

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME (BEELIAR WETLANDS) BILL 2018

Second Reading

Resumed from 7 November 2018.

DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton) [3.00 pm]: I want to thank everybody. I will be the lead speaker on the bill. This is the issue that brought me into the Parliament of Western Australia. When I ran for the electorate of Riverton in 2008, the outstanding issue at the time was, of course, congestion on Leach Highway. Roe 7 had just been finished and the question was whether Roe 8 would be built, as had been planned for 50-plus years, and then Roe 9 and then the road into the port. The government of the day, the Carpenter government, was obfuscating. It was trying to undermine the building of Roe 8. Our commitment to build Roe 8 was the reason I won by 64 votes. At the next election, I won by over 4 000 votes, basically on the basis of our continued commitment to build Roe 8.

Mr A. Krsticevic: And being a great local member!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Yes, and being a great local member, and, amongst other things, rebuilding Willetton Senior High School and investing around \$70 million in some of the state's best high schools.

We are here not so much to debate Roe 8, which was a major issue, and I have discussed that, but to discuss an act of planning vandalism being attempted by the Minister for Planning. Land has been set aside in the metropolitan region scheme for Roe 8 for in the vicinity of 55 years. A huge number of studies have been done into whether it would be continued, all of which basically identified it as the appropriate way to develop both efficient and safe transport links east–west for not only light traffic, but also heavy traffic. Up until 2008, there had been, to a large extent, bipartisan agreement to build Roe 8, but now this bill will allow a portion of the land designated for Roe 8 to be excised from the metropolitan region scheme for the Beelihar wetlands. Rather than going through the metropolitan region scheme process, the government is trying to use its numbers in this house and in the upper house in the Parliament of Western Australia to avoid accountability. I make that point. The government is using this bill to avoid the accountability of amending the metropolitan region scheme.

To amend the metropolitan region scheme, the planning commission would look at the evidence—and there is plenty; indeed, it is overwhelming. It would go out to the community, as has been done repeatedly, and the community would say, “For God’s sake, build the road.” It would look at not just the environmental impact of this road, but also the environmental impact of not building the road, and it would conclude that building Roe 8 as planned would be the best environmental, social, economic and developmental means to address the growing amount of east–west traffic, particularly the traffic accessing the port of Fremantle. This is an attempt by the government to use its numbers to avoid accountability and to undermine the planning process. Let us understand that. That is what the government is doing. It is trying to excise a portion of the land that has been designated as a road in the metropolitan region scheme for 55 years not through the standard planning processes, but through this bill.

Most of the claims in the second reading speech are false. The cost to the public in the future, both fiscal and economic, will be phenomenal. Fiscal costs will be in the billions. Let me go through it. Just to make it plain, the government’s decision to rip up the Roe 8 contract and start again was extremely costly, but now the attempt to excise the land that Roe 8 would have been built on is not only unnecessary, but also an act of economic vandalism against the future of Western Australia. It is the reason that this government stands to be condemned. This decision is completely unnecessary and the process by which the government is pursuing it is inappropriate. It thinks it has the numbers, but that is an issue that we will decide.

Before I critique the substance of the bill and the reason for it, I will go back to the decision to excise the Perth Freight Link land. The Perth Freight Link had been through the most detailed social, economic and environmental planning of any road ever constructed in Western Australia. In the first and second terms of the Barnett government, over \$25 million was spent examining every aspect of that road. All issues were addressed and documented. Anybody who had a view was able to have input on it. At the end of the Barnett government’s term in office, it signed a contract to build the road, with 80 per cent of the funding, or \$1.2 billion, coming from the commonwealth. It also included a freight charge, which the freight industry agreed to and which would raise in the vicinity of \$350 million. In a little bit over 10 years, that would have funded the state’s total contribution. That would have been a remarkable outcome.

Right before the election, the then opposition decided that if it won, it would rip up the contract, which it did. But in doing so, it destroyed jobs for its first term, because the Perth Freight Link was the only large shovel-ready project that was available to it. Remember, when the McGowan government came to power in 2017, the Premier

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

of the day described the economy of Western Australia as recession-like—the worst since the Great Depression. What was one of the first things he did? He ripped up the Perth Freight Link contract and pulled in the vicinity of \$1.5 billion to \$1.6 billion out of the economy. Some of that money was redirected to new projects—most of it will eventually be redirected to projects—but very few of those projects were shovel-ready. The government basically took out of the economy in the vicinity of \$1.6 billion, traded in 5 000 to 10 000 jobs and pulled the project. No wonder our unemployment rate is going up under the McGowan government. It was an act of economic vandalism, particularly as the Premier of the day said that we had to get infrastructure going because we were in a recession-like state.

What did the government do? It pulled the only major shovel-ready project it had. Indeed, it ripped up contracts and reallocated money to other people without a tendering process. I repeat: it reallocated contracts from the Perth Freight Link to other projects without a competitive tendering process. Most of those projects were not shovel-ready and many of them did not have business plans. The contracts were given to specific firms that were involved in the Perth Freight Link contract. It basically undermined the infrastructure planning process in this state.

When we were debating the Infrastructure Western Australia Bill, we told the government that Infrastructure Western Australia had potential, but it would depend on the character and standing of the people who administer it. We have no confidence that this government will adequately use Infrastructure WA to advance the betterment of planning and developing infrastructure in the state. All we have to do is look at the government's behaviour to date. This has been the most politicised and atrocious approach to infrastructure planning of any government in modern times. The government has been absolutely useless. What is the issue here? The government is going to excise the land for Roe 8 to prevent future governments from building Roe 8. What the government is not addressing is the opportunity cost of that. Over the last 10 years, truck and vehicle traffic in that area has increased by 50 per cent and it is expected to increase at about that rate into the future. We are going to see a massive increase in light and heavy vehicle traffic, particularly traffic to the port of Fremantle, over the next 10 to 15 years. If the government does not build Roe 8, what is it going to do? The primary purpose of Roe 8 was to remove 74 000 light vehicles and 70 000 heavy vehicles from suburban streets and put them on a dedicated route—namely, Roe 8—by 2031. That was the purpose of Roe 8. As I said, it went through one of the most extensive planning processes in history.

The Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018 does not address—it is purposely designed not to address it—the impact of excising the land and forever stopping Roe 8 from being built. That is the major reason. There is no discussion about that. Basically, the explanation is that the government went to the election and promised to stop Roe 8. It did, but that does not mean it has to excise the land and remove the option for future governments to address the issue. The decision to rip up the contract for Roe 8 and not proceed with it does not necessarily lead to the need for this bill, but that is what the government has chosen to do. It is trying to prevent future governments from acting responsibly on the evidence available at the time. The government said that this decision is popular. Well, we will see about that. This will be the most crucial issue in the south metropolitan area at the next election. The opposition will continue to raise this issue—it will be an albatross around the government's neck. I will go through some of the reasons. I would prefer the government to have commonsense and that it be reasonable. I would prefer that the government looked at the evidence and came to an appropriate conclusion. I do not expect it will do that. As a party, we will resist this bill to the hilt. We will resist this bill to the hilt in this house in the second reading debate and the consideration in detail stage. We will mobilise the community and work with the crossbenches in the upper house to stop this act of planning vandalism. The Minister for Planning is the architect of the bill, and she should stand condemned.

I speak as a member who represents his community. Similar to the electorates of other members, my electorate has seen an increased traffic flow on its suburban streets. Over the last 27 years, we have benefitted from the construction of Roe Highway, up to Roe 7, which has removed a large amount of traffic from the areas east of Kwinana Freeway. Roe 8, of course, was planned to take the baton and remove heavy traffic from Roe 7 at Kwinana Freeway to the west. The government will not build Roe 8, but traffic will continue to grow as expected, and the government has no mechanism to stop it. The port of Fremantle—I will refer to the port in a minute—will continue to grow and be our major port for generations. The government's justification for not building Roe 8 is that the port of Fremantle is already full, but that has been shown by a Westport survey to be what it always was—a falsehood. I will add to that later. That claim was always untrue. As the Westport survey and preliminary report indicated, the port of Fremantle will be a container port for generations. According to the Westport report, internally it has the capacity to go from 750 000 20-foot or equivalent units to 3.1 million TEUs. The issue was the transport link into the port of Fremantle. But I digress.

What will happen if Roe 8 is not built? Leach Highway goes through my electorate and, by the way, 5 000 kids attend schools in my electorate that abut Leach Highway—All Saints' College, Rossmoyne Senior High School

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

and Shelley Primary School. The students cross Leach Highway; they breathe the air from it. They cross at intersections that carry thousands of trucks each week. This decision is against the best evidence; it is against the health of those students and it is against their safety and their parents' safety. The government is perpetuating an already unhealthy situation. Yes, there is a ban of heavy trucks over 19 metres, but substantial trucks less than 19 metres use that road every day. On my way to work today at the lights at Karel Avenue and Leach Highway, I counted 10 heavy trucks going by close to Rossmoyne high school. The government is perpetuating that. The government must understand what it is doing.

I will give members an example of Leach Highway. Because of the failure to start Roe 8, Leach Highway will increasingly be a primary route for trucks. Leach Highway west of Kwinana Freeway has in excess of 181 driveway connections; that is, driveways that extend onto the highway on the section west of Kwinana Freeway before North Lake Road. There are more than 20 road junctions without traffic control lights. We are talking about moving towards 7 000 heavy trucks going down Leach Highway every day. There are 20 road junctions without traffic control lights and eight sets of traffic lights. There are 28 bus stops between Kwinana Freeway and Stock Road and most of those bus stops do not have a pullover; buses have to stop in the lane. It is the eleventh most intense area for traffic accidents in Western Australia. Seventy-two per cent of crashes on Leach Highway are rear-end collisions because of stop-start trucks, cars and lights. The government's decision to excise the land and never allow Roe 8 to be built will substantially increase the volume of traffic on Leach Highway. Indeed, a 2014 forecast stated that because of the decision to excise Roe 8, by 2021—the time of the next election—the volume of traffic on Leach Highway will increase by 45 per cent. If this bill passes, that will be compounded by future governments' inability to build it. It is not just Roe 8.

Let us look at some of these other feeder roads. Unfortunately, the member for Jandakot is not here, because this is really important for him; this is vital. I will go through some of them. Farrington Road is a feeder road. On the Melville side are traffic calming devices all the way through it, but not on the Cockburn side. It is very much a suburban road. Farrington Road will face a 54 per cent increase in traffic between North Lake Road and Bibra Drive, and Bibra Drive to Kwinana Freeway. That is a 54 per cent increase in traffic on a calm suburban road. Do members know what is going to happen? The member for Jandakot will not be the member for Jandakot after 2021, with a 54 per cent increase in traffic on Farrington Road. A study by the Cities of Kwinana, Cockburn and Melville, which I will come to later, states that in the western area between North Lake Road and Bibra Drive, which I think is in the City of Cockburn, Farrington Road will have to be upgraded to a four-lane highway by 2020. By 2031, Farrington Road between Bibra Drive and Kwinana Freeway, which is a two-lane highway, will have to be upgraded to a six-lane highway. In other words, the government's decision to not build Roe 8 does not stop the trucks and cars, and it does not address the congestion that now exists. That will have to flow on to other areas, and it is now flowing on to areas that are basically suburban roads. Without Roe 8—this is the reason we promoted it, as have previous governments—we will see massive increases in congestion on existing roads such as Leach Highway, South Street and Farrington Road. I will give members some other examples. By 2020, Karel Avenue between Farrington Road and Roe Highway will have 14 000 extra vehicles a day, which is a 41 per cent increase. Roe Highway to Berrigan Drive, will again have about a 12 per cent increase. It goes beyond that area. Take North Lake Road, from Phoenix Road to Hammond Road. Currently, there are about 59 000 or 60 000 vehicles a day without Roe 8. That is what happened. Without Roe 8, in 2020 the traffic between Phoenix Road to Hammond Road will increase by 59 per cent. Those are increases of congestion on roads that are not built for it. They are suburban roads that kids ride their bikes on, that people pull out of their driveways onto and that buses stop on; they are single-lane roads each way.

With that type of congestion we will have massive increases in accidents, indeed deaths. We are dealing with a traffic issue on already congested suburban roads that will see about a 50 per cent increase in the next few years of not only light vehicles, but also heavy trucks. We will see people killed by these decisions; I am not exaggerating. The government's decision to take away Roe 8 and excise this land means that vehicle traffic will continue to grow and flow on to regional roads, as they are now. There will be a 50 per cent increase in some of the most important areas, and that decision will impose a significant risk to life and limb, and the health of the people living in that area. The people will take it out on the government at the ballot box, as they should. Importantly, if the government does not build Roe 8 and the truck traffic continues, what will it do? We will see a massive increase in truck traffic on existing roads. What does the government have to do? It will have to improve those roads. A study funded by the cities in 2016, before the election, estimated that a failure to build Roe 8 will require an extra \$820 million of additional investments in existing roads in Cockburn and Melville alone. In other words, the failure to build Roe 8 will cost the state double the amount of money that Roe 8 would have cost, particularly in light of the freight charge. It will force the state, with the Cities of Cockburn, and particularly

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Melville and others, to invest an additional \$820 million by 2020 in additional roads. This comes at a huge cost. The government will lose the freight levy, and will have to spend an extra \$820 million in enhancing the roads.

One of the rationales that the Labor Party and its friends have always had for not building Roe 8 was its environmental impact. Let me go through that at length. There are a lot of independent studies into this. But the Environmental Protection Authority gave its assessment. Let us be honest: the EPA started this process in 2003 with a report requested by the then Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Hon Alannah MacTiernan. That was not a full blown assessment of Roe 8; it was basically a desk job by the EPA, trying to identify the risks associated with it. It assumed that Roe 8, going through the area we are discussing under this bill, was a six-lane highway with no amelioration, no offsets and no bridges, just a six-lane freeway right through the area taking up all the metropolitan region scheme land. It said, quite reasonably, that if the government did that the EPA would struggle to approve it. It set the bar for Main Roads' assessment that if all the government did was to build a six-lane freeway consuming the whole land, it would not do it. Of course, in 2009 when we started the process, we knew that and we identified to Main Roads that that is not an option, it has to come up with a better option, and it did. We spent, I think, \$20 million to \$25 million planning this process. It is all outlined in a whole range of reports including the South Metro Connect "Roe Highway Extension" volumes 1 and 2, and the EPA stuff. But also of course it went through the Supreme Court, the Federal Court and the High Court with various processes, and it was subject to 3 000 or more comments to the EPA. It was the most discussed, investigated, researched and planned road in the state's history, and the EPA, through all the court processes and appeals, gave it the tick. The starting point for the Environmental Protection Authority's assessment was that business as normal would not work, and we did not do that. The EPA also identified that the environmental impact of not building the road would be significant. As an example, Bibra Drive, which will have to have two more lanes added to it shortly unless we want major congestion, also goes through the Beelihar wetlands. In fact, if Roe 8 were not built, a whole series of roads that go through the Beelihar wetlands would have to be extended, such as Russell Road, Anketell Road, Bibra Drive, Hope Road and Farrington Road. Those will all have to be expanded in the absence of Roe 8 and in the face of this land being excised, but there has been no work by the minister to assess the environmental impact of expanding them—none!

Another example, which is even more interesting, is the Thornlie–Cockburn Link. It is now being planned and is subject to an EPA review process. The rail line itself is okay but some of the ride-away, particularly the stations being planned, will have a significant impact on the environment in its respective areas including more pristine bushland and Bush Forever land than Roe 8 would have. In other words, the government is pursuing a development not too far away, which is rail rather than road, that, by all measures, will have a more significant impact on the environment in that area—not Bibra Lake, but outside it—than Roe 8 would have. The government is going through the appropriate processes and I hope the EPA will approve it. I hope the EPA looks at it and makes sure that it has proper offsets. I am not speaking against the development of the Thornlie–Cockburn rail line, but in this case the government will spend \$820 million to avoid an environmental impact in the Beelihar wetlands, but will do nothing elsewhere. This is a perverted process if there ever was one.

There is a lot of research on this and I encourage everyone to read the Roe Highway extension plan or, in fact, the EPA report. The area in question is not pristine. Until 1973 it was used for a range of purposes. It was used as a rubbish dump, a horse paddock, and pig farms. The EPA found that it was not of high ecological value—full stop! Indeed, 75 per cent of the area is either completely degraded or degraded. It has some good areas and provides some useful habitat. I am not arguing that it does not have environmental value, but it is a joke to say that it is pristine, particularly the related areas.

The Roe 8 extension would have done a number of things to address the EPA's concerns. Firstly, Roe 8 would not have used the whole area. It would have given a substantial portion of the most ecologically sensitive—but not overwhelmingly—areas back to the Beelihar wetlands. In fact, it would have reduced the set-aside by about 50 per cent. Roe 8 would have taken some of the most environmentally sensitive areas, given them back to the Beelihar wetlands and concentrated the road on already degraded areas. That is what it was going to do. It was rational and appropriate and the best way to develop that.

Some of the areas Roe 8 was going to go through, for instance, Horse Paddock Swamp, have no environmental value whatsoever. It has been drained and has been a horse paddock. As the EPA says, it has been completely degraded. Roe Swamp is not completely degraded, so the plan for Roe 8 was to build a bridge over it—in other words, not to interact with it. In fact, a range of culverts and bridges would have been built across it so that, instead of negatively impacting the swamp and the flow of water, the road would have been built above it. The freeway as designed was not as the Labor Party argues it was. It was an ecologically designed freeway that would have been narrow and above ground.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

One of the interesting things that the minister needs to argue for is that the area includes Hope Road, which has a powerline beside it. If Roe 8 does not go through, it will remain there after this bill passes. Hope Road is not heavily used, but people use it quite often. The swamps that it runs between have a lot of wildlife such as ducks and turtles, amongst other things. The government's decision to excise Roe 8 and to do that in perpetuity with this bill means that the minister will have to be responsible for the oblong turtles. For a variety of reasons, oblong turtles get out of the water and walk up to one kilometre to lay their eggs. They do it in large numbers along Hope Road. On 11 October 2018, an ABC radio program identified that on the one evening 11 oblong turtles were smashed and killed on Hope Road because it exists and they are not protected. It is the same for ducks and ducklings and all fauna when it crosses the road. That is one of the dangers. Roe 8 was going to fix that by taking up Hope Road altogether, taking away the powerline, and creating seven overpasses that would allow the fauna to go from one end to the next. In other words, Roe 8 would have protected the turtles and the ducks and all the fauna and allow it to avoid heavy traffic by going underneath the six or seven overpasses that were called fauna pathways. This bill does not address the increasing interaction of Farrington Road, Bibra Drive, Hope Road, Russell Road and Anketell Road with the Beeliar Park reserve.

This bill will do nothing to rehabilitate the parkland. One of the main aims of Roe 8 was to rehabilitate the rundown and degraded areas of swamp, particularly Horse Paddock Swamp and Roe Swamp. Millions of dollars would have been invested into rehabilitating those areas. Now that will not be done and they will remain severely degraded. They have become severely degraded through generations of human interaction. That would have been addressed but will not be now. Unless the government comes up with additional funding, this bill will perpetuate that into the future.

When the government campaigned to excise Roe 8, one of the issues the government raised was that the port of Fremantle, with about 750 000 twenty-foot equivalent units a year at the time of the election, was full, so we have to now find an alternative port. Labor's policy was to keep Fremantle harbour where it was then—750 000 TEUs—but to move it south by 2027. Again, I go to the very lengthy Westport Taskforce report commissioned by the government. The chairwoman of the task force has given many speeches and had many discussions. She has gone around and given community consultations in my community. She has made it quite clear that the port of Fremantle, inside itself, could easily double and, with some efficiency improvements, could handle 3.1 million twenty-foot equivalent units. In other words, it could satisfy the container demands of the state of Western Australia for 100 years. Where did the government get this argument that the port was already full? I tell you what; the government concocted it. The government just made it up; it faked it. The government went out and systematically misled the public of Western Australia on this. It was across many people. In fact, the funniest thing is, when I was Treasurer, the then shadow Treasurer and I were having a debate and he stood up and was very bolshie and said that he would give a guarantee to the people of Western Australia that if he was elected and appointed as Treasurer and the Labor Party did not commit to building an outer harbour in Kwinana, he would resign. That is what he said. Check my website; the video of that declaration will be there shortly. If the Treasurer is an honest man, he should get ready to resign, because there is no way that the government can, or will, start the outer harbour for more than a decade and a half.

