preservation of species important to tourism, such as snubfin dolphins, and to recreational fishing in the long term.

That is the view of 38 scientists. I understand that most, if not all of them, have been to and done work on Roebuck Bay. I would be fascinated to hear from the minister what his scientific view is that contradicts the strong view that has been put to him by the scientific community.

In addition, 18 tourism operators in Broome have written to the Premier.

[Member's time extended.]

**Mr D.J. KELLY:** Those tourism operators are promoting the idea of a sanctuary zone in Roebuck Bay. I will quote from their letter, which does not appear to have a date. It states —

It is our opinion that including a ... sanctuary in the right place in the Bay would have many benefits to the local economy and boost regional tourism.

I pause here to note that in an answer the minister gave in question time today, he talked about the need to unlock the potential for tourism and jobs in the Kimberley. This letter from existing tourism operators in the Kimberley, in Broome, is saying that a sanctuary zone will boost jobs.

The letter goes on to state —

If a sanctuary zone was placed in an area of the bay that promoted and sustained the unique wildlife of the area, tourism could see many prolonged economic benefits. A sanctuary zone gives a clear indication to tourists of the importance of the area and becomes a very powerful marketing tool for the promotion of Roebuck Bay to the rest of the world. The southern Fingers, an area in the isolated eastern shores of Roebuck Bay, is an ideal location for a sanctuary zone ...

It goes on —

Roebuck Bay is the home of the largest population of Snubfin dolphins left in the world and is the easiest and most reliable place to view such a rare and beautiful mammal. The Snubfin dolphin could be a powerful marketing brand for Roebuck ecotourism. A sanctuary zone will protect a vital food source for Snubfins and ensure the health of this population.

They then go on to talk about the benefits of fishing tourism. The letter continues —

... with the removal of commercial gillnets and through the introduction of a sanctuary zone in the key breeding and nursery area of the Fingers, recreational fishing is likely to significantly improve.

It continues —

A good example of this comes from the rezoning of the Moreton bay marine park in Queensland, where sanctuary zones were expanded from 0.5% to 16% and this contributed to an increase in economic benefits to recreational fishers of up to \$2.5 million/year ...

They finish by saying —

It is significant to have a marine sanctuary zone proposal that is actively supported by a broad range of Broome businesses and residents. We encourage you to carefully consider the case for including a marine sanctuary zone in the southern fingers area of Roebuck Bay.

I cannot understand why the minister would even contemplate establishing a marine park with no sanctuary zone—none at all! When I heard about this originally, I thought that this could not be right, but when I spoke to the people who raised this issue with government—the minister in particular—they said that that is what the management plan says and that is the view that has been put to them by members of the government. My understanding is that this will be the only marine park in Western Australia, if not in Australia, without one—the minister is shaking his head. So, maybe it is not the only one in Australia without one, but certainly it is the only one in Western Australia. I will be interested when the minister responds and he points out the others, but it is my understanding that it will be the only marine park without a sanctuary zone in it. The scientific community is saying that there should be a sanctuary zone. The business community is saying that there should be a sanctuary zone; and quite a wide range of the broader community in Western Australia is campaigning on this issue, so I seriously urge the minister to reconsider his position.

I also understand that as part of this bill the scientific committee that was previously part of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority will go. I am concerned that the loss of that committee will diminish the voice of science in decisions around marine parks and reserves. I understand that scientific committee was not greatly used under the existing structure. The minister is nodding. It has been put to me that one reason it was not greatly used was that members of the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority already had a significant scientific background; however, by bringing the two agencies together into one agency, the Conservation and Parks Commission, the voice of certainly marine science will be diminished. I would like the minister to consider, given he is shrinking the number of personnel by creating one authority from two, that the loss of the scientific committee may in fact be a backward step. The view that has been put to me is that under the new combined body, the scientific committee would have been one way of ensuring that marine science maintained its voice within the new structure.