The Westport study is flawed. The government's terms of reference, according to the chairwoman, is to look at options between Fremantle, Kwinana and Bunbury. The study has stated that the key issue in all those options, particularly Fremantle, is transport links, but the task force is explicitly prohibited from looking at Roe 8 and Perth Freight Link. The government is spending \$20 million in a very tight budgetary position—remember, the government has cut out that much money from our schools and pushed back on hospitals—on a study of the future of the port, and has told the inquiry not to look at one of the clear and necessary options for addressing the port of Fremantle. Is that propaganda or what? It is an absolute disgrace. There is \$20 million being spent on a study to look at an important issue, but the study has been told not to look at the crucial transport link to the port—that is, Roe 8 and Perth Freight Link.

To date, the Westport study has found that the port of Fremantle can grow easily to fill the full need. There might be an option to move to Kwinana—or a couple of aspects of it—but that will not be for decades and decades down the track. The task force is not allowed to look at Roe 8, so it cannot talk about that, but it did say that there are substantial constraints on the rail link. The government is spending tens of millions of dollars extra to try to put more on rail, but rail has all sorts of constraints. Some of those constraints can be addressed through additional investment, but the investment will have to be made. Sections of the freight line conflict with passenger rail, and passenger rail has priority. One line goes through the City of Fremantle and it puts a nightly curfew on it. Then there are all sorts of problems further out, primarily because of the single line and the bridges, so we cannot double-bogie it. In other words, unless the government is going to invest hundreds of millions of dollars in

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

additional rail, rail will not represent a substantial increase in the throughput of containers to the port of Fremantle. That is just logical. The government has not addressed those issues and it is not putting in money.

As anybody who has looked at the dispersion of containers from the port of Fremantle would know, yes, a lot go to the intermodal port at Kewdale and some will go to Latitude 32 when it is built, but a lot go everywhere else. It is the most dispersed distribution of containers from any major port in Australia; therefore, necessarily, they go on trucks. Necessarily, the growth from now on—about 780 000 TEU towards three million TEU—will go on road, whether that is in Kwinana, if the government builds an intermodal port in three decades, or, until then, in Fremantle. The government told this \$20 million study not to look at the only option for taking those heavy trucks off suburban streets—that is, Perth Freight Link.

Here is the vandalism the government has perpetrated on the future of Western Australia. The government ripped up a contract, causing sovereign risk. The government reallocated the moneys, often without tender, contract or competitive pressures, to projects that had no business case. The government then had no other option for that growth in traffic. The government has done nothing to take the growth in vehicles and heavy traffic off roads in our suburbs in the southern part of the metropolitan area—it has done nothing on that. Importantly—this is the vital issue—in 2017, the government pulled \$1.2 billion worth of construction that was underway out of the economy, when it was in desperate need of economic activity. I mean, the economy was desperate, and the government pulled it out. That action was a major contributor to the growth of unemployment. To put it more pointedly, under this government's watch, job creation has failed to match demand—that is, job growth has failed to match the growth in the number of people looking for new work. For political reasons, the government pulled back on the only major project other than the Forrestfield–Airport Link that was ready to go, and the government only had a small portion of the project to do afterwards. What is even worse—it has compounded this situation—is that after the state government redirected the \$1.2 billion from the commonwealth for Roe, which would have basically funded 50 to 80 per cent of the government's whole infrastructure strategy with \$4.3 billion in extra money, the federal government then said that, on top of that, it would give the state \$1.2 billion to complete Roe 8 and Perth Freight Link. Here it is. It is shovel ready. The firms need it and, by God, we need it. What did the government do? It knocked it back. We are in this chamber debating the excision of the land so that it never can be built.

Let us be clear about something—maybe the minister should ask the Treasurer for a briefing on this—a week or so ago, the Reserve Bank of Australia lowered the official interest rate and flagged that it would go down another notch, so, in real terms, official interest rates will be negative. Then there was discussion, not so much by the Reserve Bank, but by commentators, that the outlook is so dire that we might have to go to printing money—that is, quantitative easing. In response, the Reserve Bank of Australia said that monetary policy cannot do it alone; fiscal policy has to lift it and we need additional infrastructure. What single infrastructure addition could start almost immediately in Western Australia? It is Roe 8. The government has the money, environmental approval, right of way and people ready and willing to do it. The government could just build Roe 8 and do a deal with Roe 9 later on. The economy needs it.

Over the last few months there has been a reduction in employment numbers in this state. I know the government denies it, but that is the reality. The Labor Party was elected on the basis of creating jobs. The government has been offered \$1.2 billion, on top of everything it has already received, for Roe 8. If it does not like the design, it can alter it or improve it if it wishes, but it will be an act of wanton negligence if the government does not take this \$1.2 billion to build Roe 8, given the impact that I have gone through—environmental, social, transport—of not doing it. The government will not listen because if it were really open-minded, it would have gone ahead, and this decision would not be here but going through the metropolitan region scheme process. The WA Planning Commission would look at all these things. It would not look at economic growth, but it would look at the environmental impact and the Environmental Protection Authority's approval of the road. It would also look at the alternative impacts of not building it, both environmental and otherwise. It would talk to the community in the impacted areas, which is overwhelmingly for this. There is no doubt about that. Overwhelmingly, 60 to 70 per cent of the community in the area is for the road. Why would they not be? That support will only grow.

When there is a 50 per cent increase in traffic on Farrington Road, Bibra Drive, Leach Highway and South Street and an additional 7 000 trucks and 70 000 vehicles pouring through that area on a daily basis, the popularity of the road will increase. The fact that the government is not going through, firstly, the MRS process or not accepting commonwealth money shows that it is not acting as a good government. The facts are there, and they have been there for a while.

The politics of this are pretty basic. There has been a long campaign against Roe 8 and 9, and of course the Fremantle eastern bypass. It goes back 20 years. A whole range of people have protested about those, but I can

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

assure members that they are not the only ones impacted in this case. A number of people who I will call MMNIMBYs—monetarily motivated not-in-my-backyard people—have bought land adjacent to the right of way and would love that “apparent” park to be made a park. I suspect that is the overwhelming dominance of the politics. A small number of people have had an overwhelming impact on the decisions of, firstly, the Greens and now the Labor Party. Good government is about governing for all—governing for the community as a whole and not a small, narrow vocal interest group.

Ms A. Sanderson interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister laughed, and I think the member for Bicton laughed.

Ms A. Sanderson: I was laughing.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The member for Morley does not care because Roe Highway has gone through her area and done for her what we want it to do for us. It is a very good road. She does not care. She is not involved. She does not care about the people in the south west.

If we are going to increase the volume of traffic on Leach Highway, Farrington Road and Bibra Drive in my area, I go back to the fact that we have 5 000 kids in schools adjacent to Leach Highway. I am the local member. It is the biggest issue in my electorate, and members laugh at that! If I go further over to Melville, in the member for Bateman’s electorate, Leach Highway is a danger zone. It looks like a third world country sometimes, with the amount of heavy truck traffic on there. Do it—go there! It is just disgraceful. The government has no alternative. The port of Fremantle will remain our major port for the foreseeable future. It is limited by its road access. Rail has limitations in its total magnitude. A lot of money has been spent to increase it, but the government is going to run into limits. The growth will largely be on road. The traffic is going to flow down roads that are not built for purpose. The only way we will not have total gridlock is if we expand those roads. According to the experts, that will cost in the vicinity of \$820 million of additional expenditure, and it will be an inferior option.

On top of that, the expansion of all those roads—Bibra Drive, Farrington Road, Hope Road, Russell Road and Anketell Road—will go through Beeliar Regional Park. That will have a substantial impact on the area, just like Roe 8. We do not know what the aggregate impact of that will be because the government has purposely avoided what the MRS would do, which is look at the environmental impact of the alternative. That is why we are here. We are here to avoid accountability and to avoid knowing the social, environmental and economic impacts of this decision. If the Western Australian Planning Commission did it, it would go about it professionally and produce this material. Almost all of it exists. It would probably say, “Don’t excise the road.” That is why we are here: to avoid accountability, to act blindly, and to undermine the economic, social and environmental impacts in the south metro area. That is what we are doing.

We have had a lot of stupid, destructive bills in this house. The WA Jobs Bill was not destructive; it just does not do anything! That was silliness—we witnessed that. The government commissioned the Good Ideas website. Nobody in Western Australia could put together a good ideas web page. The government had to go to Britain to have it done! If members look at the tenders website, all sorts are going around the world. Then we had the foreign investor duty. That has stopped dead offshore investment in infill properties, and undermined infill in this state. That was a particularly stupid idea. The decision of the government to restrict immigration categories under the regional migration scheme basically garrotted international tourism, but more specifically international education. We can get around those by changing them. If we pass this bill, this road will never be built. This is a one-way street. A new government will do away with the charge. We will act to allow foreign students to come back here and encourage them to do so. However, if we pass this bill, it is a one-way zone, just like it was with Fremantle eastern bypass. We were going to tunnel under it. This is a serious issue. We are in a process to avoid accountability, to excise some land that has environmental value but is largely degraded, to avoid a road that is absolutely needed and essentially fully funded with additional funding from the commonwealth. The additional money that the state may have to put down—noting that the Murdoch link will pay for a lot of it—is \$100 million for Roe 8. If we take into consideration the freight charge, the state will virtually get Roe 8 and 9 for free. It would not have to put down any additional money because any additional money would be paid off with the freight charge. But we are here to excise the land to stop a future government from taking actions that have been planned for 50 years for a road that has been studied more than any other road. There would be environmental impacts, but those impacts have been significantly offset, and the environmental impact of an alternative plan would inevitably be greater and would force tens of thousands of extra trucks down the suburbs that I, the member for Bateman and others represent.

Every day in my electorate, 5 000 schoolkids go to schools along Leach Highway, which is unnecessarily a truck zone, and will remain so because of this bill. This is a bloody disgrace, and the government stands to be condemned for the actions it has taken. It does not need this bill. It does not need to build Roe 8 until the next government does

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

so. It can rely on the assessment of the metropolitan region scheme, and I am confident that it will say, “Build the bloody thing.” The fact that the government is doing this is a vindictive act of vandalism on the planning of this state and an attack on the wealth, health and wellbeing of the people I represent.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [4.00 pm]: It is a pleasure to follow the member for Riverton, who lives in that area and knows the consequences of not building Roe 8 and 9. In fact, I think he summed it up very well. I am glad that all the points that the member has made are in *Hansard*; he made a very good case. I could not see any points that justify this particular bill. I think he correctly chose to use the words “act of vandalism”. This bill is a game of politics, and I think the government has made the wrong call on this one. The government has chosen to emphasise the fact that it is opposed to Roe 8 and 9, and I think it is going to be a fatal flaw in its election strategy.

Along those lines—the opposite lines to the member—I look forward to the comments from the members for Willagee, Cockburn, Bicton and Fremantle. I would like to hear what those members are going to put to the house to explain why this bill is necessary and important, if they do get up. I think that some will not. I would be surprised if the member for Willagee gets up, because I think he knows that Roe 8 and 9 will benefit his constituents. I and members on this side look forward to hearing the constructive comments and the strong debating points from people like the members for Bicton, Fremantle, Cockburn and Willagee.

This bill is about changing the time line of something that could happen normally. The government could have chosen to amend the MRS through a normal process. The reason it has gone through this process is explained in the second reading speech, which states —

Amending the MRS through standard processes could take up to two years; this option cuts that time significantly, meaning the at-risk section of Beelihar wetlands, the rehabilitation of which is ongoing, will be protected sooner.

The Beelihar wetlands reserve is just sitting there at the moment. I do not know why we have to rush in and rehabilitate it. Nothing will happen to it in the next couple of years. Indeed, we have made it quite clear that if we win the next election—I think that is a very good option; the more silly bills the government puts through like this, the more chance we have of winning—as the government knows, we will build Roe 8 and 9. Why would the government put this bill through? It is purely politics, and I will go through some of the reasons for that in a minute.

The history of Roe 8 and 9 is that it was a reserve created way back in the Stephenson and Hepburn plan. According to the second reading speech, it was introduced in 1963. It is Western Australia’s only ring-road in the MRS. Really large cities like Beijing are on to their seventh or eighth ring-road. Ring-roads are fairly important—if someone is stuck in an area, they can get on to a ring-road, and particularly if the ring-road has no traffic lights, they can get anywhere else in a large metropolitan area very quickly.

Perth is a terrific place to live, and it is a place where people aspire to live. As the global population increases, so will Perth’s population. There is no doubt it is a lovely place to live. Way back between 1958 and 1960, to keep Perth a lovely, uncongested place to live in, people chose to design a future road network that made sure that as Perth grew and as we got infill —

Dr A.D. Buti: We are getting high density now, too.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Correct. As we get more density in the infill areas, which the Minister for Planning promotes, we need to move those people around. In Western Australia, people have cars.

Mr A. Krsticevic: They love their cars.

Mr W.R. MARMION: They do. A lot of people have four-wheel drives, because they like to go to the country.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: They go on holidays.

Mr W.R. MARMION: They go on holidays. They have to drop their kids off at school, and they do not live very close to a railway station. Even if someone is lucky enough to live in infill within 800 metres of a railway station, they still have a car, particularly families with children. People cannot get away with not having a car in Western Australia.

The very smart people back in 1958 to 1960 decided to make sure that we have a road network that would support Perth as it grew. One of the basic elements of the network was to have a ring-road, and that was Roe Highway. I put this on the record, because I worked in the planning section of Main Roads for a brief period. Historically, Roe Highway was not a high priority in the 1960s and the 1970s, but there was still congestion in that area. A road called High Road was given an extension, and they called it Leach Highway. Leach Highway was created as a bandaid measure. It was not actually meant to be a highway. Now, Leach Highway is three or four lanes wide at some intersections. It was never designed as a controlled-access highway. Residents live in properties along

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Leach Highway, and their driveway goes onto the highway. Can members imagine living on Leach Highway and having to back out there? I live north of the river—I do not want to get a north–south river debate going—and fortunately I do not have to use Leach Highway very often, but on the infrequent times I have used it, I have been concerned about the phenomenal amount of trucks. I would think that any frequent user of Leach Highway would say that is a disaster. We know what the traffic issues are.

I will elaborate on some dot point benefits of Roe 8 and 9, if I have time. Firstly, we have the funding availability. It is paradise to have \$1.2 billion sitting there. The Treasurer is not here—he does not want to be here because he knows he would be embarrassed by me saying, “You’ve got \$1.2 billion.” That is a large amount of money, members.

Mr A. Krsticevic: It will provide 4 000 jobs.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Yes, 4 000 jobs. Why would we turn that away? That is just one point. There is funding availability, so why not use it? With that funding availability, 4 000 jobs would be created. Is that right, member? What do we need at this time? There is the high cost of living. People’s wages are flatlining, and with the cost of living, we need a bit of stimulus.

Mr A. Krsticevic: There are 90 000 people who could do it.

Mr W.R. MARMION: There are a lot of people who are unemployed and looking for jobs. People do not want to sell their houses, because the housing prices have dropped in every electorate, including my own. People might say that the people in Nedlands are well off. I can tell members, a lot of people in Nedlands are hurting just as much as everyone else. What a stimulus \$1.2 billion would be to jobs and the construction industry in Western Australia.

I turn to the efficiency of the road network. The network is obviously inefficient. Leach Highway has traffic lights all the way along, so by building Roe 8 and Roe 9, there would immediately be a more efficient road network; that is a no-brainer. If I have time, I might be able to get onto the very good report written by Greg Martin, an honorary fellow of Engineers Australia. He did not get to be an honorary fellow for nothing. He is a well-regarded former public servant and engineer, and he wrote a very good report that highlights the reasons that Roe 8 and Roe 9 should be built. I have mentioned jobs. The other problem if Roe 8 and Roe 9 are not built is there has to be an alternative. Where is the alternative? Why would the government get rid of or try to cut off an option, when it has no other options have been given? No engineer would do this. The option of Roe 8 and Roe 9 has been in planning for 50 or 60 years, and the government decided to get rid of the reserve for that one option with a view to think about some other options without actually having two or three options for us to look at before doing so. It does not make any sense at all. I have tried very hard to think whether there is a reason that the government would get rid of the only option for its roads—and I could not work it out.

Mr A. Krsticevic: They do not like the people south of the river!

Mr W.R. MARMION: I did not want to get into a north–south debate, but possibly the member is right.

On that point, if there is not an alternative, we have to look at how to make the current road system better. How can we make Leach Highway better? We could get rid of the grade intersections. Let us choose the intersection of Stock Road–Leach Highway. How much land would we need to put in an interchange that would mean that people would not have to stop at the lights? What impact would that have on businesses on those intersections? The government has come up with an option—a bandaid—for the Stirling Highway–High Street intersection, and that is a roundabout. We have not seen the final design for that roundabout. In fact, I have designed a roundabout, believe it or not. It never went ahead; an interchange was built instead. It was at the intersection of Roe Highway–Mitchell Freeway. There was a possibility of a massive roundabout with a radius of about 1.3 kilometres, but it did not go ahead. It was an interim before a full interchange was done. A roundabout design at the intersection of Stirling Highway–High Street, which I understand is a bandaid solution costing \$100 million, means trucks will come down Leach Highway, then High Street, go onto the roundabout and then swing around and head onto Stirling Highway. The benefit of a roundabout is that people would not have to stop because there would be no traffic lights, but imagine a truck going around a corner in a 3.5-metre wide lane. The lanes would have to be made wider. I would like to see the design and to know the speed at which trucks will be going as they come spinning down High Street and get onto the roundabout. I wonder how cars will interact with the trucks on that roundabout. It will be a challenge.

Mr A. Krsticevic: It will be a disaster.

Mr W.R. MARMION: It is possible—anything can be designed. I would like to see the design, and I would like to know what the radius will be and the speed at which cars and trucks will be going around that roundabout. That is just another dot point showing a benefit to Roe 8 and Roe 9. It would alleviate the cost of that interchange,

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

because Roe 9 will go under High Street. The next intersection is Marmion Street, and that is flying over the top, so the first time any vehicle would have to stop from Muchea on Roe 8 and Roe 9 would be at the end of Roe 9 when it joins Canning Highway.

While I am on that, one of the clever strategies the Labor Party successfully used at the last election was the eight-second grab, “the road to nowhere”. That is an utter fallacy. Stirling Highway is two lanes both ways and Roe 8 and Roe 9 would be two lanes both ways, so they would be joined with the same design volumes for both north and south. That phrase is a fallacy. The road would join straight onto Stirling Highway. I must say that the phrase “the road to nowhere” stuck for maybe a year or two. Gradually, people have worked it out themselves. If it is a road to nowhere, why is the government building a roundabout? Why is the government spending \$100 million on a road to nowhere?

Dr M.D. Nahan: So they can go around and around!

Mr W.R. MARMION: That is right! That is true—someone going the wrong way could use it to go back the other way. That is very good!

One of the other fallacies put out is that Roe 8 and Roe 9 are bad for the environment. If we consider carbon dioxide emissions—it is one measure for the environment, but I will stick to that one—let us see how many traffic lights there are for someone driving along Leach Highway. In fact, I will read all the problems with Leach Highway whilst I am on the subject, because it is not a controlled-access highway. There are in excess of 180 driveway connections. I mentioned driveways before. Can members imagine 180 driveways backing onto Leach Highway? A person would want to make sure that there is enough room on their property so they could get in quickly if a truck was coming up their backside. They would also hope that they have enough room on the front verge to be able to turn around so that when go out onto Leach Highway they can go front-way out. Can members imagine backing out onto Leach Highway? God! It would be terrible. There are 180 driveway connections directly onto private properties. How many driveways will there be on Roe 8 and Roe 9?