I go on to a different issue. The bill provides that fire management, including planned burning, is a function of the CEO. The opposition supports that. I want to raise with the minister a particular problem in my electorate with a Bush Forever site at Ashfield Flats. Recently, a fire at that site came very close to destroying some homes. This is a Bush Forever site that is six or seven kilometres from the CBD. It was set alight one afternoon and the fire burnt up to the back fence of a number of properties, and even burnt a pergola against a house in Ashfield. That is quite remarkable. When I looked into why that had happened, I found that responsibility for bushfire management on that site is confused at best. It is owned by the Western Australian Planning Commission but all it does is mow a few lawns and do the bare minimum. It does not manage it; it does not have a comprehensive management plan for that Bush Forever site, because it does not see itself as being the end user of that land. That site needs a comprehensive management plan. It is a great bit of Bush Forever; it is a wetland, right on the edge of the Swan River. It is very close to the CBD and it is a great breeding area for birds and wildlife, but it could be so much more if it was properly managed. However, the owner of the land, the WAPC, sees itself as land banking or warehousing it until the government decides who will be the end user. WAPC has not put in place a comprehensive land management plan. I hope this bill will assist this government in making a decision on that Bush Forever site and to transfer responsibility to an agency that will manage it for what it is, a Bush Forever site of environmental significance in Western Australia, and as part of that, get the fire management right. It is ridiculous that remnant bushland that is so close to the CBD could, in an afternoon, be set alight and almost result in houses being lost. It is simply not good enough for this government to have a significant wetland under its responsibility and to do virtually nothing to maintain its environmental values because the WAPC does not see it as its responsibility. The minister has committed some money to repairing and improving the environmental values of the Eric Singleton Bird Sanctuary, which is not far from Ashfield Flats. I commend the minister for that and I now urge the minister to turn his attention to Ashfield Flats.

Finally, on this issue, I will go back to where I started, and commend two community groups that work tirelessly to enhance and protect Ashfield Flats—that is, AshfieldCAN and the Bassendean Preservation Group. They both do a remarkable job. The Bassendean Preservation Group has a greenhouse from which its members propagate thousands of seedlings every year and plant them all around the Swan River. They do fantastic work. They need to be backed up by the state government.

**MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle)** [4.30 pm]: I am thankful for the opportunity to speak on the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2015. I would like to make a couple of comments about the bill. One is that I endorse the comments of previous speakers from this side of the house who have spoken about the import of the bill and the need for there to have been thorough consultation with community groups that are very active in the conservation area. It is an area in which there is a lot of expertise amongst community groups—conservation groups of various kinds—and it seems incredible that the Minister for Environment chose not to give briefings to a range of those groups that asked to get a full understanding from the government’s perspective on what was to be included in the bill and its intent. Having some idea about the expertise in a number of the community groups, I do not doubt at all that they were able to get on top of the technical issues and the intent of the government by reading the bill, the explanatory memorandum, the second reading speech and the like, but I suppose the concern is the government’s attitude that it has nothing to learn from the array of community groups that are so active, and have been active for decades, in the area of conservation and environmental protection in this state. In fact, many of the protections now enshrined in law in this state and across the country exist thanks to those groups because of their activism, their raising of awareness of the importance of our natural environment and the complexity of ensuring that we manage our environment and the way we interact with it. From the examples that have been given by other speakers I understand that groups that sought a briefing included the Urban Bushland Council of Western Australia, the WA National Parks and Reserves Association and the Wilderness Society of WA. As I said, it seems incredible that not only did the minister not think that it was important to keep those groups informed about such an important piece of legislation as it relates to the areas they are active in, but also he thought neither he nor the government would have anything to learn from those groups with their decades of experience and knowledge of the broader environment they are active in. I want to place that point on the record.

I know this issue has been raised by other speakers, including the member for Gosnells, but I also want to raise the question of the bill enabling joint vesting of national parks with traditional owners, which seems to be a positive move and is supported. Having said that, I understand the minister will have ultimate responsibility for the risk in and liability for the vesting. I understand this change is strongly supported by Aboriginal groups and conservationists and that it would help the negotiation of Indigenous land use agreements. However, the Wilderness Society, and Peter Robertson, who has been active in that society for decades, raised a very valid point, which was the lack of any time frame associated with the joint vesting process to be completed. I quote a letter from him to the member for Gosnells. It states —

The concern is that there does not appear to be any time frame within which the joint vesting must be completed, so the TO’s may be told that it is going to happen but (going on past experience!) it may take years or forever.

If this is correct the Bill needs to be amended to include a requirement that the joint vesting be completed with (a year?) of the vesting or re-vesting process commencing.

I think that is an important point and it will be interesting to hear the minister's response to that and whether he will consider taking up that issue, because I know it has been raised by a couple of speakers from this side of the house.

Probably the biggest issue in conservation that has come before this Parliament for some time is the decision by this government to approve the extension of the Roe Highway across the Beeliar wetlands. It seems to me that although a number of amendments proposed in this bill are not objectionable, the case of the decision to approve the Roe Highway extension through the Beeliar wetlands is a case of the minister fiddling while Rome, or I should say the Beeliar wetlands, is about to burn. We know that in September 2013, conditional approval was recommended by the Environmental Protection Authority for the controversial extension of the highway across the wetlands from the Kwinana Freeway to Stock Road in Coolbellup, now called stage 1 of the Perth Freight Link. This government is determined to proceed with awarding this contract, we think, by September, although the dates change—I understand it might be within a matter of weeks—and for work to commence on that road in early 2016.

The impacts to the Beeliar wetlands have been spoken about often both in this house and publicly. The project will clear 97.8 hectares of native vegetation; 5.4 hectares within the Beeliar Regional Park; seven hectares of Bush Forever site 244, which seems incredible considering the naming of the Bush Forever site; 78 hectares of foraging habitat for the listed endangered Carnaby's black cockatoo; 73 hectares of foraging habitat for the listed endangered red-tailed black cockatoo; 2.5 hectares of potential nesting habitat for black cockatoos; and 6.8 hectares of wetlands in Roe Swamp, Bibra Lake and Horse Paddock Swamp. There will be the fragmentation of fauna habitat, assemblages of priority fauna, Swan Coastal Plain significant bird species habitat, and migratory bird and significant wetland bird species habitat. Each one of these things has significant impacts on flora vegetation and fauna in critical assets listed by the EPA, and it is unacceptable under the principles of environmental protection applied according to the act that that road construction is allowed to proceed.

It is incredible that prior to the decision of the EPA in 2013, the authority had categorically ruled out any safe construction of the extension of Roe Highway through the Beeliar wetlands, yet in 2013 conditional approval was given, which, as we know, was then the subject of appeals. I think 165 appeals went to the minister and in July this year this minister decided to allow construction of the road. It was no surprise that this environment minister and this government would make this decision and feign some concern about the environmental values of the Beeliar wetlands, try to convince the public that safe construction of road could take place and that it would be done in such a way that many of those important characteristics of one of our best preserved wetlands could be maintained.

It is incredible that the government would try to convince the people of Western Australia that construction was possible and that the environmental values of the Beeliar wetlands would be maintained. I do not think anyone buys it, quite frankly. The construction of Roe 8 and now the full Perth Freight Link have been very polarising issues. It is an incredible shame that, despite the very real alternatives to constructing that road, particularly the ability to take freight away from the metropolitan area and get on and build an outer harbour or a second port, likely in Kwinana, this government decided to press ahead with the construction of Roe 8. Even though it says that the outer harbour is still necessary to supplement the Fremantle port, it insists on taking a road west from the freeway and slightly north, even though it says that it will be useful to eventually take freight south. It makes no sense whatsoever. There are good alternatives to building Roe Highway over the Beeliar wetlands. It is not just people within political parties who are saying that. Conservation groups have been very outspoken on this. There is the Save Beeliar Wetlands group that has been very active and it is now part of the Rethink the Link alliance. Cockburn council has also been very active on this issue. When the decision to finally grant environmental approval was made in July this year, Piers Verstegen, the director of the Conservation Council of Western Australia, said in a news reports at the time —

There is no way to bulldoze a major freeway through an environmentally and culturally sensitive wetland environment and not cause a very serious environmental impact, ...