Dr D.J. Honey: None.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Zero—correct. Infill has made it even worse. Infill is a clever thing to do because we need it, but some of these infill properties have battleaxe subdivisions. What do battleaxe subdivisions do? They create more cars backing out onto the driveways and more driveways.

What else have we got? There are 20 road junctions without traffic light controls, so there are junctions with normal roads—let alone driveways—for which people must look out. If a truck is going along at 70 kilometres an hour and a car blindly pulls out of one of these road junctions, it creates a dangerous situation, and it does not surprise me that there are lots of accidents.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr W.R. MARMION: Those are the road junctions.

We finally get to the eight sets of traffic lights in the eight kilometres between Kwinana Freeway and Stirling Highway. Those traffic lights mean that trucks have to stop. When trucks stop, they have to slow down and there are two problems with that. First, when they are slowing down—I am not sure how many gears trucks have now, but they have lots—drivers like to go through them slowly. They judge when the lights will turn red so they can gradually ease their way down the gears and not wear out their brakes. What happens, as people know, is that when some drivers see there is a gap before a red light, they jump in front of a truck at the last minute—worse, sometimes even two cars might do it—and the truck has to brake harder to try to ensure there is not a rear-end crash. I understand that rear-end crashes on Leach Highway are double the average in Western Australia. That is one of the reasons it is dangerous.

The other thing that happens when trucks slow down and then have to speed up again is that they use more diesel, so they put more emissions into the atmosphere. Can members imagine 6 000 or 7 000 trucks travelling on Leach Highway each day and having to stop at these traffic lights? If the majority of those trucks were moved to another road on which they did not have to stop, the massive reduction in carbon emissions would do a great deal to help the Morrison government meet the targets it has committed to in the Paris Agreement. There is an exceptionally strong argument to build Roe 8 and 9 purely for the environmental conditions. In fact, other countries probably would not look at the economic benefits; they might be minor for those countries, even though they are paramount for us. The environmental benefits of reducing the emissions from trucks when they are stopped at traffic lights might mean that those countries would build such a road anyway.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

The other problem is that Leach Highway has 28 bus stops between Kwinana Freeway and Stock Road and only two of those 28 bus stops have an embayment for buses to pull into. We can imagine the flow-on effects for the trucks burning along Leach Highway if a bus suddenly stops in front of a car that is in front of them. It is a very dangerous road. How many bus stops do members think there will be on Roe 8 and 9?

Mr A. Krsticevic: None.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Correct. I am looking forward to members opposite explaining to me why we should not build Roe 8 and 9.

I would now like to highlight what Roe 8 and 9 would do. It is amazing. If the project were to be completed, people would be able to drive from Muchea to Fremantle—a distance of 88 kilometres—without stopping. Where else in Western Australia could people travel for 88 kilometres without stopping? I know that Marmion Avenue is pretty long, but there are lots of traffic lights along that road. Forrest Highway is one such road, and there are some highways in the regions, but, in the CBD, this route would be 88 kilometres of grade-separated road all the way from Muchea to Fremantle. I cannot see why the government would not do that.

We had a concern when we were thinking about building Roe 9. We still had the road reserve for the old Roe 9 route, which went further to the west and then north, but we could not go north because the area was blocked. Do members remember why it was blocked? A former Minister for Transport almost did a similar thing to what we are doing today: “How do I stop Roe 9? Let’s sell the land so that we can’t build Roe 9.” Again, why would the government do that? Why would it cut off an option? As it turns out, we can now tunnel. Where there is a will, there is a way. The tunnel option means that there would be fewer property resumptions. The tunnel option is quite a good option in this case; in fact, it probably would be better because the distance would be less. From an economic point of view, with the net present value, it would be a win. Perhaps we should thank the previous Minister for Transport for doing that, because we have a better net present value option. That road reserve would have a benefit—this was planned for and approved in our design when we were in government and construction started—for residents in Hilton and South Fremantle who have to use lots of local roads to get onto Leach Highway. We could have a special road for residential commuter traffic from the Hilton area straight onto Stock Road. The benefit of that controlled access reserve is that the road would have no connections. I cannot see why anyone who lives in Fremantle, Bicton, Willagee and Cockburn would not strongly support the Roe 8 and 9 project.

I will finish because I know that everyone on our side wants to speak on this bill, as do the members for Willagee, Cockburn, Bicton and Fremantle. I do not want to take up all the time this week. I want to finish by referring to the report prepared for the South West Group of Councils by Greg Martin. As I said before, being an engineer, Greg has a very high reputation in Western Australia and has a lot of integrity. He has a great record in public service. He was the head of the commonwealth construction branch in Western Australia before it closed and then he moved to Main Roads and had a very successful career in transport in Western Australia. I think he is now an adjunct professor at Curtin University. He wrote a very good report that basically analysed the impact of not building Roe 8 and 9. It was an objective report; it was not biased. It was funded by the South West Group of councils. I will read some of the points he made.

Dr A.D. Buti: What is the South West Group of Councils?

Dr M.D. Nahan: It is Melville, Kwinana, Warnbro and Cockburn.

Ms A. Sanderson: Every councillor?

Mr W.R. MARMION: It is all the councils.

I will read some of the points he made in his executive summary. The fourth paragraph states —

If the Perth Freight Link does not proceed, an immediate consequence is that heavy road freight between Kewdale/Forrestfield, Fremantle Port and Western Trade Coast and associated freight destinations will continue to mix with all other traffic west of Kwinana Freeway on the existing State and local road network.

This will exacerbate current and emerging congestion as the population grows in Perth and Peel by a further 1.5 million to 3.5 million in about 2050 and vehicular traffic increases on key roads in the South West Metropolitan Region.

He is not saying anything that is not obvious. We all know that. That is his summary. He has also highlighted what I said before —

West of Kwinana Freeway, Leach Highway has in excess of 180 driveway connections, more than 20 road junctions without traffic light control, eight sets of traffic lights and 28 bus stops between

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Kwinana Freeway and Stock Road. Between 2009 and 2013 more than 72% of crashes on Leach Highway were rear-end collisions.

This extensive report refers to the economic consequences if the government does not build Roe 8 and 9, and I have outlined some of them. The government has decided that it will go ahead with a roundabout. We have not seen the final design of it, but we know that the government has budgeted a bit over \$100 million for it, so it will be interesting to see whether it comes in under that.

In summing up, I am very disappointed that we are not going through the normal MRS process. It is outrageous. This is being done just to gain two years. We in Western Australia are proud of the metropolitan region scheme; not every city has an MRS that it can rely on to plan for the future. I am very disappointed. I think that when the people of Western Australia, who are more important than members in this place, realise what is happening and that this could jeopardise one of the most important road infrastructure links yet to be completed in Western Australia—the number one link left to be completed in the metropolitan area—it will be a fatal flaw in the government's policy to be re-elected.

MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman) [4.29 pm]: This is actually the third time this term that I have got up to talk about the subject of Roe 8 in Parliament. As I have said before in this house, the government's Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2018 is nothing other than pure planning vandalism. The inconsistencies of fact that have been peddled by the government to try to justify the removal of Roe 8 from the planning scheme are really interesting. It is fascinating that when the Labor Party was in opposition, it adopted a successful campaign method used by the Labor Party in Victoria to halt an infrastructure project in Victoria—namely, the scattergun approach. If the government tried to deal with that argument, it would move on to the next argument before the government could respond.

The government has raised a list of issues, and I will quickly step through them today—that the former Liberal–National government had no business case for Roe 8; the last mile; the road to nowhere; Beelihar wetlands; the outer harbour; and road to rail. I turn to the government's argument about the business case. A business case was submitted to Infrastructure Australia, and it rated Roe 8 the most important infrastructure project in Australia yet to commence. What is interesting about this from a business case perspective is that the economics of this project were very good. It had a benefit–cost ratio of 2.3 and was going to cost in the order of \$1.6 billion. It would direct traffic away from other major corridors, such as Leach Highway and South Street, and that data is available to look at. A lot of people might say that we never made our business case public. Show me a major infrastructure project for which a government has actually made the business case public prior to going to contract. In fact, the former Labor government was put under a lot of pressure about Mandurah rail line and it made explicit arguments about why it would not release the business case. The government advanced the argument that there was no business case, but, right now, the opposition cannot see the business case for Metronet. There are inconsistencies and hypocrisy from this government when it makes its argument about Roe 8.

I turn to the government's argument about the last mile. When I was the Minister for Transport, I shared with members in this chamber that I had a commitment from Main Roads to do the planning for the last mile but Main Roads advised that it was not necessary for 10 years. It advised that the last mile in the \$5 million upgrade to the Canning Highway and Stirling Highway intersection, as part of the Roe 9 works, was not necessary for a further 10 years. The estimated cost of the last mile was \$500 million and it involved duplicating Stirling Bridge and tucking underneath Tydeman Road to take the trucks to port. We were advised in 2015 or 2016 that that was not necessary until 2026. The work was done to do the last mile but the best advice that we received from Main Roads was that it was not necessary at that time. In an environment of scarce capital resources, we had to prioritise. Was it better to start putting funding away for the last mile or was it better to do the Cockburn–Thornlie rail link done or other important infrastructure projects that were being considered by the former Liberal–National government and by this government? It was about prioritisation, not that it had not been planned and thought through.

I turn to the argument about a road to nowhere. In his articles about Roe 8, Paul Murray pointed out quite clearly that it was never a road to nowhere because it would connect Roe Highway to Stirling Highway. I do not know how the government can make the argument of a road to nowhere.

There were arguments that Roe 8 would destroy the Beelihar wetlands, yet only 0.5 per cent of the Beelihar wetlands sit inside the Roe 8 reserve. We were not going to barge through it; we were going to bridge over it. In fact, during a discussion with an environmental lobby group last week, I was advised that it has been proved that bridges over wetlands are beneficial to the environment because they provide a safe habitat for the animals in that environment. There are benefits in bridging over a wetland area. The former Liberal–National government was not destroying the half a per cent of the Beelihar wetlands; rather, it had committed to bridging over it. It is even more interesting that although it was only half a per cent of the Beelihar wetlands, the wetlands accounted for three per cent of the

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

total Roe 8 reserve. Ninety-seven per cent of the Roe 8 reserve had nothing to do with wetlands. Roe 8 involved six hectares of wetlands, 30 hectares of virgin bush and 60 hectares of degraded bush. The Environmental Protection Authority's issue was not the wetlands; rather, it was the virgin bush that would be destroyed. The EPA's finding was that it was important that the government had an offset. As a result, the former government purchased an additional 1 000 hectares behind White Cliffs that abutted a national park, of which 600 hectares would be used as a permanent offset for the bush that would be destroyed in the construction of Roe 8. The government can hardly argue that Roe 8 would be detrimental to the Beeliar wetlands; it is not an accurate argument whatsoever.

Another issue raised by the government was the outer harbour—"Let's go and build the outer harbour." In fact, I heard the Treasurer state during the election that if the Labor Party did not commence construction of the outer harbour before the end of this term, he would resign from Parliament. What is fascinating about the outer harbour—the government has gone very quiet on it lately—is that in 2006, former planning and infrastructure minister Hon Alannah MacTiernan commissioned a strategic environmental assessment which said, "Although this is only a desktop review, we can't see any scenario in which an outer harbour is even possible due to an environmental impact." That is my summation of the findings of the 2006 strategic assessment. I encourage all members to read that report and question how the government will achieve a great environmental outcome building an outer harbour.

We have talked about the road-to-rail argument—"We've got too much on road, we want to push it all to rail." The advice that I received when I was the Minister for Transport was that if we could achieve 30 per cent on rail, it would be world's best practice. Western Australia currently has double the number of containers travelling by rail in any other state in Australia. As I have said in this chamber before, Singapore removed containers from rail because it was less efficient. We have lost sight of the efficiency of freight movements within the metropolitan area to ensure that we keep our cost of goods as low as possible. That is what we need to do. This government has increased the subsidy to rail to try to get it up. It has increased the subsidy from \$30 a container to \$50 a container. It has lifted from around 13 or 14 per cent on rail to around 22 per cent, 23 per cent, maybe moving up a bit more given the last numbers I saw. What is fascinating is that we have shifted it from 15 per cent to 22 per cent or 23 per cent, but we are paying the containers that already go by rail \$50 instead of \$30. The 15 per cent of containers that already went by rail are receiving \$50—an additional 20 bucks. The increased cost to get that extra seven per cent is a lot more than what it is costing for the first 15 per cent because the government is subsidising the containers that already went by rail. In 2016, there was around 750 000 twenty-foot equivalent units in and out of the port. It went up over the next 12 months to over 800 000 containers. I have not seen the latest report. I know that when the government was in opposition, it argued that the capacity of the port was 1.2 million to 1.4 million TEU, but that is not true. A 2002 assessment done by Hon Alannah MacTiernan suggested that it was somewhere between 1.2 million and 1.4 million TEU, but with technological advances and upgrades to the port, it was advised that it would be closer to two million or over two million containers through the port. By straightening berth 1, the capacity of Fremantle harbour could be increased to three million TEU at a cost of about \$300 million.

As I have said in this chamber a number of times, the issue for a future government of Western Australia is not the capacity of Fremantle Harbour; it is the capacity we as a community are prepared to accept going through there. We have to understand that we will get to two million containers and 30 per cent by rail, and we have a capacity issue with rail for a couple of reasons. Although the government might be upgrading the bridge, there is capacity past the Fremantle Roundhouse and through the old part of Fremantle, which is an issue. There is a sprinkler system on that railway line to stop the screeching as the trains go around the bend through the old part of Fremantle. It has real trouble increasing productivity through that area. That will be a capacity in the future. But, if we can achieve 30 per cent and we think about two million 20-foot or equivalent units, that means around 600 000 containers will go by rail, but 1.4 million containers will go by road. In 2016, when it was 750 000 containers, rounded to 15 per cent to keep the numbers easy, that is around 637 000 by road, three years ago. We are talking about shifting it from 637 000 containers a year to 1.4 million containers a year, if we can get to 30 per cent by rail. We have not heard a solution to that from this government. One of the problems with being able to put it on rail is that it comes off a ship and does not go straight onto rail because we do not have the facilities to do that. They have to get onto a truck, over to rail and onto rail, and then the rail goes out to Kenwick or Kewdale and gets unloaded onto—guess what?—a truck, and then it drives out from there. The problem we have trying to do a lot of containers by rail over a very short distance is this double handling of the containers that need to go on and off trucks all the time.

When we look at those six issues—no business case, the last mile, a road to nowhere, the Beeliar wetlands, an outer harbour, and road to rail—all the arguments by the government are flawed. Every one of them is flawed. In fact, when it was in opposition it was totally disingenuous to run those arguments in the community, yet, from a political perspective, it ran an effective campaign on it. We were not good enough on our narrative at the time,

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

and we spent too much time trying to explore an alternative because we tried to find a better solution than taking it down Stock Road and onto High Street, because of the impact on the cemetery, on commercial businesses and on the residents of Palmyra. I committed to seeing whether there was not a better alternative. We found it. If I look at Roe 8 and Roe 9 across economic, social and environmental bases, it is a sound project. If I initially look at it purely from an economic perspective, this had, as I said, a benefit–cost ratio of around 2.3. It is the first infrastructure project in Western Australia that would have been fully self-funded. Main Roads had undertaken work with the transport industry to examine a freight charge based on a share of the productivity gains from removing traffic lights. The three measures looked at were time, fuel and maintenance. If we took 50¢ out of a \$1.09 per kilometre benefit, which was derived from the industry working with Main Roads on those three productivity measures, it would have been revenue in excess of \$100 million a year for the state. The total cost to the state, ignoring the federal government grants, of Roe 8, Roe 9, and the Gateway WA and NorthLink WA projects was \$1.35 billion. The net present value from a 30-year look at the revenue streams and the benefits would have generated \$3.5 billion, or, in gross terms, \$6.8 billion back to the state in addition to the \$8 billion that would flow to industry. From an economic perspective, this was an exciting project for Western Australia. What made this more exciting from an economic perspective was that when we explored the tunnel option, we thought that it would cost an additional net \$300 million to do the tunnel. We thought it would be an additional gross \$700 million, but we would save \$400 million in property acquisition costs. The benefit–cost ratio was very similar, because it would take off 1.1 kilometres of road—we would shorten the distance by 1.1 kilometres. From a benefit–cost ratio, it was very similar, and the federal government supported us on this initiative. What was fantastic about this was that when we got the formal tenders back, the costings of the Roe 9 tunnel came in \$550 million under budget. The whole of Roe 8 and Roe 9, when we thought it would cost an extra \$300 million for the tunnel, taking it up to \$1.9 billion, actually came in at around \$1.45 billion. From an economic perspective, there was a significant saving.

From an environmental perspective, as I have said in this house before, we know that diesel pollutants in the atmosphere are a major concern. It was measured that this project would save 450 000 tonnes of diesel pollutants over a 10-year period. In addition, we know that from an environmental perspective the 600 hectares of offset for the 30 hectares of bush take was a better outcome for the environment from a natural habitat perspective for cockatoos et cetera.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr D.C. NALDER: Within the spend, \$35 million was being spent in and around the Beeliar wetlands area to remove invasive species, both plant and animal species, to improve its environmental outcomes. Some of Hope Road, which currently goes through there, is aligned to the Roe 8 reserve, but half of it is not. It is a bunded road, which means it is raised about a metre above the wetland area. That stops a lot of little critters from moving through. From an environmental perspective, it is restrictive. Removing this was a better outcome to enable animals to move freely through that Beeliar wetland area. Part of the process of building Roe 8 was to remove Hope Road. From an environmental perspective, this is a far better outcome and I am happy to argue any of these points based on fact.

From a social perspective, as we have heard from other members, a risk is created, as there are 180 driveways between Stock Road and North Lake Road, in addition to the intersections of all the various roads that come on and off Leach Highway. The intersection of North Lake Road and Leach Highway was ranked as the eleventh worst black spot in Western Australia in 2016. I have to qualify that that was when I was Minister for Transport, so some of the intersections that were worse than that may have gone, so it may be a higher rank now. But the issue along Leach Highway is that the number of interactions that involve a truck are more than double the state average. This government is not coming up with solutions to deal with this. Before it deals with this planning situation or removing it, we would think the government would have a solution about how it would make everything a lot better for the movement of vehicles around Western Australia. The interaction of trucks, as I have said in the past, primarily occurs when those trucks are at intersections, whether those intersections are driveways, side streets or traffic lights. The difficulty with large trucks is their inability to stop quickly. The risk always comes when an inexperienced driver in front of a truck has an orange light and pulls up quickly in front of a truck that cannot pull up as quickly. The whole point of creating a freight freeway is to remove those trucks from those interactions and situations. From a social responsibility perspective, this is a very important piece of infrastructure.

In addition, and I have shared this before, the advice of Main Roads was that by 2021 the intersection of Murdoch Drive and South Street would fail and nothing could be done to the intersection to improve that situation. The government has attempted to bring the Roe Highway extension in on the south entrance, but I think that is a half-baked solution, because it will just bring the traffic around Roe Highway and through Murdoch Drive, making it very difficult to get on and off Farrington Road. I think the government has come up with a half-baked

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

solution to try to solve the issue. From a social and economic perspective, I believe that Roe 8 and Roe 9 should proceed, and that Western Australia would be better off environmentally.

The federal member for Tangney has been vociferous about the benefits of Roe 8 and Roe 9. He undertook an analysis of his community and commissioned a poll. It is fascinating that the poll found that in the City of Cockburn, 73 per cent of the residents surveyed supported the construction of Roe 8 and Roe 9, with 18 per cent opposed, and the remainder undecided. In the City of Melville, 66 per cent supported the construction of Roe 8, whereas only 19 per cent opposed it. It is fascinating to get a sense of the community's expectations. Once people start looking beyond the hype of the arguments that have been put forward by this government and the misinformation in the public domain about the facts of Roe 8 and 9, they start to see through the government and know that it has been hypocritical and insincere about the arguments it has made. Overall, across the cities of Melville and Cockburn, 70 per cent of people were in support of the construction of Roe 8 and only 19 per cent were opposed to it.