He continues —

This is an area that has similar values for the southern part of Perth as Kings Park has here and if this area was in the western suburbs there is no way this would be allowed to go ahead.

Similarly, the Cockburn council, particularly Mayor Logan Howlett, has been very active in defending the Beeliar wetlands, which he knows is enjoyed by a huge number of his ratepayers and the communities that visit that area that get to understand something of the untouched environment—such a small amount is left within our metropolitan area, but it will be irreparably damaged by the Roe 8 proposal. In July, Cockburn Mayor

Logan Howlett said of the Roe 8 approval that the Liberal government's plan to motor along with Roe 8 was an "appalling decision". He continues —

The Cockburn community will continue to rally and put pressure on the Government to rethink this decision, ...

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Excuse me, member. The conversation is getting very loud. Members need to either leave the chamber or desist now.

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** The Cockburn mayor said —

There is a better way and they know it. The government is using outdated planning strategies from the 50s to provide for an integrated transport solution for the future.

Earlier this week in a debate in this house, I referred to a proposal by the Property Council of Australia that was released last week. It outlined the need for the government to prioritise infrastructure projects that would prove to be the next job-creating projects and be not just short-term construction projects, but provide some sort of infrastructure development that would create ongoing jobs. I referred to the development of the coast around the Kwinana area, which includes the outer harbour. Similarly, this afternoon the Kwinana council came out with a largely sensible proposal—I cannot say that I agree with all of it—for some sort of decisive action on the outer harbour. It proposes that the outer harbour be built within 10 years and then be linked to the Fremantle port sale proposal. Of course, it is no surprise that we do not support the sale of the Fremantle port. However, be that as it may, under the Kwinana council's proposal, as it has been reported, the buyer of the Fremantle port would be required to complete full construction of an outer harbour container port at Cockburn Sound within at least 10 years. The report on that proposal makes the point that the proposal will spark further questions about the government's controversial \$1.6 billion Perth Freight Link proposal, and is a key recommendation of the 50-year vision released by the Kwinana council to enhance and grow WA's major industrial strip in Kwinana. The council argues that, by including the outer harbour and a time frame for its construction in the sale of Fremantle port, the sale price for Fremantle port will increase and it will be much more attractive to potential buyers. I have seen only the media reports, but there are elements of this proposal that I do not support. I have mentioned the sale of Fremantle port.

[Member's time extended.]

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** I certainly do not support that, and this side of the house does not support that. Also, Kwinana council proposes to stop containers moving through Fremantle port, and that is not a position I support either. The Fremantle council's proposal and the previous plan developed by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Alannah MacTiernan, was that there would be a cap-and-transition process for containers out of Fremantle port. Fremantle port would continue to grow while the outer harbour is built, but eventually the number would settle back down to about 600 000 containers in and out of Fremantle port. It makes sense; there is significant infrastructure there that can still be used, but it is not infrastructure that should have 1.7 million containers coming in and out of Fremantle port.

This is yet another debate in which I have managed to wind my way round to the Perth Freight Link. The relevance of this debate today is the consideration of improvements to conservation and management, and the Conservation and Land Management Act, but, at the same time, this minister has seen fit to approve development of a road through, as I said, one of the metropolitan area's most important and best-preserved wetlands. It is something that I would not be proud of if I were the Minister for Environment. It is incredible. The issue came up in September last year when the Roe 8 proposal was included in the validation of Environmental Protection Authority's decisions that were under question because of possible conflicts of interest. The debate was why the consideration of Roe 8 was included in those validations. That road has been within the government's sights for a while; it has been Liberal Party policy for some time. However, I think that we can see from the way that the public debate is going over the Perth Freight Link, it is yet to make a convincing argument about why this is needed, why it is important and why, in fact, it represents a good investment for managing congestion, particularly freight traffic for the twenty-first century. It is an absolute crying shame that the Beelihar wetlands will be impacted as a result.