One of the points I have been making to this government is that if it does not like the design, it should change it rather than remove it altogether. The government is missing out on a perfect opportunity to stamp its own authority on this project. When we put Roe 8 and Roe 9 out to tender, we had no idea that the tunnels would come in at the pricing they did. It was roughly \$900 million for 3.3 kilometres of twin-board two-way tunnels, which was \$550 million under what we thought the price would be. If the government is concerned about the Beelihar wetlands and thinks it is an important issue, the government could drop the road beneath the Beelihar wetlands for a kilometre. I do not think it is a very important issue. This government has run arguments that it knows are illogical. It knows that Roe 8 should proceed, but it has got itself in a political bind and is moving down a process of planning vandalism to the state. We have seen this from state Labor before with the removal of the Fremantle eastern bypass. It removed that, and the people of Fremantle are suffering as a result, because of the excess of trucks that shift from Cockburn down through South Fremantle to get to Stirling Bridge and the port. It is not acceptable and the government should not be doing this again. It should have learnt not to remove road reserves, because it is not in the best interests of Western Australia. We call on the government to reconsider this crazy approach.

We will fight this all the way because we believe that it is wrong for Western Australia, and that the government has misled the people of Western Australia. We want the facts out in the community so people can clearly understand the benefits of Roe 8 from an economic, social and environmental perspective. I have not heard a justification from this government other than that it won an election and believes it has the right. But it has no right to avoid proper process and merely come in here with a bill to remove something that has been a road reserve for the best part of 50 or 60 years. In my view, that is totally inappropriate and irresponsible of this government. I call on government members to put this on hold and at least do the work to assess the economic, environmental and social impact, and then mount an argument in this place against what we have laid out. The government should have the decency to go through a proper review process rather than come through with a carte blanche removal. We have not seen that. The minister should at least make a cogent argument for the economic, social and environmental benefits of this removal.

If the government is going to remove the Roe 8 reserve, what is the solution? We do not hear anything about that. Back in the election, we heard about the outer harbour, but that has gone very quiet. As I have said, if the capacity of Fremantle harbour is limited, which the Premier promised he would do—he promised to cap it at the pre-election productivity level, which was 750 000 containers—a three million growth in containers would take about 50 years. What will we do then? If the government is going to cut the capacity of the inner harbour, it needs to have somewhere that has the capacity to grow to about six million twenty-foot equivalent units. The desktop strategic environmental assessment looked at only three million TEUs in the outer harbour. It is not big enough. It has to be twice the size, and the environmental impact is likely to be twice as great. The economic cost of building an outer harbour is estimated to be between \$5 billion and \$6 billion when all the landside works of rail and road that have to be established are included. How will that work? We do not have a clear understanding from this government, yet it is going through a process of removing the Roe 8 reserve when it has not fully worked through the solution.

The government should give us some confidence that, although we may not agree with it and may argue against it, it has a sound basis on which to take it forward. We do not have that; it is totally absent. To remove the Roe 8 reserve in the absence of a solution is irresponsible and inappropriate behaviour from this government. We will continue to argue that its actions are not right for the community of Western Australia, particularly for the freight industry and the communities that live south of the river. Both those groups will suffer as a result of the actions of this government. We will continue to fight that as long as we can, because we know that we have the right solution and it could have fantastic benefits for Western Australia. We will continue to maintain the fight for it.

MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Leader of the Opposition) [4.58 pm]: I rise to contribute to the second reading debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2018, which the opposition

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

will oppose for a variety of reasons, including those that have been very well articulated by members on this side. I thank members on this side for the information they have provided to Parliament about the issues around this legislation, including the government's lack of process and foresight in removing a very important road reservation, which may well be required at some point in the future. I thank the member for Riverton for being the lead speaker on this bill on my behalf as the opposition spokesperson for transport. We made that agreement because the member for Riverton knows that Roe 8 and Roe 9 is a significant issue for people in his electorate and in the adjacent electorates in the south metropolitan area.

Overwhelmingly, the constituency of south metro wants this project to go ahead. The member for Bateman articulated the irregular process taken for changes to the metropolitan region scheme. The minister is taking a bullish approach and circumventing normal process. Usually, an MRS amendment goes through a rigorous assessment process over a period of around 24 months. There are calls for submissions, and hearings are managed by the Western Australian Planning Commission. After a 24-month consultation process with every industry, government and community stakeholder that might be adversely, or, indeed, positively, impacted by a change to the metropolitan region scheme, the WAPC makes its recommendations based on the input it has received. That recommendation goes to the minister, who makes a decision on whether to approve the amendment or not. That comprehensive consultative process, which is there to protect the Western Australian community's interests, is for not only those who might seek to gain politically now, but also our grandchildren into the future, who will be impacted by decisions on changes to long-term planning in this state. Any removal or sale of government land has an impact on the generations that come after us. Once a decision is made in this place or by government, for example, it is often further down the track that the short-sightedness of that decision becomes apparent.

The western suburbs high school scenario illustrates this most effectively. In the 2000s, the teenage population in the western suburbs was on a rapid decline and a number of schools, including Hollywood, Swanbourne, City Beach and Scarborough Senior High Schools, were struggling for student patronage. When former Premier Colin Barnett was education minister, he made the decision to close a number of those schools to build capacity at Shenton College and Churchlands Senior High School. The Court government was tossed out in 2001. The Labor government came in and Alannah MacTiernan, as Minister for Planning and Infrastructure—I think that is what she was called—decided to sell off the Scarborough high school site. That Department of Education-owned site in the heart of the western suburbs, in Scarborough, was sold off for housing. There is now a housing estate there. Eight blocks of land were held aside for the provision of a swimming pool, because there had been community fundraising for a swimming pool at the Scarborough high school site. The eight blocks of land were held until Terry Redman, the then Minister for Lands, sold off those blocks and put the money in trust for the City of Stirling to build a swimming pool. However, a swimming pool does not provide an opportunity to build a school to educate children in an area with a rapidly increasing teenage population. Indeed, there is a need to build a new school. The students from Scarborough, Innaloo and Doubleview, where we are looking at the teenage population doubling over the next 10 years, now have to travel to Subiaco or Churchlands to go to high school. We will be watching the City Beach high school site with great interest because, similar to what has been proposed with this Beeliam wetlands bill, if the government sells off that land for a housing development to get a quick sugar hit of funds to the budget for it to spend, it may not necessarily be in the long-term interests of the children who will come after us. Indeed, that is the struggle that governments have.

On the Beeliam wetlands bill, members have said a lot about the Roe 8 and Roe 9 project. The Liberal opposition remains committed to that project. A very sound business case was put to Infrastructure Australia, and it assessed that business case. Infrastructure Australia outlined the problems that the project was seeking to address, as being that —

- Growth in freight traffic on mixed use routes is adversely affecting public safety and social amenity in Perth's southern suburbs;
- Sub optimal access to Fremantle port and key strategic industrial areas is leading to reduced freight efficiency; and
- Fiscally constrained government resources are limiting the ability to address the freight and productivity issues.

There was a private sector capital contribution of \$374.5 million, initially financed by the state government. That contribution relates to the freight industry being prepared to contribute towards this project because it knew that it would improve efficiency, save money and reduce its carbon footprint. Why would the industry not support it?

Infrastructure Australia found that the business case was sound and identified five root causes of the problem, being —

- location of Fremantle Port Inner Harbour;

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

- high levels of economic growth in Western Australia;
- population growth in Perth and southern suburbs;
- expansion of trade through Fremantle Port ... and
- constraints on increasing truck productivity within the existing road network.

Ms R. Saffioti: Is that the business case?

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: This is the Infrastructure Australia report on it. The report continues —

The Business Case uses quantitative data to assess the problem including historical and projected growth in freight movements at Fremantle Port Inner Harbour, historical growth in heavy vehicle traffic volumes at key locations ...

In modelling to see who would be the beneficiaries of this project, one of the considerations was obviously commuter traffic. Infrastructure Australia's summary states —

... within the PM peak, travel time variability means that more than 80% of trips have travel times greater than 20% more or less than the average for the PM peak.

To translate that gobbledegook into something that makes sense to people, it means that commuters in the southern corridor spend on average 20 per cent longer in their vehicles than any other commuters in metropolitan Perth. It is time spent in vehicles chewing up fuel, listening to talkback radio or whatever it might be—maybe listening to something else. It is time spent away from their families. It is time spent wasted in traffic. It is time spent chewing up fuel. It is time spent idle while trying to edge along Kwinana Freeway or go east to west through the congestion points on Leach Highway, South Street and other roads. It is a waste of people's time and money.

We talk to the freight sector. I concur with the member for Bateman's arguments around the campaigns for and against this project. The scaremongering that went on for people living around Bicton and Fremantle, including that there was going to be an inordinate increase in the volume of freight traffic as a result of this road, was nonsense. The freight traffic will grow at the rate that it is going to grow. What was going to happen was that the freight would get to the port, and the road network to access the port, faster because the trucks would not have to stop at all the sets of traffic lights along Leach Highway. They would get their safer because they would have fewer interactions with other vehicles and at lower cost because they would be using less fuel. There would be less driver time. The trucks would get to the port in a more environmentally effective way because they would be using less fuel and their carbon footprint would be less. All that was going to happen with Roe 8 and Roe 9 was that it would provide an alternative east-west route for commuters, and the freight traffic on Leach Highway would switch to Roe Highway and get to the port faster and more efficiently. The freight traffic is not going to magically double unless there is some sort of unpredictable economic revival in the state, which I cannot see happening under this administration. It was just going to get to the port faster and more efficiently, and that was why the freight sector was so excited about it. The impact it would have on road safety is compelling. Sixty-six per cent of crashes on Leach Highway can be considered serious—that is, involving major property damage, requiring medical attention, resulting in hospitalisation or resulting in a fatality. That is compared with 55 per cent of all crashes across the metropolitan area. A person is more likely to be involved in a serious crash on Leach Highway than anywhere else, requiring hospitalisation. It would also involve significant property damage.

I know that area quite well because I have a business out that way and I often drive through Fremantle and along Leach Highway where I have family members who live in pockets of suburbia around there. It is a scary road to drive in a car that is stuck between B-doubles and three or four other trucks, or with one beside and one behind, travelling almost in a convoy from one set of traffic lights to another. Cars get stuck at each set of traffic lights waiting for trucks to start or get their gander up, and they just manage to gain some momentum before drivers must slow down behind them again. That is how people live if they want to access any of the retail businesses along Leach Highway. There are clusters of big-box retailers such as hardware giants and car yards. Anybody who wants to access those businesses is caught up in this nightmare of being stuck between trucks and trying to make a right-hand turn. They are having rear-end crashes because they are trying to pull over to turn into the retail centres. If they are rear-ended by a truck, that causes significant damage and injury. Four thousand crashes occurred along Leach Highway in the five years to 31 December 2013. That equates to two crashes a day. Half of those crashes occurred on the 8.7 kilometre stretch of road between Kwinana Freeway and Stirling Highway. The Liberal Party remains committed to the duplication of that section of road but this government is trying to kill it forever by removing the road reservation.

Another aspect of the Beeliar wetlands-Roe 8, Roe 9-Perth Freight Link debate was the environmental aspect. Environmental groups from right across the state were involved. As a former police minister, I can tell members

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

that there were a lot of familiar faces at the Roe 8 demonstrations. Every single environmental coalition known to man was there. I saw many people that I have seen at many protests across the state. There were quite a few who had been involved in protests at James Price Point. That resulted in the former government looking at specific legislation to stop people chaining themselves to lumps of concrete and various other things to prevent people going about their lawful activity. They are the same protesters that I saw on camera in the tent embassy in Canberra many years ago.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Professional protesters.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: They are professional protesters. I accept there were mums and dads there who were genuinely concerned that the Beelihar wetlands were going to be trampled on. Our plan for the Beelihar wetlands, as the member for Bateman said, was for part of the road to be built in a “bridge fashion” over the Beelihar wetlands. We also had significant environmental offsets. I cannot remember the figure.

Mr D.C. Nalder: Six-hundred hectares.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Six-hundred hectares of land was set aside for conservation to compensate for the very small section of land that abuts the Beelihar wetlands.

Another component of the wetlands’ preservation, which was an opportunity that was going to come with this Roe 8, Roe 9—Perth Freight Link project, was that the former government envisaged building a series of boardwalks through the wetlands, some birdwatching stations, and in fact managing human activity through the wetlands so that they could be protected. I understand there are lots of man-made tracks for goats through the wetlands, which is a very good way to introduce foreign species.

Mr P. Papalia: Have you ever actually been there?

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

Mr P. Papalia: How do you know there are not multiple tracks? I have been there lots of times.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: So have I, member.

Mr P. Papalia interjected.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: We wanted to put a boardwalk through there so that we could access the wetlands. We wanted to put specific stations there where people could sit and enjoy the wetlands. They could be birdwatching or whatever it might be. We could have had an Aboriginal interpretive centre for the wetlands and a range of programs. The Noongar people could have talked about the significance of the wetlands to the First People of this nation.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: In the noise around the anti-Roe 8, Roe 9 protest, none of this message was heard by the community and nobody was really paying attention. It was only after the election chaos had died down that we, as the opposition, started to be contacted by people in that south metropolitan corridor saying, “We didn’t understand what you were going to do. We didn’t actually really believe that the government would tear up that contract because we did actually really want Roe 8 and Roe 9.” They wanted that; they just did not want the government that had proposed it. They were two separate things. There was a lot of voter regret in those south metropolitan areas. As the opposition, we intend to fully capitalise on that voter regret. The people in the south metro area want this project.

I will go to the report by Greg Martin. The member for Nedlands has already alluded to this. It basically looks at the broader economic and social consequences if the Perth Freight Link does not proceed. He noted what would be adversely affected. The consequences of not proceeding with this project included —

Regional road network congestion affecting access and mobility for commuters, public transport services, emergency vehicles and active transport initiatives of walking and cycling

Constrained road capacity for east–west travel from home to jobs and activity centres

Effective reduction in the employee catchment for employers and job choices for employees

...

Reduced road freight productivity and freight efficiency due to “stop/start” urban traffic

He goes on. Further on in the report, Mr Martin mentions that the Perth Freight Link would be required whether an outer harbour is developed or not. If an outer harbour is developed, the Perth Freight Link is needed. If we stick

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

with Fremantle and try to increase the capacity at Fremantle, we need Perth Freight Link. No matter what the harbour plan is, the report said that we need both.

I have concerns about the government's outer harbour proposal. I remember studying Cockburn Sound when I was a geography student back whenever that was—when perms were popular! Cockburn Sound has been one of those environmental disasters for Western Australia; I cannot call it anything else. In the 2006 desktop study by the Environmental Protection Authority titled "Fremantle Ports Outer Harbour Project", which I think Hon Alannah MacTiernan requested, the government at that time was looking at several options for Cockburn Sound to develop an additional harbour.

The recommendations in the Environmental Protection Authority's report state —

... the EPA does not express a preference for any particular port option. It appears all options would have significant environmental impacts, especially within Cockburn Sound.

2. That the Minister notes that cumulative pressures along the eastern margin of Cockburn Sound will increase the threat to the improvements in the condition of Cockburn Sound which have been achieved through strong action by Government, industry and the community in recent decades.

There is a third recommendation, which does not add to my argument; it is more administrative.

I refer to the report titled "2018 State of Cockburn Sound Marine Area Report". This is a really important part of Western Australian ecology. The report notes —

some commercial and recreational fisheries are in decline (for example, mussels, crabs, herring, garfish), while others are stable (for example, squid, octopus, snapper)

We still have some real issues in Cockburn Sound. Between 1954 and 1978, the seagrass bed coverage in Cockburn Sound declined from 4 200 hectares to 900 hectares, a reduction of 80 per cent; that is, 80 per cent of our seagrass was destroyed by 1978. Most of that loss occurred between 1969 and 1975 and was attributed to the increase in nutrients that stimulated the growth of phytoplankton and epiphytes. They make the water turbid so that the sunlight cannot get through to the seagrass. If the seagrass does not get sunlight, it cannot produce chlorophyll and cannot grow.

The annual monitoring of seagrass shoot density has been undertaken at sites in Cockburn Sound since 1988. Shoot density monitoring measures the health of the seagrass. Although there have been some successful attempts to grow the seagrass over the past 10 years or so, because of the issues with declining water quality at Cockburn Sound, the seagrass recruitment is not as strong as it could be. Where we would expect the shoots to be quite thick, they are thinning. That has ramifications for the sustainability and the resilience of the entire seagrass beds. Seagrass is important because seagrass is the habitat for our benthic species such as crabs, molluscs et cetera but it also provides the nursery for our fish in our snapper fishery, for example. When the snapper schools start spawning, the fertilised eggs attach to the seagrass. If they cannot attach to seagrass, they cannot recruit; if they do not recruit, we do not get fish stocks. It is a really important nursery in what is a very important fishery for not only Cockburn Sound, but also the entire west coast bioregion.

The report states —

Significant declining trends in shoot density have been reported at several of these sites over the past 11-15 years, indicating continued decline of meadows in areas at the northern end of Garden Island, Eastern Shoal and Mangles Bay.

That is a problem, and with the cumulative effect of the expansions and the activity in Cockburn Sound, increasing pressure on that sound with further infrastructure and further movements through the sound is only going to add to this difficult problem. It is an environmental problem that we have not managed to solve. We went from 4 200 hectares to 900 hectares—we still have only 20 per cent of an optimal seagrass situation in Cockburn Sound.

Another issue is the concentration of contaminants in the sediments at Cockburn Sound. There is tributyltin—TBT—which is a particularly nasty chemical. Believe it or not, I remember learning about this in year 11 at high school. TBT is not used any more. It is a specific chemical that is used in anti-fouling paint under boats.

Dr D.J. Honey: It is "tributyltin".

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Tributyltin, yes—I had forgotten that! It is used in anti-fouling paint. It kills living things; that is why it is used in anti-fouling paint. TBT generally has a half-life of two years; however, when it attaches to floating sediments, it can remain in the system for up to 30 years. We have TBT in the sediment in Cockburn Sound

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

that is still there, and if the sedimentation in the sound is stirred up, the TBT-polluted mud will become more active in the system. It causes infertility in marine molluscs; it causes birth defects and embryonic dysfunction in fish and vertebrate sea life; and, if consumed, it has a toxic effect on humans.

There are many issues with the quality of the water in Cockburn Sound. As a recreational fishing person, I am very concerned about the continued health and viability of that fishery into the future. It would be great to take my great-grandson fishing in Cockburn Sound and know that we could catch a fish and not be poisoned with TBT; indeed, to be confident that there were fish there, because we have managed to maintain and grow the seagrass beds and keep the water quality pure.

I cannot sit down without addressing some of the accusations of the Premier last week in question time of my relationship with Christy Cain. I would like to put on the record that I do not have a relationship with Christy Cain. A few years ago, when Christy Cain and the Maritime Union of Australia were talking about the future of Fremantle port, I was in 100 per cent agreement with what they were saying about the future of Fremantle port, and my intention in mentioning Christy Cain was merely to say that I agree with what he said about the Fremantle port. I know that he is against Roe 8 and 9 and I fundamentally disagree with his views on that issue. I want to put on the record that although I intended to meet with the MUA about Fremantle port, that meeting has not yet occurred. However, as we start considering different options for ports in Western Australia, that meeting with the MUA may occur.

I thank members for their indulgence in listening to my contribution to this debate and apologise for the earlier interruption of my phone.