People in my community are gearing up for that campaign. They have been incredibly active throughout the community. Not a week goes by that I do not meet more people who are pretty well working full time on this issue. They are going out into new suburbs to deliver leaflets about opposition to the Perth Freight Link. Many people are motivated by their experience of the wetlands and their passion to ensure that that development does not happen on their watch. I will be there with them and I know that other people from this side of the house will be there alongside them. That proposal is a disaster for the environment when there are good, credible alternatives that would make much better use of our infrastructure dollars.

Conversely, this government makes some good decisions. I was very pleased about its decision to not accept the recommendations of the Legislative Council's Standing Committee on Public Administration to conduct a hunting trial. The report I am referring to is titled "Report on Recreational Hunting Systems". I will read from the government's statement dated May 2015 —

The trial is not supported for reasons including the safety of the community, the doubtful effectiveness in control of feral animals, animal welfare issues and the significant resources required to establish and administer such a trial. Measuring the impact of the proposed trial on feral animal numbers over two years is unlikely to provide insight into any long-term impacts.

I, along with most Western Australians, welcomed that decision and I congratulate the government for it.

A minority report by Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson, MLC, and Hon Darren West, MLC, rebutted a number of committee recommendations about the possible extension of recreational hunting systems. The minority report conclusion states —

For good reason, the Australian community has repeatedly rejected American style gun culture. Following the tragic events at Port Arthur in 1996 the Australian community has keenly adopted tough controls on gun ownership. An introduction of recreational hunting system would require a weakening of gun ownership licensing requirements.

The minority recommendation was —

**Based on evidence presented to the committee and considerations stated above, the Minority recommends that recreational hunting not be permitted on unallocated Crown Land.**

I thank not only the committee for its work, but also the government for its decision to not go down that path.

That concludes my comments about the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill. Seeing that I have a little more time, I will return to the Perth Freight Link. I want to make a few other points about the government's strategy. It impacts on the Beeliiar wetlands inasmuch as the Premier has given a clear signal that this government is determined to go ahead with stage 1 of the Perth Freight Link. There is significant community concern about the original proposal for stage 2 of the Perth Freight Link. That is the part of the freight link that would go down Stock Road and Leach Highway. We do not know what will happen with the tunnel option, which is the other alternative for stage 2 of the freight link. Last night I met with residents from Hamilton Hill who will be impacted by the tunnel option. They have had no direct communication from this government about the proposals to build the freight link along Forrest Street and then to tunnel under the old Fremantle eastern bypass reserve route. They have had no communication about that at all. Anyone believing the government might think that people would still be able to make a cup of tea in their kitchen while a freight tunnel was constructed under their homes, as though it will have no impact on the community on top of that tunnel! It is pretty difficult to believe. Not only will the community on top of the tunnel be impacted, but also a significant area of Hamilton Hill will be impacted by the extension of Perth Freight Link down Forrest Street before the tunnel.

There are problems with stage 2 but the government is intent on destroying the wetlands and pressing ahead with stage 1. Even if the Premier gets his way and stage 2 does not proceed, the government has failed to appreciate that pressing ahead with stage 1 leaves everyone, including the people impacted by the road option for stage 2 of the freight link and those impacted by the tunnel option of the freight link, in an ongoing period of uncertainty. The people I represent want to send the government a clear message that if the government puts off stage 2 of the Perth Freight Link but proceeds to build stage 1, it will spread and amplify the level of uncertainty. Apart from their passionate defence of the wetlands, people recognise that both areas—whether it be the road option that will impact people in Willagee and Palmyra or the tunnel option—will impact the communities of Hamilton Hill and White Gum Valley. These people have been incredibly active. They will continue pressing their point both in the media and on the ground. They have already done a lot of work and are doing it every weekend.