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe) [5.28 pm]: I rise to contribute to the debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018 and to indicate my very strong opposition to it. I am opposed to this bill because it is fundamentally bad public policy. We have seen a lot of virtue-signalling legislation from this government already, but I say that this is the worst of the virtue-signalling legislation that I have seen come before this house in my time in Parliament. It is worse than some almost childish attempt to curry favour with a particular group. This is a reckless and irresponsible bill that is attempting to prevent the development of transport infrastructure that is absolutely critical for the future of this state. If this bill goes through, it will directly lead to increasing the cost of importing and exporting goods through Fremantle port. It is going to risk lives—in fact, people will be killed. People will die because the Roe 8 and 9 extension does not go through. This will risk the lives of car and truck drivers, with large trucks forced to mix with cars on suburban streets. This will not apply to just the area we have been talking about south of the river. I can tell members that traffic chaos is so bad that trucks now choose to go down Stirling Highway and go out the east of Perth through the north of my electorate. We see a substantial increase of this. We are now seeing these trucks start to rat run down minor roads to escape the traffic density on both Curtin Avenue and Stirling Highway, which adds to that potentially fatal mix.

This will limit the potential for the growth of our economy, and it will prevent the creation of thousands of jobs. I will go through that in a little bit of detail later on. I was interested to note some of the comments made by the minister in the second reading speech. I quote the start of speech —

The McGowan government is committed to delivering its election commitment to discontinue the Perth Freight Link ...

Is it not funny how the government thinks that some commitments should be stuck to doggedly regardless of how they will impact on the wellbeing of our whole community? Then there are other commitments. Remember the one about no new taxes?

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: That one!

Dr D.J. HONEY: Yes, that one. That one did not last too long. There was a commitment for no new fees and charges. There has been a 19 per cent increase in electricity charges and a 16.5 per cent increase in water charges. There was a pyrrhic attempt at putting a tax on the gold industry.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Yes, there was the commitment by the Premier and others going back decades in the Labor Party not to expand electronic gaming machines into the broader community, yet, what do we see? We see the Treasurer, who represents a community that will be most affected, promoting a bill that will do exactly that. We have a government that thinks some things have to be stuck to—that not building Roe 8 is an election commitment it has to stick to—but others are not so important. The government has put its foot on the throat of the Western Australian economy in the way it has managed it. It is almost perverse. The government is sticking to something that will be overwhelmingly unpopular in the community. Our prospects in the southern suburbs are looking brighter and brighter.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: My member opposite here is a keen student of all of this I am sure he will go through in detail the seats we will be looking at picking up.

Dr M.D. Nahan: I thought Dawesville was in the country!

Dr D.J. HONEY: It is a regional seat, but the member for Dawesville takes a keen interest in metropolitan Perth as well, which is very refreshing.

As I said right at the get go, the government does not to stick to some commitments, but to some it does. The second reading speech continues —

As part of this commitment, we committed to reserve the Beeliiar wetlands for generations to come.

Guess what, members. So did the Liberal Party; so did the previous transport minister, our shadow Treasurer, who did an outstanding job this afternoon articulating the strength of the case for this Roe 8 and Roe 9 extension to go through. We are absolutely committed to preserving those wetlands. I continue quoting the speech —

The public of Western Australia made their thoughts very clear prior to and during the election campaign that bulldozing through an environmentally significant wetland to build a major highway extension was not the freight solution ...

Here we are, bulldozers wading through the mud and the grime, ploughing right through the middle of North Lake and just south of there. I wonder how many members opposite have been down there. I encourage members to do it. I will go through this in a little bit of detail. I went there to have a look, just to refresh my mind. While members are sitting here, they might be a bit bored by this speech. They can go onto Google Earth and have a good look at where that road is going to go.

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I will get into it.

Even more perverse, a bit further into the second reading speech it states —

By amending the MRS through this bill, we are getting on with the job and letting the public know that we take our commitment ...

Actually, the government is not getting on with the job; that is the problem. In fact, for a little bit of virtue signalling we have a really destructive bill potentially going through this Parliament. I have high hopes that the upper house will have the good sense to reject this bill completely.

The second reading speech talks about the outer harbour as a solution. On this side of the house we have a diverse range of views on that issue. We are allowed to have a diverse range of views on this side of the house, not like the members opposite who have to go along with crazy bills. Members on the opposite side have to go along with crazy bills to implement electronic gaming in their electorates where it is going to cause havoc, but on this side we can have a difference of opinion. Can I tell members—I am building a sense of anticipation!—that I support the outer harbour as a long-term solution, but it is a long-term solution. In my previous life, before I came into this place, I knew quite a bit about that and I had quite a bit to do with it. That solution is decades away. It is not a solution for 10 years or 15 years; it is a solution for 20 years. Again, I will cover that little bit of detail as I go through.

Mr M.P. Murray interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Dr D.J. HONEY: As I said —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Armadale!

Dr D.J. HONEY: — I am sure that most members opposite do not have any real idea of what the original project was. They sort of think that this bill is a bit of an environmental bill; it is supporting the environment. I will go through it. I encourage members to go onto the Liberal Party website occasionally. There is some fantastic information there for members.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members!

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Dr D.J. HONEY: I know the Minister for Mines and Petroleum is a keen student. He studies a lot and I respect that. He looks into things a lot. He could go on the website and pick up some useful facts. There is a great little document titled "Roe 8 and Roe 9 to Alleviate Traffic Congestion". This document goes into some considerable detail, but in a nice summary form. It is only two pages long, so most members should be able to get through it! It gives a really excellent summary of the business case and safety. I think other members have covered that excellently. Let us reflect on that. It is about saving lives, because people will die from the solution that this government is implementing. That is outside all the economic harm. If we could extend Roe 8 in the way that was planned, it would take 6 900 heavy vehicles a day off Leach Highway, Farrington Road, North Lake Road, South Street and Beeliar Drive. I do not know how many members go down there. Does the member for Armadale cut through that way and then cut up through the glorious western suburbs when he comes here? I do not know. He probably sticks to the freeway.

Mr M.P. Murray interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Dr D.J. HONEY: It is terrifying driving along there, because there are enormous trucks with wheels about twice the height of my car buzzing along beside me. I look at the truck drivers and they are exhausted. However tired they are when they get into the outskirts of Perth, by the time they get to Fremantle port they are exhausted because they constantly have to cope with this dreadful traffic that comes through the area.

I will go through some of the fast facts in the document —

- Between 2009 and 2013 more than 72% of crashes on Leach Highway were rear-end collisions.

The average is only 43.5 per cent in the rest of Perth. Heavy vehicles account for only 5.4 per cent of accidents, but on Leach Highway the figure is 11.1 per cent. It is more than double because of the heavy vehicle traffic there. The document also states —

- 31% of crashes on Roe Highway between Kwinana Freeway and Willeri Drive involve heavy vehicles.

It is an enormous increase. It is more than double. Obviously, 31 per cent is a phenomenally greater increase due to heavy traffic. We know the solution. Again, the shadow Treasurer went through in some details. The solution was not going to put a road through the area at all. In fact, the plan was to build a bridge through that area so animals and plants could grow contiguously. I will go through the map a little bit. Anyone who looks at it will realise that currently that is not the case. Hope Road completely dissects it. It is a raised road at least a metre, probably almost two metres, above the area, which completely cuts it off anyway. There is a major powerline that goes through, and that was in fact the alignment for Roe 8. For those members who are environmentally conscious, this project, if it went through, would reduce CO₂ emissions by 450 000 tonnes by 2031, which is in just over 10 years.

There are lots and lots of other facts on the website. Members should read it; it is a great website to peruse. It has some useful facts on it.

There are two things about the extension to look at. I did bother to go down there; I drove down there with my colleague and had a good old look. My parents-in-law used to live there. I like the area. The first thing to look at is where the road was proposed to go through the area between North Lake and South Lake, and the other one is where the current alignment has gone. I want to go through that in a little detail, because it is profoundly stupid. I will take members through it. I know that the member for Armadale knows that area well—I am not trying to single him out—having been a leading academic at Murdoch University. If we look at where the Roe 8 extension was to go through—I wish members could see the picture, but they can look at it on Google Earth—we can see that it is already a cleared track. Do members know why? It is because it is a powerline alignment. All the trees and shrubs have been cleared for bushfire control underneath a major high-voltage powerline. That alignment along that corridor has already been cleared. Hope Road, which is a large raised road, completely dissects the area south of that. Again, a bit along the lines of the suggestion by the member for Bateman, perhaps with a little bit of imagination, Hope Road could have been the alignment, but that choice was not made at the time; obviously, in the other direction, it was a straight line. The alignment for that road is already a highly disturbed area and, as the member for Bateman pointed out, bridging that area and then rehabilitating the land would have improved it from an environmental point of view. This is not a road that would go through the middle of a lake. This is not a road that would require bulldozers trudging through the middle of swamps or wetlands. The area is dry. It is the middle of winter, yet it is completely dry. It is a completely degraded route because of the powerline.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Let me go a little bit into where the current road will end. It will end on Murdoch Drive, between Murdoch University and the hospital precinct. I want to spend a little bit of time on this. There is so much material on this issue that I will have to give it to other members. At Murdoch University, there are all the students with their beaten-up old cars, or should I say the academics with their beaten-up old cars and the students with their BMWs, and people on bikes and the like coming into the university on one side of the road. What have we got on the other side? There is St John of God Murdoch Hospital, which includes the community hospice, Wexford Medical Centre, the dermatology service, WA Cardiology and the orthopaedic clinic. There is also Fiona Stanley Hospital, which includes the education building, the emergency department and the Harry Perkins Institute of Medical Research. When I was there a couple of days ago, I saw ambulances trying to get across Murdoch Drive and I thought what fun they would be having with massive trucks lined up going both ways along that road. There is also Hearts West; the State Rehabilitation Service; Murdoch Police Station; Murdoch Fire Station; South Metropolitan TAFE; Wandoo Rehabilitation Prison; Melville State Emergency Service; Animal Resources Centre; Wesfarmers Chemicals, Energy and Fertilisers; Telethon7 Community Cinemas Murdoch; and Orthocell Ltd. The government is going to direct all that freight towards those businesses. All the users of those services, including ambulances, people who have just come out of hospital and people who are trying to get to medical appointments, will have to mix with the heavy freight on Roe Highway heading to Fremantle port. If the government wanted to think of the worst possible place to terminate Roe Highway, I think it has done a really cracking job of choosing it! Clearly, the way the government has done it will cause an enormous amount of difficulty and hardship.

The government has stated that the solution to the freight constraint into the port of Fremantle is to increase rail freight. Congratulations to the minister. As has been pointed out by the member for Bateman, the government has already achieved quite a significant input to rail freight. We know that rail freight will max out at 30 per cent. That is best practice. As we know, major ports in the world get rid of their rail freight to increase the freight capacity of their ports. At Antwerp harbour, which is the second largest port in the whole of Europe, there is no rail freight; it is all truck freight, and, in fact, it goes through the middle of the city. Antwerp has a very good road system that ensures that the traffic gets through there efficiently. Rail freight will max out. I have done a simple calculation. If freight is increased by about three per cent a year, in three years there will be a 36 per cent increase in freight. That is probably a reasonable estimate. I have seen higher estimates, but I have taken that to be a conservative estimate. If the government is successful in going from the 20-odd per cent that it is now at to 30 per cent, there will be an increase of 10 per cent in rail freight, so the other almost 30 per cent of freight will have to go on road. The government has no other choice. This is not a solution. At best, it will delay the build-up by three years or so.

[Member's time extended.]

Dr D.J. HONEY: It is a short-term delay; it is not a solution to the problem. We can expect a much more substantial increase in freight. Members will know that the Kwinana industrial area is going through quite a boom. There is a large number of mineral-processing operations outside of lithium occurring in that area. All that freight will be container freight going through the port of Fremantle, so there will be a substantial increase in freight.

As I have said, the concept of the outer harbour is at least 15 to 20 years away, and there is a good reason for that. Fremantle port is a public asset. We own it. The members of the public of Western Australia own that port. It is a multibillion-dollar asset. The Fremantle port profit is around \$100 million. An investor in an ordinary business would be looking at a return of about 10 per cent. I went to South Korea and Japan recently with the member for Churchlands and we talked to businesses there. Amongst the businesses we talked to were banks and investment companies, and we talked about their willingness to invest in major infrastructure projects in this state. They are looking for a return on that investment of one to two per cent. At the very least, Fremantle port is a multibillion-dollar asset owned by the public of Western Australia. Why would the government spend billions of dollars developing another port when, as we have heard in considerable detail today, Fremantle port has the capacity to expand probably four times, but at least three times? Surely a sensible and prudent government—we are told this by the Treasurer—that is keen to save money for the public of Western Australia would look to do everything it could to maximise the utilisation of an asset that the public of Western Australia owns; that is, Fremantle port. As I have pointed out, that can be done only if there is adequate road traffic into that port. I recognise the good work that the government has done to increase rail freight, but that cannot possibly cope with any reasonable estimate of an increase in freight through that port. If we do not do that, the converse is that it will cost jobs.

I will not have time to go through it all, but I thought it was fascinating that the core of the government's argument seems to be that it is an environmental issue. This is a really important project to save the environment. Is it not interesting that, on other infrastructure projects, the environment is not so important? Gosh, it will be interesting

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

to look into the future to see how all these other projects go. I happen to have—it is not a secret—the publicly available “Environmental impact assessment: Yanchep rail extension: Part 2—Eglinton station to Yanchep station” dated 24 August 2018, which is within the term of this government. On page 59, table 20, “Potential construction and operational impacts to flora and vegetation”, refers to the permanent loss of native vegetation, the permanent loss of threatened environmental communities, the permanent loss of priority environmental communities, the permanent loss of priority species and the permanent loss of bushland within Bush Forever site 289. Gosh, members opposite should get their protest groups and the rent-a-crowd they had for Roe 8 up there, because they will be working full time to save that one!

Let us have a look further in the report. It states that 62.32 hectares of vegetation will be compromised, including 51.19 hectares of remnant vegetation. I will not go through it all but it refers to 47.3 hectares of vegetation that is worth recovering. There is a significant portion of that within the development footprint. Hang on! The government is obsessed with the major capital project that is Metronet to extend the existing rail network, but in this case the environment is not a priority; it is not a reason to stop that project. The project will help some commuters but it will not do anything to improve traffic flow into Fremantle port. One of my favourite topics—the Minister for Planning knows this—is the government’s infill policy. Is it not fascinating how the environment is not so important for the infill policy? Boy; I could go on and on about this one—and I will!

Ms R. Saffioti: Tell us more about your trip to Japan, South Korea and Singapore.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Minister, I paid for that trip out of my pocket, unlike the ministers who swank around for half a day’s meeting in Doha and then go on a trip to Europe. No! We went over there and we worked hard. We met with businesses over there and learnt about what is important to this state. We learnt how terrified they are of this government.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe, through the Chair.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister for Transport! Thank you.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I am not quite sure about the Minister for Planning’s latest conspiracy theory. No doubt I will hear about it.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister! Thank you. Hansard has no hope of capturing any of this.

Dr D.J. HONEY: It was a pleasure to speak to people who care about developing economies around the world. Can I tell members how refreshing it was? One of the reasons —

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: We are worried about a loss of the environment.

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister!

Dr D.J. HONEY: They have got billions. There is a trillion dollars in Japan to invest if the minister wants to know. I will put her in contact with the right people and she can speak to them. Maybe she can develop the state.

Ms R. Saffioti: We’re not selling the port like you.

Dr D.J. HONEY: This is some sort of infantile verballing exercise. I am disappointed in the minister. She usually stretches things a little, but here she is going too far.

Members, I have only six minutes. I have a wealth of —

Several members interjected.

Point of Order

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I cannot hear what the member for Cottesloe is saying. There has been a steady stream of verbal abuse from the minister. I cannot hear the member on his feet. Could you help him, protect him, from the verbal abuse?

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr S.J. Price): Member for Riverton, that is not a point of order. I totally agree. I know that Hansard is having trouble hearing. Member for Cottesloe, do not engage if you do not want the interjection. Carry on.

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I do not mind constructive interjection—persistent is not too helpful. One of my favourite topics is the way this government is destroying Perth with its infill policy.

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Listen to the arithmetic, guys; you will enjoy it.

Perth comprises 642 000 hectares. A one per cent loss of tree canopy in Perth equates to 6 420 hectares. It is not 50, 60 or 100 hectares; it is 6 420 hectares of lost tree canopy. There is a great article in the *Stirling Times* that is headed “City of Stirling tree canopy target unachievable”. There is a general target in Perth of around 18 per cent. The City of Stirling is struggling to achieve 12 per cent; in fact, it is going backwards. Interestingly, the article states —

If these trends continue, many suburbs will lose between 50 per cent and 85 per cent of tree canopy on residential land in the next 10 years ...

I will dimension the size of the problem for members. If we assume that we have an 18 per cent coverage over the 642 000 hectares of Perth, a 50 per cent loss, which is what we are looking at—I have detailed reports but I do not have time to go through them—is 57 780 hectares of tree canopy lost in the next 10 years, which is almost 60 000 hectares of lost tree canopy in the next 10 years.

Dr A.D. Buti: Are you saying that’s due to infill?

Dr D.J. HONEY: Overwhelmingly. There are a number of studies —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Once this is over, I am happy to give the member for Armadale a detailed CSIRO report that analyses this and the change in tree canopy. We are talking about thousands of hectares of lost tree canopy. It is really important. A one per cent —

Dr A.D. Buti: What is urban sprawl?

Dr D.J. HONEY: No; it is infill. The member should read the articles. It is infill. It should be done in a way that does not destroy the trees, and that is the problem—infill is destroying trees and that is a fact.

Every one per cent loss of tree canopy in an area increases the average daily temperature by 0.6 degrees. I know that members opposite are wound up about global warming. This is global warming. In some areas in which people live, it is estimated that temperatures have increased by six or seven degrees because of infill—wall-to-wall houses. I accept that some government members are concerned about the environment, but if they are concerned about the environment, they should be concerned about that and look at something that is useful and that will have an impact on the environment and the flora and fauna in Perth, which is where our people live.

Let us look ahead in time. I get little whispers every now and then, like members opposite do. One of the whispers is that the Labor Party has had its eye on the Marshall Road lands in Whiteman Park for years. On 8 May 2007, Hon Giz Watson stopped the last Labor plan to turn that area into a housing development with a disallowance motion for planning changes. A little bird told me that as part of the Metronet project, the government is looking at taking 250 hectares—not 50 or 60 hectares—and turning it into concrete and cement to pay for its Metronet dream. If members opposite want to get excited about environmental projects, they should get their teeth into that. I will wait with bated breath to see what comes out of this, but if the little birds that have been talking to me are correct, the government is looking to turn 250 hectares into concrete and cement to pay for its wishful dream of Metronet. The truth is that all responsible commentators—whether it is Gareth Parker, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Western Australia or Peter de Kruijff from *The West Australian*—know that this is a foolhardy move. This is just a little bit of virtue signalling that will compromise the future of this state and jobs for Western Australia.

This government cares about jobs—well, not so much, because Western Australia has the highest unemployment rate in Australia with 90 000 people looking for jobs. The federal member for Tangney, Hon Ben Morton, tells us that \$1.2 billion is on the table for a shovel-ready project. Do members know what that equates to? It equates to

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

4 000 jobs in Western Australia. This government, in doing a little bit of virtue signalling, is saying, "I don't care about 4 000 jobs. I don't care about those poor people who can't feed themselves, who have lost their homes and who have had all of that hardship." I do not have the chance to go through the letter to the editor from Fred Affleck, who is a retired chairman of the Freight and Logistics Council of Western Australia, but he paints an excellent picture as to why this project should go ahead.

The Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018 is reckless and careless. It does not care about people's safety, it does not care about the wellbeing of people in Western Australia, it does not care about reducing greenhouse gases and it does not care about the impact on commerce and jobs. This bill deserves to be condemned and it should be thrown out of Parliament.

MS L. METTAM (Vasse) [5.58 pm]: Obviously, I have only a few minutes before the dinner break to begin my contribution to the debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. I join my colleagues in opposing this bill, which proposes to remove the road reserve for what has effectively been recognised as the continuation of Roe 8—a plan that as other members have pointed out represents 4 000 jobs for this state. Together with Roe 8 and Roe 9, it represents 10 000 jobs to Western Australia. The importance of jobs to the Western Australian economy is well recognised. The Western Australian economy is suffering from the second highest unemployment rate in the country. It is one thing for a government to halt a project after it is elected, but it is another thing to not take advantage of the \$1.2 billion in federal funding that is available for this road project. It is outrageous and irresponsible to delete this road reserve forever. Other members have already spoken about the process that has been obfuscated as a result of what has been proposed in the bill. An amendment to the metropolitan region scheme by legislation does not follow due process.

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Ms L. METTAM: I would like to continue my remarks and join the Liberal opposition in opposing the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018.

As I stated, the opposition will oppose this bill, which proposes to remove the road reserve for what has effectively been recognised as part of Roe 8. It is one thing to halt a project when elected to government and not access the \$1.2 billion in federal government funding that is currently on the table, but it outrageous and nothing short of irresponsible to delete a road reserve forever.

[Quorum formed.]

Ms L. METTAM: This legislation will amend the metropolitan region scheme, which does not follow normal or due process. It avoids the Western Australian Planning Commission's review of all the community submissions that would usually be made and also avoids the WAPC's consideration of the real merits of land use changes. This is the sort of due process that would normally be expected with the removal of a road reserve such as this, but due process has not been followed with the introduction of this bill.

This legislation will effectively lock Perth's southern suburbs into the congestion and road safety issues that it currently experiences, and it is anticipated that these conditions will only get worse as the Perth and Peel regions' populations grow to 3.5 million. The congestion issues will only get worse given that thousands of cars and trucks will in future have no other option but to continue travelling through Perth's southern suburbs.

The arguments for Roe 8 have always been solid. It is effectively about moving trucks off Leach Highway and supporting a safer, albeit growing and expanding, south metropolitan community. This bill represents a wasted opportunity to significantly reduce congestion, improve road safety and improve transport efficiency in terms of time and cost.

Other members have already spoken about the economic vandalism this bill represents, in part because of the \$1.2 billion that the federal government has on the table, given Roe 8's potentially great gains for the local community. When the project was first introduced in 2016, it was recognised as the most important project in Australia yet to commence, and it was competing against more than 90 other projects across the country. The project also had a cost-benefit ratio of 2.3. It is a longstanding commitment of the Liberal Party and has been a number one issue for the seats of Jandakot, Riverton and Bateman. At a federal level, it is also a number one issue in the seat of Tangney, which was reflected in a recent community survey that revealed that about 70 per cent of residents polled in Tangney supported the future progress of the Roe 8 and 9 projects.

Roe 8 has been part of the metropolitan region scheme since 1963. It was never any surprise that this project would be progressed because it was stage 8 of the Roe Highway project. It has been on the metropolitan region plan for 50 years, so this bill is effectively a measure for turning our back on this project. It would usually take

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

around two years to introduce a road reserve of this kind. As I stated earlier, the project has national recognition. In February 2016, Infrastructure Australia said that of the 93 infrastructure projects across the country, Roe 8 was the most important, given the great benefits to the surrounding communities, the obvious road safety benefits and the benefits to industry. Roe 8 was about supporting the development of activity in the southern suburbs surrounding Fiona Stanley Hospital. The land for Fiona Stanley Hospital was purchased by the Department of Health back in 1981 because of its close proximity to Kwinana Freeway and the proposed stage 8 of Roe Highway.

Despite the objections from members opposite about the cost of this section of the road, the current government has effectively supported access to Murdoch Drive by extending Roe 7 to the hospital precinct. The Liberal opposition stands with the community in support of an east–west link that could free up access to Perth Airport, Fiona Stanley Hospital and Murdoch University. As I have stated, the government has avoided a comprehensive process by turning its back on this important project.

Roe 8 is the missing link in the transport corridor between Muchea and the Fremantle inner harbour. It builds on the foundation of a freight link for the inner harbour and the outer harbour in the future. The Perth Freight Link in the south west metropolitan region was to comprise a four-lane carriageway extension of Roe Highway from Kwinana Freeway to Stock Road, and the proposed Fremantle tunnel to High Street, with two lanes extending from Canning Highway to the Fremantle inner harbour. The proposal that was originally on the table would have taken over 6 900 trucks and over 74 000 light vehicles off suburban roads, including Leach Highway. That would have overwhelmingly supported road safety objectives, as well as the amenity of the southern suburbs. It would have created a dedicated free-flowing route, bypassing 15 sets of traffic lights on Leach Highway and Stock Road, providing some real efficiency gains. Overall, the Roe 8 and Roe 9 projects together would have created 10 000 direct and indirect jobs for the people of Western Australia. As I have stated, jobs are important to the Western Australian economy, now more than ever. We have the second highest unemployment rate in the country. It is critical that the government commit to the growth of jobs and the support of the south metropolitan communities.

Apart from these obvious benefits, there was the benefit of support from the commonwealth. Although the former Liberal–National government committed \$500 million in the 2009–10 budget, there was an absence of federal funding during the Rudd–Gillard–Rudd years. It was of great value to see a federal coalition government announce and then maintain its commitment to Roe 8 and the Perth Freight Link, given its clear strategic importance to the people of this state. I will quote from an article from *The Sunday Times*, with a comment from Senator Mathias Cormann. He told the newspaper —

“In our 2019–20 Budget that commitment will continue to be recorded as a contingent liability in the Budget.”

Senator Cormann said the funding commitment would be triggered immediately if a WA government decided to proceed with the PFL project, which he described as a “critically important piece of economic infrastructure for WA and for the south-metropolitan region of Perth”.

It is critically important, as described by our federal Minister for Finance.

Road safety aspects of this project that the current government is turning its back on are overwhelming and obvious. They have been highlighted by Greg Martin, an independent engineer, who was funded by the South West Group of councils to produce a report titled “Transport and Traffic Implications of not Proceeding with Perth Freight Link and the Broader Economic and Social Consequences”. He wrote —

If the Perth Freight Link does not proceed, an immediate consequence is that heavy road freight between Kewdale/Forrestfield, Fremantle Port and Western Trade Coast and associated freight destinations will continue to mix with all other traffic west of Kwinana Freeway on the existing State and local road network.

This will exacerbate current and emerging congestion as the population grows in Perth and Peel by a further 1.5 million to 3.5 million in about 2050 and vehicular traffic increases on key roads in the South West Metropolitan Region.

The report also goes into what the alternatives could be, and outlines the challenges of the alternatives to the Perth Freight Link. For instance, the upgrading of Leach Highway between Kwinana Freeway and North Lake Road has challenges, with five signalised intersections, multiple business accesses, uncontrolled side streets and turning lanes. The report refers to the challenge of upgrading this stretch of Leach Highway and North Lake Road as an alternative, as this section of road has some of the most expensive commercial land in the city and presents challenges with grade separation, given the number of small businesses that would be impacted. Grade separation at the Leach Highway–Stock Road intersection would also be highly challenging and problematic, given the

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

topography of the area and the high level of commercial development. South Street also has its challenges, given the direct access for residential and commercial properties and the fact that there are few signalised intersections as well.

The area that is most challenged by road safety in this region is Leach Highway. Crash statistics for trucks along Leach Highway are between two and six times the metropolitan average. West of Kwinana Freeway, Leach Highway has in excess of 180 highway intersections and more than 20 road junctions without traffic light control, and eight bus stops, by which the heavy haulage vehicles are challenged, but also, quite obviously, those school communities. The member for Riverton has already talked about the fact that 5 000 students utilise this stretch of road. Some major schools, such as Rossmoyne Senior High School, Melville Senior High School, All Saints College and Shelley Primary School, share this stretch of road with these trucks, which experience crash statistics well above the metropolitan average—as I stated, two to six times the state average—while they are mixing with over 5 000 students a day trying to access these schools. Thirty-one per cent of crashes on Roe Highway between Kwinana Freeway and Willeri Drive currently involve heavy vehicles. Although the metropolitan crash average for heavy vehicles is 5.4 per cent, for Leach Highway, between Stirling Highway and Kwinana Freeway, the average is more than double that, at 11.1 per cent.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms L. METTAM: Between 2009 and 2013, 72 per cent of crashes on Leach Highway were rear-end collisions, which is significantly higher than the metropolitan average. This suggests congestion-related crashes. We are talking about a mix of families, communities, students going to those different schools—over 5 000 students—and heavy haulage vehicles experiencing a higher than average level of crashes.

This is not just about the communities of the south west metropolitan region; this is also about jobs and industry. The McGowan government has turned its back on a project that would have created over 10 000 direct and indirect jobs, if we include the Roe 8 and Roe 9 projects. There is an urgent need to provide efficient, safe and effective freight access across the metropolitan region, including the Kewdale and Forrestfield freight and logistics hub to the Fremantle inner harbour and the western trade coast and freight destinations, as highlighted in the Martin report as well. The Roe 8 project alone represented 4 000 direct and indirect jobs—500 jobs in construction and thousands of indirect jobs as well.

The project would support and put downward pressure on freight handling at Fremantle port, which is anticipated to satisfy demand for the next 20 years. Fremantle port has seen one of the highest rates of freight by rail in the world at what was originally 14 per cent, but I understand has grown to about 23 per cent. There has been a lot of support from the transport industry for the efficiency gains that Roe 8 proposed. It is a proposal that would have removed those traffic lights and improved the cost of doing business for the transport sector. I quote from Cam Dumesny in a recent article from ABC News written by Nicholas Perpitch about Roe 8 not progressing, and he states —

“It's bad and it's only going to get worse. This will be an increasing point of congestion, both for our industry and the community,” ...

I will talk now about the challenges for the environment and the environmental objections that were such a great feature of the Labor opposition's argument against this project when the Liberal-National government was in office. As the Leader of the Opposition has already stated, the protests were led by a group of professional protesters who had been involved also in the Tent Embassy in Canberra and in the James Price Point objections. It was held up under the former government as a result of court action undertaken by these environmental protesters. It effectively delayed this project for over a year. It was of some value that this court action failed, but it is worth pointing out the hypocrisy by the other side concerning the environmental objections about this project. The construction for Roe 8 would impact on only 0.49 per cent of the entire Beeliar wetlands. That 0.49 per cent is part of the 97.8 hectares that would be cleared for the Roe 8 project. The former state government would have acquired offsets of over 1 000 hectares, which would be equal to one and a half times the size of Kings Park. That would be the offset for land dedicated to the Carnaby's black cockatoo habitat at 624 hectares. In fact, the clearing that was undertaken as part of the beginning of this project happened in the existing road reserve. By removing the heavy haulage vehicles from those major roads, the project had the potential to reduce 450 000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent by 2031. As has largely been stated, it was a proposal to take those heavy haulage vehicles off the roads.

The hypocrisy of not supporting this project on the basis of environmental grounds has not been lost on many members of the public, particularly when projects such as the Thornlie-Cockburn and the Yanchep lines progress. They are both proposals by this government that involve removing pristine areas of Bush Forever. I point to a letter written by Garry Wainscott dated 3 June 2019, headed “Hypocritical climate change stance”, which states —

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

The word hypocrisy immediately came to mind when I read that our Premier, Mark McGowan, has warned that WA could go it alone on climate change if the Federal Government does not meet his demands ... This is a Premier who has blocked the relief of motorists and local residents from the carbon monoxide, particulate matter and other pollutants generated along “pollution alley”—Leach Highway—by blocking the development of Roe 8 and Roe 9.

With the need for Fremantle port increasing for at least another 25 years, and maybe much longer, the lack of progress on Roe 8 and Roe 9 not only is further increasing traffic congestion in the area, as well as for Cockburn and Fremantle residents, but also is endangering the health of both the motorists who use Leach Highway and the residents within at least 200m of Leach Highway from the increasing pollution.

Another resident, Vivien Murray, wrote a letter to the *Melville Times* titled “Save the lake”. She says that she is a senior who likes to walk in the Beeliar wetlands area and she wrote —

When the Roe 8-9 extension was started and the Barnett government promised, as part of the Roe 8 Extension Environmental review, to restore the lake and surrounding native wetlands by removing those weeds, I was among the many nature lovers who rejoiced.

The Federal Government also pledged \$1.2 billion to the highway extension ...

She states further on in relation to the now Premier —

History shows he won that election and millions of dollars were wasted in cancelling the contract to build the extension.

...

Hundreds of trucks belch out fumes on Leach Highway and Farrington Road and the weeds continue to choke the lake and the wetlands that sustain the black cockatoos' habitat.

Where are those Greenie activists now?

Vivien Murray wrote very well in that letter those concerns from an environmental perspective that are larger than life now given the pollution created and increasing on Leach Highway and the opportunities lost from the Beeliar wetlands.

As many members in this place have already stated, there is a significant amount of community objection to this Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill. Recent polling in the area illustrates 70 per cent support for Roe 8 and Roe 9, the Perth Freight Link project. Mayor Russell Aubrey states in the WAMN News that we have pushed for Roe Highway not just for road safety but for the amenity of our community. He thinks the construction of Roe 8 will increase driver leisure time and decrease congestion and said —

The future costs of congestion can be avoided as it is expected that there will be 50 per cent increase in traffic across our city between now and 2031.

In conclusion, as I have stated, I join my Liberal colleagues in opposing this bill. It is a proposal that is set to shut off an opportunity for the community of the southern suburbs of Perth. It will turn off the tap on an opportunity to address congestion in a meaningful way along the significant freight and community corridors. It will turn off the tap on an opportunity to improve road safety on Leach Highway in particular and put downward pressure on freight, something that has been acknowledged and supported by all areas of the transport sector. It is a key component of the integrated Perth Freight Link and it is critical for our industry, jobs and growth. We cannot afford to turn our backs on this opportunity to address the need for the Perth Freight Link. It is about growing jobs and supporting those 10 000 indirect and direct jobs in this state. It is about supporting industry and those south west metropolitan communities.

As has been stated in this place, when Roe 8 was first proposed in 2016, Infrastructure Australia said that it was the most important project in the country yet to commence. It is, honestly, quite outrageous that this government would turn its back on this opportunity to see this important project succeed. I will leave my comments there.

MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands) [7.28 pm]: It is great to see the Minister for Transport still in the chamber listening to all my colleagues' very well thought through speeches. It is great to see also the Deputy Premier, and the member for Fremantle, a cabinet minister, and the member for Bicton, all people who understand full well the importance of road infrastructure to our state.

The Minister for Transport often stands in this place and tells us that she loves building roads and how good this government is at building roads and partnering with our federal colleagues to build roads for Western Australia.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Unfortunately, she does not seem to be listening to what is being said on this side of the chamber. If the minister puts the *Hansard* transcripts under the pillow and sleeps on them, through some sort of neural osmosis, she may come around and start to see the benefits of not doing what she is professing to want to do with this bill. The Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018 is, quite frankly, an act of infrastructure planning vandalism. For the minister and for some of her colleagues, the remnants of any Labor caucus—economic, social, environmental and road safety sensibility—has clearly acquiesced to the loony left again. She has acquiesced to the loony left because, as she has said in this place on many occasions, she is a proponent of strong road infrastructure, yet she is turning her back on what is clearly needed here.

The government professes to be a sound economic manager but it is not. It is nothing more than an opportunistic taker and this bill is an example of that. It takes the federal GST reform; it is quite happy to take all those billions of dollars. It takes industry-led royalty revenue streams; it is happy to take all those billions of dollars. It takes from families by increasing household fees and charges and increasing taxation when they need to be supported. The Labor government is very good at taking and getting itself to an operating surplus on the back of all that take, but here is one opportunity for it to give back to the people and the economy of Western Australia with a key piece of infrastructure, and it has failed. The minister has failed to provide the people of Western Australia—in particular, the people of the southern parts of metropolitan Perth—with a key economic piece of infrastructure that would have supported them.

She failed to look for a win-win solution on this project. The government could have enhanced environmental outcomes and connected people with the Beeliar wetlands region more cleverly through not only a world-leading, well-engineered road project, with the construction of effective bike paths and footpaths and nature access points, but also enhancing that whole environmental region. At the same time, it could have built a key piece of infrastructure. The minister also knew that she had tunnelling options up her sleeve that she could have looked at. She loves her tunnels; I have seen her out there with her tunnel borers. She has had problems with them, but I have seen her out there a bit. There have been a lot of photo ops with the hard hat and the tunnelling machines. She could have had another photo opportunity with a hard hat and a tunnelling machine on this project and looked after all those banksia trees on that very narrow strip, which is mostly sand because it is a high-voltage powerline access area. Regardless, she could have bored under it for that small section of wetland and had her photo taken in a hard hat. The minister obviously had the state-of-the-art bridging options that the former state government took forward with its plan that would have supported the environment, as we heard other members say.

What did the minister do? She chose the emotive option to acquiesce to the loony left at the expense of a sensible, thoughtful and constructive approach. Here we find ourselves today with this ridiculous bill. The history of this project does not go back to the Barnett government; it goes back to 1955. One of our upper house colleagues, Hon Simon O'Brien, very kindly provided the members on these benches and me with some of his notes. Let us look at that history. Gordon Stephenson in 1955 came up with what was to become the metropolitan planning region scheme. The southern and eastern sections of Roe 8 would be part of the ring-route around metropolitan Perth. Stephenson planned that to go through Fremantle and South Fremantle, along Marine Terrace and north to connect with Stirling Highway and the port of Fremantle.

Ms R. Saffioti: Through Cottesloe.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Stirling Highway was part of that ring-road back then.

Mr R.H. Cook interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: That was later. Then, of course, in 1974, Stirling Highway was extended to Canning Highway. In 1985, Stirling Highway was extended southwards from Canning Highway to High Street, which we know now. It was all part of that linking up of the ring-road system. We understand the need. Stephenson had a plan to extend down the railway line in through Cottesloe, down through that section near Bold Park, and to cut across the bottom nine of the Wembley Golf Course. That was another opportunity. It is now no longer on the transport plan because the government wants the road to come, as the Deputy Premier highlighted, under the river from Stock Road, popping up on the other side. There are other options. Now with tunnelling and engineering expertise, the government could certainly do some wonderful things, and the Beeliar wetlands was the first point.

A member interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Roe 8 is the missing piece of the jigsaw. The minister now thinks she has some gold. I am talking about Roe 8. Member for Cottesloe, she will try to turn this into some six-lane highway cutting through the Cottesloe and Churchlands electorates. We know that has been shelved. We know that is no longer viable because it is not an economically feasible option but that the Beeliar option, Roe 8, is. I will get to that in a minute.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Dr M.D. Nahan: It's fully funded too.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: It is fully funded as well. She will try to politicise it and pitch her class warfare against the western suburbs again. This has nothing to do with that. As members on this side of the house have already highlighted, the people in those southern suburbs most affected by the creation of Roe 8 are the supporters of it. They are not opposed to it. The minister in her reply speech will no doubt try to politicise it. We know that is what she is doing. Fast-forward to very recent days and we have a gentleman by the name of Greg Martin, AM, PSM, who completed, on behalf of the South West Group of councils, a report into Roe 8 for the government. To give members some background, he is a director and principal of Greg Martin Transport Strategies; a former representative of the Infrastructure Coordinating Committee of the Western Australian Planning Commission; a member of the WA Freight and Logistics Council; chair of the National Transport Commission; deputy chair of the Taxi Industry Board in Western Australia; a member of the WA Transport Policy Advisory Group, Western Australian Planning Commission; and until June 2011 he was professor of planning and transport studies at Curtin University and executive director of the Planning and Transport Research Centre. He is not a lightweight in reflecting on the pluses and minuses of Roe 8. In his report that he provided to the group of councils, he stated —

If the Perth Freight Link does not proceed, an immediate consequence is that heavy road freight between Kewdale/Forrestfield, Fremantle Port and Western Trade Coast and associated freight destinations will continue to mix with all other traffic west of Kwinana Freeway on the existing State and local road network.

This will exacerbate current and emerging congestion as the population grows in Perth and Peel by a further 1.5 million to 3.5 million in about 2050 and vehicular traffic increases on key roads in the South West Metropolitan Region.

He said about Leach Highway —

West of Kwinana Freeway, Leach Highway has in excess of 180 driveway connections, more than 20 road junctions without traffic light control, eight sets of traffic lights and 28 bus stops between Kwinana Freeway and Stock Road. Between 2009 and 2013 more than 72% of crashes on Leach Highway were rear-end collisions.