There are many reasons that the Perth Freight Link is so offensive. It will be counterproductive to its claim of removing trucks off Leach Highway and local roads; it is an incomplete plan; and it does not even get to Fremantle port, as we well know. In the context of the discussion about the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2015, once the Perth Freight Link is constructed, it will irreparably damage important and currently protected bushland.

**MR A.P. JACOB (Ocean Reef — Minister for Environment)** [4.58 pm] — in reply: I thank members for their contributions to the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2015. As I close out the second reading on this bill, I want to briefly touch and reflect on the bill that we debated in this house yesterday, the Constitution Amendment (Recognition of Aboriginal People) Bill 2015. It was a very significant day and a lot has been said about that bill. I will not go into all of that now. Although the constitutional recognition and the change was, if you like, the headline piece and carried a lot of symbolic weight as well as genuine importance,

what was said time and again yesterday from many speakers is that there is still a lot more work to be done. I believe this bill represents one of those pieces of legislation that fits in with what was done in this place yesterday, particularly the proposed amendments to this bill that relate to the joint vesting of lands under the Conservation and Land Management Act. I referenced briefly in question time today the opportunities in joint vesting and the creation of a range of conservation reserves, particularly in the Kimberley at this stage as our focus is up there, backed up with a significant government spend of \$81.5 million to increase access throughout those regions. Ultimately those measures will increase economic activity and jobs, and have already created many jobs particularly for Aboriginal people and traditional owners. It is therefore quite significant that we are debating this Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill.

I want to bring the debate back to the matters we debated in this place yesterday. Touching on a few of the key themes that were raised, I will refer particularly to the Kimberley and to the range of discussions on zoning in marine parks and particularly sanctuary zones. The member for Bassendean made reference to feedback on the zoning of Roebuck Bay Marine Park from a number of people in the scientific community that had been relayed from representatives from the business community and from community and environmental groups as well. The member for Bassendean did not mention—I just caution members of the opposition on this matter—the views of traditional owners. In the approach to joint vesting, Roebuck Bay Marine Park is a particularly important park as it comprises a mix of land. As well as intertidal areas, land-based Yawuru freehold land will be brought into the draft conservation management plan. The single most important view, from where I stand and from where this government stands, is that of the Yawuru people. They were not mentioned by the member for Bassendean in the debate, but the view of the Yawuru people is the single most important view on the zoning of the parks as we roll them out.

Another point I make is that there is no cookie-cutter approach to marine parks or national parks. Western Australia comprises one-third of the continent. I suspect it is the largest sub-national land mass in the world. If we were our own nation, we would be the tenth or the eleventh largest. It is incredibly varied, it is incredibly diverse, and zoning that works in one region on the south coast is completely different from how it applies in the Kimberley. Indeed, we need not go very far from one place in the Kimberley to another to find that different solutions work for different areas. Those are the points I raise on that matter at this time.

In bringing debate back to the bill, I suppose one of the key points raised by all members, and I believe some were also raised by the Wilderness Society, was about the concurrence of joint vesting with the determination to create conservation land under the bill. I draw the member for Gosnells' attention to clause 10 of the bill to insert proposed section 8AA(4), which reads —

- (4) Land in respect of which a determination is made under subsection (2)(a) is, when reserved under the *Land Administration Act 1997* Part 4, by this subsection vested jointly in the Commission and the Aboriginal body corporate.

New vestings, therefore, will happen concurrently; and no doubt we will have an opportunity to explore that further.

This is a particularly significant bill and I note that the opposition is supporting it. It picks up on a range of key election commitments for this government: joint vesting in particular; the merging of the Conservation Commission of Western Australia with the Marine Parks and Reserves Authority; some long overdue elements such as bringing a set head of power for regional parks and a set head of power for prescribed burning; and, of course, a range of other tidy-up matters. I look forward to debating the bill further and I commend it to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.