He highlighted —

Modelling suggests that average weekday traffic volumes on the cross section of High Street east of Stirling Highway will increase by almost 37 per cent between 2011 and 2031. 413 crashes occurred on the stretch of High Street between Stirling Highway and Carrington Street in the 5 years to December 2011. Around 56 per cent of crashes involved major damage to property and 76 crashes occurred where local roads intersect with High Street.

He highlighted the broader economic and social consequences. He states that they include —

Regional road network congestion affecting access and mobility for commuters, public transport services, emergency vehicles and active transport initiatives of walking and cycling

Constrained road capacity for east-west travel from home to jobs and activity centres

Effective reduction in the employee catchment for employers and job choices for employees

A constraint on expansion plans and investment in employment and activity centres

Reduced road freight productivity and freight efficiency due to “stop/start” urban traffic

Road based public transport forced to operate in the “whole of transport mix” on major roads

Disruption to progressing the integrated planning of public and private investment and development in the region

Reduce the potential comparative advantage of existing commercial and industrial infrastructure and business operations in the South West Metropolitan Region

Loss of State and local government revenue from expected up-valuing of property through improved amenity from general reduction in growth of traffic across the regional road network

Opportunity cost of the additional funding for new programs brought forward to compensate for the reduced level of service on the existing regional road network

He was very serious in his finding that if we stop Roe 8, that is what we will confront.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

He states also—other members have highlighted this fact —

By 2021, Roe 8 will reduce congestion and improve productivity and road safety by redistributing in excess of 6,900 trucks and 74,100 light vehicles per day from Farrington Road, South Street, Leach Highway and other local roads onto a dedicated free-flowing route. The Fremantle Tunnel option for the Perth Freight Link will enable the movement of approximately 4,700 trucks and 40,300 light vehicles, removing traffic congestion and reducing safety risks, on local roads ...

It is worth members opposite reflecting on what Greg Martin has highlighted in his report. They might then decide to vote with us and stop this ridiculous bill.

The Premier has postured and promoted himself, particularly to industry, as being a supporter of third party infrastructure recommendations. He prosecuted that case when he pushed through his Infrastructure WA Bill. Members on this side will well remember that. We have highlighted that albeit what the Premier has said, Infrastructure Western Australia will be very much a Ruffles-style kitchen cabinet approvals process for whatever Infrastructure WA invariably recommends to the Premier. It will be a Clayton's third-party recommendation group. The Premier will be able to pick and choose what he wants to listen to. He can blame Infrastructure WA if things are not going well and he does not want to be held accountable for that. He can also use Infrastructure Western Australia on a whim to try to drive through the changes that he wants. He will get a bet both ways.

I turn now to what Infrastructure Australia, the national body, said about Roe 8 in its 2014–15 assessment brief on the Perth Freight Link project. I will highlight some key elements. It states that the capital cost of the initiative by the proponent was \$1.742 billion. It states also that the commonwealth capital contribution sought by the proponent was \$925 million, the state government capital contribution was \$275.5 million, and the private sector capital contribution was \$374.5 million, initially financed by the state government.

Ms S.F. McGurk: That was to be recouped using tolls.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Let me get to that. It states also that it would be a high-level development and implementation program, with construction commencement on 1 November 2015 and construction completion on 30 June 2019. If that had succeeded, the project would have been done and dusted in four days' time, and the people of the southern suburbs would have been very happy. It states also that the project opening would be on 1 July 2019.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Like the Gateway project, it could have been delivered earlier.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Yes. The benefit–cost ratio that was attributed by Infrastructure Australia was 2.5:1.

The report states also that the project aligns with the following state strategic priorities —

- State Planning Strategy 2050 and Metropolitan Region Scheme;
- Directions 2031 and Beyond;
- Murdoch Specialised Activity Centre Structure;
- Draft Moving People Network Plan;
- WA Regional Freight Transport Network Plan;
- Draft Perth Freight Transport Network Plan;
- Draft State Port Strategic Plan; and
- Fremantle Port Inner Harbour Port Development Plan.

The report states, under “Problem assessment summary” —

There is currently heavy congestion and significant delays to freight journeys with Level of Service below D for many sections of the route. Impacts of this include inefficient freight movements which limits productivity and economic growth, higher than average crash rates involving heavy vehicles and dis-amenity for the nearby community.

The report states also, under “Overall assessment” —

Infrastructure Australia considers that the proponent has provided good evidence that access to port gateways in Perth is a nationally significant problem. In addition, Infrastructure Australia has a high level of confidence that the proposed solution will deliver net economic benefits.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

If that same report about a project had been provided to the Premier by Infrastructure WA, he would say, “Yes. Good. Tick that off. Go and build it, because that is what industry wants.” This is an example of a third party that has given advice about what we need to do, yet the Premier is ignoring it. That is a real shame.

We have a specialist report prepared by Mr Greg Martin for the South West Group of Councils. We also have Infrastructure Australia’s 2014–15 assessment brief. Therefore, why was Roe 8 not built during the term of the Barnett Liberal government? Some members were in this place between 2008 and 2013, and some of us were in this place from 2013 onwards. People who read *Hansard* might say, “Given all those reasons to do it, why was it not built?” That is a fair question. We need to look at the legal history to understand what happened after Infrastructure Australia made that recommendation.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: The legal history is interesting. The government announced the project on 17 December 2014, for a start date of early 2016. The then state Minister for Environment gave conditional environmental approval to Roe 8 on 2 July 2015, so things were progressing. In 2016, the Supreme Court of Western Australia found the assessment of the project invalid. The state government requested that the Environmental Protection Authority re-assess the Roe 8 project, and it also appealed the Supreme Court decision. On 15 July 2016, the Court of Appeal overturned the Supreme Court’s decision, and the original EPA assessment and ministerial approval remained valid. Although the Supreme Court decision was overturned, that legal process took out a huge chunk of time for the government to get this done. It slowed everything up. On 16 December 2016, the High Court dealt with a counter opposition to the legal outcome, and declined to hear an appeal against the validation of environmental approvals for the Roe 8 project, so that was finally put to bed. However, that was at the eleventh hour. On 9 January 2017, the Federal Court decided to refuse an interim injunction on the construction of Roe 8. That would have enabled the government to finally get on with it. However, it was too late. It was January. The election was held two months later, and the Barnett government lost government.

The Barnett government did all the planning. It listened to the third party recommendations. It communicated as best it could with the community. However, that was against very strong headwinds and emotional protests. The protesters did not look at how much science, engineering, environmental protection and planning had gone into the project. All the constructive and thoughtful aspects of planning were drowned out by the emotive politicking of the Labor opposition at the time, to try to take advantage of the situation of the government of the day. It ignored the needs of the community. It ignored the needs of the economy of metropolitan Perth and Western Australia. It ignored the needs of the people who need this piece of road infrastructure. It particularly ignored the needs of the industries that need this road infrastructure. The new government came in and said that it would not do it. We know that the government was voted in by the people in a landslide, but we also know that in that process the government hoodwinked the voters of Western Australia because many Labor lies have since been uncovered. We know that the government said that there would be no new taxes and no increases in taxes. That is straight-up wrong. We know that the government said that increases in fees and charges would be kept in line with inflation. It threw that out the window. We know it said that there would be no privatisation, but away it went and privatised just about everything it could get its hands on.

Dr M.D. Nahan: No—commercialised.

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: That is right; it redefined “privatisation”.

Then the government said that its wages policy would be linked to inflation. Those workers voted in the government thinking, “Good; fair enough. We’ll have a wages policy linked to inflation”, but the government got rid of that.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Mr S.K. L’ESTRANGE: The list goes on. The government certainly won a landslide victory, but it did so, clearly, on a large number of false promises.

What happened to Labor’s so-called economic rationalists: the Premier, whose electorate is in Rockingham; the Deputy Premier, whose electorate is in Kwinana; the Minister for Housing, whose electorate is in Willagee; the Minister for Small Business, whose electorate is in Warnbro; the Minister for Corrective Services, whose electorate is in Cockburn; the Minister for Transport; Planning; and, of course, the Minister for Child Protection, the member for Fremantle? What happened to their need for this piece of road infrastructure to support their communities? Their electorates voted those members in and wanted those members to make decisions that would support them. What happened to that so-called group of economic rationalists? They were clearly gagged and tied up by caucus’s loony left. There is no other explanation for why they turned their backs on such a key piece of infrastructure —

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Ms S.F. McGurk interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: — unless they were held to ransom by the member for Fremantle, who is interjecting on me now, and no doubt the member for Morley, who was laughing earlier. The loony left and the right of the Labor Party are at war at the moment. We hear all about it. Whispers come from all over the place. We know they are at war. We know they are having troubles. But they are ignoring —

Mr R.R. Whitby interjected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: I include, too, the member for Baldivis. His community needs this road infrastructure, as does the community of the member for Bicton, who is sitting next to him. She ran a platform of opposing Roe 8.

Ms S.F. McGurk: And got elected.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: She got elected, no doubt off the back of all those Labor lies, member for Fremantle. We know what happens when Labor tells the truth about what it is going to do. We saw that at the federal election. The federal ALP leader, Bill Shorten, told the truth. He said, "I'm going to increase your taxes. I'm going to take your savings off you, and if you don't like it, don't vote for me." Guess what happened? They did not! What did your mob do? You said, "We won't play that playbook." Shorten should have listened to Mark McGowan. Members of the government said, "We're not going to do anything like that. We'll just do it when we get in", which is what the government did. It is highly likely, member for Fremantle, that that is the reason the member for Bicton got elected.

The people in government members' electorates will have an option at the next election to hold the government accountable for those lies. It is clear that all sense and sensibility have been lost on that side of the chamber. What has it been replaced by? The minister stood up and said that she is going to replace this magnificent piece of road infrastructure, which would not only have environmental positives in the way it would be constructed in opening up that section, but also give people who live in the area increased amenity and access to the area, which would have supported households et cetera. What did the minister come up with? She came up with a new intersection, a roundabout, a slip-road, a netball car park and a pipedream linked to an outer harbour. That is the alternative from this government. Throw out the \$1.9 billion infrastructure plan—bin that—and go on some journey to sell to the people of that area the idea that a couple of roundabouts, a car park and slip-road are going to fix the problem. That is the level of seriousness with which this government is taking infrastructure in Western Australia. On the one hand, the Premier stands up and says that the Infrastructure WA Bill will solve all these problems by improving certainty for industry and supporting industry, and that that is what industry wants, but, on the other hand, those opposite are clearly infrastructure vandals. They are not at all interested in good, constructive, productive, efficient, environmentally sensitive infrastructure planning. They trashed this road and want to replace it with a few bits and pieces, and make out and communicate that there is no problem—there is nothing to see and everything is okay. Well, it is not.

To conclude, government backbenchers and ministers have been in power for two years. The government has handed down three budgets. It has only one budget to go before the next election. That much is clear. Yet a lot of government members are still operating very much as though they are opposition shadow ministers and opposition members. They have not stepped up and realised that government is an adult endeavour that requires them to concentrate on the big picture needs of the community and the state, and not just attach themselves to bumper sticker slogans and protest groups that put them under a little bit of pressure. They need to think big picture; they need to be looking for win-win outcomes. Win-win outcomes do not mean building a road that nobody wants because it is a bad road. Win-win outcomes mean building a road that has the support of the people around that road and the support of industry that needs that road. They should ensure that it is constructed in such a way that it mitigates all the concerns by using tunnels where tunnels are appropriate, and that environmental protections are created and maintained where they are needed. But they should still have their eye on the big picture—that is, making sure that the infrastructure being created has long-term benefits and brings the people they represent on the journey with them to support their endeavours. If the minister chooses to politicise this in any other way, she is not playing adult government; she is just playing cheap politics.

Creativity is needed here. The former government tried to be creative. It tried to address all concerns, but that was just washed out in the protest debate. It tried to look for creativity—that is what this government should look for—to cater for the economic, social, environmental and safety requirements of the project. The minister needs to take a responsible and mature approach, and she needs to apply that to this project. To simply get rid of this land from the metropolitan region scheme forever is infrastructure economic vandalism. The government has chosen to ignore advice. If the government does not vote with us, it has chosen to ignore our advice and the advice of expert third party professionals in this field. The outcome that the government is trying to achieve today will be tested at

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

the 2021 election. We will, as the Leader of the Opposition has outlined, make this a key aspect of our commitments at the next election. The people in the seats of those ministers and members will hold them to account for not looking after them in looking for a win-win solution that can build good, constructive, productive, sensible infrastructure that is supported by the community and the people it is there to serve.

MR J.E. McGRATH (South Perth) [7.58 pm]: I rise to say a few words about the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. I do so as a former Fremantle resident and as someone who has used Leach Highway a lot. I go to Fremantle quite a bit. I have found that the shortest way for me to go to East Fremantle Oval is to go down Leach Highway, but I often take Canning Highway, which can be a bit of a car park on a Saturday. I find it frustrating to use Leach Highway.

I start my remarks by remembering the late Trevor Sprigg. He and I were elected in the same election in 2005. We sat at the back of the chamber and Sprigg was on about Roe 8 all the time. I asked him what Roe 8 was. I was worried about Canning Highway in South Perth and the traffic in my electorate. He said, "We've got to have Roe 8." He was on about it constantly and said that his constituents wanted Roe 8 built. Unfortunately, Trevor passed away in January 2008. If he came back to this place today in 2019 and found that even though we won government in 2008, we failed to deliver Roe 8, he would be disappointed. I know there were a lot of complications with the process in general, but I think the Barnett government left it all too late. We cannot leave projects such as this until the eve of an election. It became too problematic.

I think it is a good project. I saw the original drawings. I grew up in Hamilton Hill and went to Bibra Lake and places like that. We spent a lot of time in that area as young people. I understand the sensitivities around the Beeliar wetlands. After looking at the drawings and seeing how the road would be lifted and how the flora and fauna could still exist underneath it, I felt it was a pretty good engineering outcome. But as the member for Churchlands just informed us and reiterated, with those court cases and appeals very close to the election, it became very problematic. Labor won the election. I am not really sure that Labor won the last state election on Roe 8. It might have been a bit of a factor. Given the mood of the public, Labor would have won those seats anyway. The public wanted change. Labor was swept in and given a massive mandate. Personally, I am not sure that Labor won the election on Roe 8; I think it won it on a lot of things. I do not want to go into it. It was a massive election win. Now Labor is going ahead and it wants to preserve the wetlands. It is in government and that is its right.

I agree with the upper house member, Hon Aaron Stonehouse. He said that he does not think he will support this legislation because he feels that the government of the day has stopped the project and it is not going ahead. Another government might get in one day. It might be here for two terms. We might win the next election; who knows? The government does not really need to do this. It has won the day. The project is not going ahead. The government is not taking the federal funding. It will widen Leach Highway between Stock Road and Stirling Highway. It will take out the first tee at Royal Fremantle Golf Club. I am surprised that the golf club has not complained about that. Golf club members would normally march in the streets if they knew that half their fairway would be taken away. I think the government has done a bit of a deal with them. They are going to get a new clubhouse, so the government has been pretty smart.

Let us talk about my history with the Fremantle port. I always believed that we should be looking for an outer harbour. If we travel the world, we see that all major cities have put their container terminals somewhere else. The big ocean liners come into Sydney's Circular Quay and Darling Harbour, and there is no container terminal. I think that is the way of the future. My worry is that it will take a long time. I think it will happen one day, but it is a question of timing. I was in favour of selling off north wharf, building apartments and having 5 000 or 6 000 people living there. It would be very vibrant. The big cruise ships would come in and Fremantle would be revitalised. I went to an event in Fremantle. It might have been Remembrance Day. I was on Monument Hill. I looked down at the harbour and saw all the containers and the ships and I thought that we should leave it as it is. It is a working port. That is my view. One day it will not be a working port. We know that will happen. What will happen in the meantime? This is the big challenge for the government. The Westport Taskforce is looking at what can happen out there in Cockburn Sound. It is a massive project. The government has now taken action to draw a line through the Perth Freight Link project. It still does not have certainty from the task force it has put in place to say, "Let's go. We can do it now." In fact, the latest Westport Taskforce report states —

Fremantle is already highly productive, handling 1,003 ships and 769,686 TEUs in 2017/18. This port could potentially handle more than double this number of containers and more passenger ships.

It also states —

... significant increases to road and rail freight capacity servicing the port.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

It is saying that the port has a lot of life left in it and, if we keep the port going, which will obviously happen, a lot more road and rail freight will service that port. The railway is obviously not an issue, but road traffic is an issue. Leach Highway is a very busy road.

Let us look at the background of this. I want to talk about Gordon Stephenson. He was an amazing man. In the 1950s, the government of the day—I do not know whether it was a Liberal or Labor government or who the Premier was—brought him out from Scotland and he drew up a plan for our city. In that plan, minister, he said that we should have a stadium for 80 000 people and it should be on Burswood Island. He said that back in the 50s. What a great Premier or Prime Minister he would have been. He had vision. That was his vision. He also did the ring roads. Ring roads are important. All big cities have had to construct ring roads because we cannot continue to allow traffic through heavily populated areas. When Jeff Kennett was the Premier of Victoria, he did the ring roads and the bridges. If people wanted to travel from Hawthorn to the airport, they had to drive through the city. If we wanted to travel from Perth Airport to Scarborough, where the Leader of the Opposition lives, we had to drive down St Georges Terrace. Now we have the Graham “Polly” Farmer Freeway and the tunnel—a great Liberal project.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: I did it for 10 years, member, to and from work, and missed the tunnel by four months.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: These are the challenges for the government. It obviously has a plan. It wants to widen Leach Highway down at the skinny end where it goes past Royal Fremantle Golf Club. Who knows? It may work.

I have been swimming at Port Beach lately. I am really out of form at the moment. I started at Port Beach and now the beach has been shut down. I do not know whether the whales complained or the sharks, but I cannot swim at my beach anymore because it has shut down. The government does not have to worry about my traffic going down to Port Beach.

Dr M.D. Nahan: What did you do—jump in and cause erosion?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Please, stop it.

Mr A. Krsticevic: How quickly were you moving up and down that coastline?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: They are very cruel.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you need protection?

Mr J.E. McGRATH: At least I go out and swim with the sharks. I do not worry about a shark net. I do not want any protection. I just swim. It is the sharks' water.

I notice the trucks on that bridge. One after another after another, they head over the bridge, down to Marmion Street and then up Leach Highway. There are a lot of trucks. It is a big problem. If the Perth Freight Link project had gone ahead, it would have solved all those problems. It is interesting to note that Professor Stephenson planned for Roe Highway to continue westwards through South Fremantle and along Marine Terrace. All those big trucks would have run past Cicerello's on Marine Terrace. Obviously, we could not do that today, but back in the 1950s, there would not have been that many houses there. Then it was changed and Stirling Highway was extended over the Swan River towards Canning Highway, and later on it was extended further. There was always going to be an outcome, but we never quite got to it. I remember when we were in opposition and the then Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, Hon Alannah MacTiernan, sold off the area that was known as the Fremantle eastern bypass. Before that election, we were telling people, “Don't buy there”, but they did, and that land disappeared. Under the original Fremantle bypass plan, eight kilometres of east–west road reservation was proclaimed and that was going to be Roe 8. I think it was going to go somewhere up near Winterfold Road, which is very close to where I used to live, so my house might have been demolished. It was not a very valuable house, but the bulldozers would have come in and we probably would not have complained about it because we would have got a better place!

That is a little bit of background on why this has for a long time been a very contentious issue. I know the McGowan government believes it has a mandate to save the Beeliar wetlands, but if a poll were to be held today, I think we would find that the people in the electorates around there would support Roe 8. As members have said, some polling was done and about 70 per cent of those polled said that yes, they wanted it; only 20 per cent were totally against it; and the other 10 per cent were obviously undecided. There is support for it, and I think it will become a big election issue in that area at the next election. As I said, I do not think the government won those seats because of Roe 8; I think it won them because of other issues, but people are getting sick of the traffic and trucks on Leach Highway. When one drives on Leach Highway, or any highway, trucks cannot slow down quickly behind people. They are on a set speed and they just keep driving at that speed. They are not driving over the speed

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

limit, but they are driving at a set speed. I note that according to the statistics, most road crashes are rear-enders. People get to a set of lights, suddenly there is traffic backing up, and we get this rear-end situation.

I do not think this issue is going to go away. Congestion is becoming an issue for many areas in our city. As I said before, when people cross Canning Bridge and start driving up Canning Highway towards Fremantle, it becomes a very busy road. Our population is growing, so we have to expect that. Our planners and engineers in Main Roads have to prepare for easing congestion. Obviously they work for the government of the day, but I do not know what they privately think about whether this can work. Personally, I do not think we need to support this legislation. In fact, the opposition is not supporting it, because I do not think the government really needs to do it.

In her second reading speech, the minister said —

... we committed to reserve the Beelias wetlands for generations to come.

That is a very noble sentiment, but I do not think the Beelias wetlands would necessarily have been destroyed. There is quite a bit of wetland, and I do not think Perth Freight Link would have gone through a lot of it. From what I am told, a lot of the wetlands would not have been affected by it. The minister said that the government is going to amend the zoning under the metropolitan region scheme from primary regional roads to parks and recreation. That is fairly noble—to give people parks and recreation—but should it come at the cost of a transport system that is under a lot of stress? The minister also said —

Land for Roe 8 and 9 was reserved in the metropolitan region scheme in 1963.

So now we are saying to Professor Stephenson, “You did some wonderful things for Perth, professor, but this is one you couldn’t quite get through.” It was a plan for a link all around the city from Muchea, winding down along Roe Highway, and ending up at Fremantle port.

[Member’s time extended.]

Mr J.E. McGRATH: When I ask for a brief extension, I will not use all my time!

The minister said —

Western Australians have given us a clear mandate to not build Roe 8 and 9, and to restore the Beelias wetlands and return them to the community to enjoy.

The point we are making as the opposition is that we do not think the Beelias wetlands would have been completely destroyed. It still could have been there for the people of that area to enjoy. The minister continued —

Beelias Regional Park also has cultural significance to Aboriginal people, particularly North Lake and Bibra Lake, which have spiritual importance.

I did not realise that when we used to go to Bibra Lake as kids and ride horses at Devine’s and places like that—the riding schools. Mind you, we had to walk through about five kays of bush to get there—there were no roads—and I did not realise it had Aboriginal significance. That is something that I do not think has been mentioned tonight. I will be interested if the minister, in her reply, could tell us what that significance is. The minister also said —

... the at-risk section of Beelias wetlands, the rehabilitation of which is ongoing, will be protected sooner ...

By doing so through this bill, rather than by amending the metropolitan region scheme.

It is a very interesting conversation that we are having on this issue. The minister is in government and she has made her decision; we are in opposition and we did not get that project through when in government. I think that when projects are contentious, governments have to get them through early in their term. It is no good leaving it until the eleventh hour because it will become too difficult, and we needed to get it through earlier.

Ms R. Saffioti: Like the on-ramp!

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Like the on-ramp. The on-ramp is going to happen, but the minister will be delivering it. I hope she will invite me; I do not even want to cut the ribbon, but I will be there!

Ms R. Saffioti: Because those clubhouses aren’t enough!

Mr J.E. McGRATH: Yes! I have talked to my colleagues about election slogans, and someone in the Liberal Party thought up “The Bill Australia Can’t Afford”; that was a masterstroke. The one the state Labor Party came up with was the “Road to Nowhere”—the road that stopped at Stock Road, and then people have to turn around and go down past D’Orsogna’s—and it worked. We were accused of coming up with a project that was going to deliver a road to nowhere. Fancy a government like ours being accused of building a major project that was going to end

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

up nowhere—in the middle of the bush, or something! I do not know who thought up that one; obviously the minister did not, because she is not claiming it!

I will be interested to hear the minister's answers to some of the questions that have been raised tonight. We will be opposing the legislation. I doubt the minister will get it through the upper house. I have not spoken to members there, but I think it will be a tough one to get through.

Mrs L.M. Harvey: Like the TAB.

Mr J.E. McGRATH: We will get the TAB through; that will go through. But I think this will be very interesting, and I will be interested to hear the minister's explanation for why she wants to progress this, because she does not have to. She could have just said, "Oh well, it's not happening; we're not going to take the money off the federal government", but she wants to do this. Whether it is because she wants to stop the Libs from going ahead with the project when we win the next election, or whether she has another reason, I will be interested to hear what she has to say.

MR Z.R.F. KIRKUP (Dawesville) [8.19 pm]: I join with other opposition members in speaking against the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. It is always difficult to follow the very considered conversation of the member for South Perth. He is exceptionally well researched, and it is like a family member speaking to us all in the chamber. He takes on a higher credibility in everything he contributes to this place. I appreciate his contribution. It is that little bit more cutting when it is not so political, but "considered" is the term that I would probably continue to use. The central part of my contribution adds to that of the member for South Perth; that is, why has this piece of legislation been presented to this house? For the same reasons that he has outlined, the member for South Perth raised the question of why this piece of legislation is being brought before us today. I will probably echo his points, and I will find myself agreeing with him throughout my speech. Perhaps a lot of the previous state election issues were conflated in Roe 8 and Roe 9. The Leader of the Opposition raised the point that people in the southern seats were not necessarily voting against the project, but were more likely to be voting against the government of the day. Perhaps this legislation is the conflation of the two issues. I do not understand why we have this bill before us, because this has been part of the plan since 1963, which was the year the reserve was first set aside.

Ms S.F. McGurk: That might be a clue, member, what you just said.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Because it was from 1963?

Ms S.F. McGurk: It was a very good year.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: As good a year as that was—it was the year that Kennedy died, though—it was the year that the member for Fremantle was born, which means it was a great year.

Mr D.T. Redman interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The member for Warren–Blackwood was born in the same year—there we go.

The member for Fremantle will appreciate that much of Perth has been planned around this, and so we had in place the skeleton of the infrastructure on which a lot of our transport links have been based for some time, as part of the Stephenson–Hepburn plan. The member for Nedlands pointed out the ring-road concept. He and I were talking about that when I worked in the former Premier's office. He was always an advocate for the ring-road concept, and making sure that we saw the culmination of that plan to its final purpose—to make sure that we had these links right the way through the city. I do not think that this bill makes for an efficient transport network, but I appreciate that the government has its own prerogatives in that respect. I do not think this bill makes a lot of sense from a planning perspective. If we are protecting the wetlands, the argument is that only a very small percentage of the wetlands would have been impacted and, as the member for Bateman pointed out, perhaps it may have been more environmentally enriched by a project like this, had it proceeded. I do not think this helps the employment situation at all. This is something I will be discussing in great detail in relation to Mandurah, in particular. I go back to the concluding point of the member for South Perth, and the starting point of my contribution: why do we have this piece of legislation before us? It is trying to achieve an entirely political goal. Would the government be better off naming this bill, not the "MRS Beeliar wetlands bill 2019", but the "save the seat of Bicton bill 2019"? We will get to that later on.

The first point I would like to get through is that it does not make economic sense. A number of people in my electorate were employed on this project when this contract was torn up. I remember when the former Premier visited them. Some of those people who were my constituents had jobs there. As the member for Vasse pointed out, Roe 8 and 9 would have contributed to somewhere around 10 000 direct and indirect jobs. When we have an

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

unemployment situation in Mandurah of between seven and eight per cent, and a youth unemployment rate of 20-plus per cent, we want to see as many infrastructure projects being built as possible. Roe 8 and Roe 9 would have meant that people in Mandurah in particular would have been very close, and able to go up the road and work on an important infrastructure project for our state. The economics of this do not make a lot of sense. We know it would create quite a few jobs. Legislation that blocks what can only be described as a shovel-ready project is disappointing, because it would have created so many jobs.

This seems to be a bit of a trend. We saw federal government money being set aside for Roe 8 and Roe 9, and the state government not coming to the party. We see many projects funded by the federal government that are not being funded at all by the state government. The Ellenbrook rail extension is funded entirely by the federal government, as well as the relocation of the Midland train station, the extension of the Midland line, the Byford extension, Tonkin Highway and Mitchell Freeway—all are funded by the feds, and I am not aware of any state government funding going towards them. Certainly, it is not booked at the moment, and they seem to me like important job-creating projects. The Labor Party went to the election in 2017 saying it would be the party of jobs, and now it wants to tear up contracts that would have created, as with Roe 8 and 9, 10 000-plus direct and indirect jobs. In an area like Mandurah, which is suffering from high rates of unemployment, that would have been very important. Some people in my seat, particularly in the suburb of Falcon, were working on the project already, and they were obviously retrenched, and some did not move on to other projects. I realise that some were moved on to the Murdoch interchange project, but it is not the 10 000 jobs that would have been created as part of Roe 8 and Roe 9.

Seeing the government not accessing the \$1.2 billion set aside by the feds is a significant concern, but to delete the road reserve forever is a fundamental change in what I believe is acceptable behaviour by the state government. The member for South Perth rightly points out the government can change its infrastructure priorities as it sees fit, as is its prerogative. If there is an election situation in which it believes that a particular member, probably in the seat of Bicton, was elected on the basis of the project not proceeding, although that is probably the wrong interpretation, I can understand why the government would choose not to access that funding. However, to cancel and delete the reserve entirely is a very dangerous road to go down. The member for Cottesloe rightly called this legislation reckless, and I absolutely agree with that. It is particularly reckless in this case.

We know that building Roe 8 and 9 will mean fewer trucks and cars and fewer accidents on local roads in the suburbs that it will impact. The member for Riverton has pointed out some of those areas in particular as part of his lead contribution here. I know that for people coming from my area up to Perth, it would make for easier access to the airport, for instance, or Murdoch University. It will ease up traffic around those areas and reduce congestion, which I think is pretty important. The member for Riverton pointed out that it would remove, I think, 14 sets of lights along the way. It would be important to anyone seeing nearly two accidents a day occurring on those stretches of roads. We must do everything we can to make sure that there is free-flowing traffic through Leach Highway and Stock Road. That would make a lot of sense from a safety, economic and employment perspective, when we would have seen 10 000 new jobs created, and congestion significantly reduced. That is a really important contribution, and I do not quite understand why the government is proceeding with this.

We recognise that this project is identified by Infrastructure Australia as one of the highest transport priorities in the nation. The majority of the traffic would be reduced, as I said. Twelve and a half minutes would be saved on travelling between Kwinana Freeway and Fremantle. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that time not spent in a vehicle is time that can be spent with families. That 25 minutes, both ways, is a pretty good saving, I would think, spread over a year. There is a lot more time that can be enjoyed with friends and family, not being stuck in traffic. We all know the importance of the 14 sets of lights between Leach Highway and Stock Road. Members have spoken about the environmental consequences as well. The member for Cottesloe in particular spoke about the environmental impact. To me, given only 0.49 per cent of the Beeliiar wetlands impacted would be impacted by Roe, deleting this reserve to save 0.49 per cent is an unusual priority.

I think a lot of the issues we heard about during the 2017 election, particularly the environmental issues, were raised largely in a hostile manner during the campaign. I think there was a lot of militancy and militant environmental groups who were, effectively, professional protesters who, as the Leader of the Opposition —

Mr P.C. Tinley interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I am not dismissing them, member for Willagee. I do not dismiss those who had legitimate concerns. However, I think it is important that if professional protestors bolstered the number of people who had their own local concerns, and, as we saw, professional protesters came down from James Price Point or somewhere else to protest about 0.49 per cent, that is probably —

Mr A. Krsticevic: Overkill.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Yes, member for Carine, it is certainly overkill. That is a very good point.

Considering especially that the overall environmental impact would have been, I think, 450 000 tonnes of CO₂ emissions being reduced between now and 2031, the overall environmental impact would probably be better if there were a more direct route. Environmental concerns were raised about 0.49 of one per cent of the wetlands, yet the environmental impacts of the reduced carbon emissions alone would be something worth investigating by any government that has responsible concerns about environmental sensitivities. As I think the member for Cottesloe pointed out, a lot of the land has already been set aside due to the overhead powerlines there. Again, the impact would have been minimal. The restoration projects to improve the degraded areas of, I believe, North Lake and Horse Paddock Swamp would have been very important. The amount of \$45 million had already been invested to accommodate those environmental sensitivities. I do not think we would have seen the significant environmental impact that was proposed through social media and environmental activist groups. A lot of those issues became heated in what was an important election and where we probably did not get our message out as thoroughly as we could have because, as the member for South Perth discussed, a lot of other issues came around in the 2017 election. We simply did not have the time to properly prosecute them.

Dr A.D. Buti: Excuses, excuses!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Member for Armadale, I think that is important recognition of why this bill is in front of us. I genuinely believe that the government does not have a mandate to do this. I think there is a lot of wash-up in this. When it comes to the seat, the person who knows that area best is likely the member for Riverton. He knows that. I will tell members that the member for Riverton did not just win his seat by 64 votes in 2008, an outstanding result I would say, aided by a great headquarters at the time, but also —

Ms R. Saffioti: When he promised Roe 8.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: In 2008.

Ms R. Saffioti: And did nothing for eight years.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Sure. He won by 64 votes. I appreciate the Minister for Transport's interjection.

Of all Liberals in Parliament in 2017, I believe the member for Riverton had one of the smallest swings against him. I would largely say that is because he knows his area best and the impacts something like Roe 8 and Roe 9 would have had on his seat. We saw a swing against him much smaller than a swing against any other Liberal member. If there was such a mandate for somewhere like the seat of Bicton for that, we would have seen the flow-on results of that in the seat of Riverton.

Several members interjected.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I know, but for what we have here, the member for Riverton knows that area best, member for Armadale. We heard him earlier today make what I think was an extremely considered contribution about why this bill before us is wrong. He justified the reasons for us to stand against it. I do not believe for a second —

Ms S.F. McGurk: Do you accept that it is bad government to move one community's problem onto another community?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I think, member for Fremantle, that if something has been outlined for decades to have been occurring, it is best to proceed with it to give certainty to those communities. If we want to talk about shifting the blame, how about shifting it intergenerationally? That is exactly what is happening now. We have had something that has been set in for a long period and now, because the Labor Party won the seat of Bicton, it is seeking to get rid of decades worth of planning for an area.

Ms R. Saffioti: Why did you reduce the six lanes to four lanes? Why did you reduce the Stirling Highway reservation?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I cannot claim for a second to be as in touch with important transport issues as the Minister for Transport but I do not believe that she has an electoral mandate for this bill to come to this place and be passed. I think she will see quite a lot of hostility towards it in the upper house, perhaps, but again, we cannot judge what those in the other place might do. However, I think it is important that people scrutinise this bill properly. I am aware that a number of members of the South Metropolitan Region have concerns that they have aired publicly and it will be very interesting to see how far this bill progresses.

As I said at the start of my contribution, perhaps this bill will be best named the "Save the Seat of Bicton Bill 2019". That seems more appropriate. If we look at the federal results, we will see that the seat of Bicton went from 2.9 per cent Labor to become a 3.9 per cent Liberal held seat. The seat is already ours based on the federal Liberal result.

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: If we look at the result in Darling Range, member for Armadale, that seat would be ours by a greater majority. The most recent state poll in the Darling Range by-election or the last federal poll when people went to an election basing their decisions on a Labor versus Liberal contest, the seat of Bicton by both measures would be with the Liberal Party. Importantly, when we look at those booths in the federal election, there is a telling indicator. The member for Tangney, now Hon Ben Morton, given he is an assistant minister—he would have been Mr Ben Morton, but he is honourable and, I understand, honourable for life—campaigning on this during his election. I am certain he was aided by the member for Riverton. Let us go through some of the booth results in the federal election along the strip where Roe 8 and Roe 9 would have had a significant impact. We see that all the booths through the Roe 8 and Roe 9 suburbs, had a swing towards the Liberal Party by a margin —

Ms R. Saffioti: Go through each booth.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I will. I am happy for my figures to be pointed out as being wrong but the vast majority I have in front of me, Minister for Transport, show that in the federal election places like Beeliar West, Bibra Lake, Success North, Beeliar, Success South, South Lake and South Lake East all had a swing towards the Liberal Party.

Dr A.D. Buti: Do you think it is due to Roe 8?

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I would argue, member for Armadale, that if the federal member for Tangney campaigned on the basis that he would see the Roe 8 and Roe 9 projects funded and people voted in favour of him with an increased majority —

Dr A.D. Buti: You are joking. Did people in Pearce vote on Roe 8?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Armadale and member for Dawesville and anyone else who is yelling, member for Carine. I call you for the first time, member for Armadale. Go ahead member for Dawesville.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate your protection, Deputy Speaker. What I suggested before the member for Armadale got very excited, was that in the seat of Tangney where there was a range of booths and the member was campaigning on the basis of making sure he would do his best to ensure Roe 8 and Roe 9 were funded, we saw swings towards the Liberal Party in suburbs and at polling booths that were affected by that project.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: In the words of the member for South Perth, it will be a small extension, but we will see how we go.

To me, the Roe 8 suburbs, as we call them, were above the more modest swings achieved across the rest of the federal division between 0.5 and two per cent. I suggest that when a federal member prosecutes this case together with an outstanding state member, the member for Riverton, and people vote for the Liberal Party with a number higher than the average across the rest of the seats, that shows endorsement for the project proceeding. That is what he wanted to achieve.

I would like to reinforce also that, recently, the Premier put an announcement on his Facebook page. I point members to a number of comments on that Facebook page. People who voted Labor at the last state election, the member for Bicton will be interested to know, said that they did not vote for Labor based on Roe 8 and Roe 9; in fact, they want them to proceed. I suspect that will be the crux of the problem when it comes to the member for Bicton's seat in 628 days' time. I think that is the problem she will have because this legislation before us conflates the result of the 2017 election and the Roe 8 and Roe 9 issue more broadly speaking. I remind members again that when a poll has been commissioned, as the member for Bateman pointed out, by the honourable member for Tangney, and given at the most recent federal election we saw higher than average swings to the Liberal Party and the rest of his seat in the Roe 8 suburbs, and when we hear from people like the member for Riverton, an area affected very strongly by this project, we listen to those members. We realise that what we are proceeding with in this bill is not something that relates to good governance or good policy. I suspect that as the member for South Perth pointed out, although the department and the agencies are serving the government of the day, it is unlikely they themselves agree with it.

I would not think that this bill should be before us in this place on any measure, except that the member for Bicton resides on the government benches. I have no doubt that the member for Bicton will be a ferocious defendant of this bill and publicise very, very broadly her support for this bill in her local media and on her social media, because I think she believes that is important to do. I promise members that Roe 8 and Roe 9 are very important projects for the state of Western Australia. Infrastructure WA knows it. The Liberal Party knows it. A number of members in the commonwealth government know it. Agencies know it. The community knows it more broadly speaking. Do not confuse the fact that the seat of Bicton —

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Several members interjected.

Ms R. Saffioti: You had eight years.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: A lot was done during that time, minister. Do not confuse the fact that just because the seat of Bicton sits on the treasury bench that that is an endorsement for Roe 8 and 9. It is not—not by any stretch of the imagination. The results reflect that. The poll that was commissioned reflects that. The public sentiment reflects that. The comments on the Premier's Facebook page reflect a large part of that. I do not think that this is a very good piece of legislation that is deserving of our time and the government's time. The opposition will not support it and I look forward to joining my colleagues in voting against this bill.

MRS A.K. HAYDEN (Darling Range) [8.42 pm]: I would like to join my colleagues to speak on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. It has been quite a nice few hours listening to the diverse reasons that this bill should not be passed through the chamber. The very question that the member for Dawesville started with his speech of "Why is this bill even before us?" has been echoed by all members on this side of the house. I think the minister has a few fun notes to take home with her. I think the member for Churchlands offered for her to sleep on *Hansard* overnight and, hopefully, it will seep through the pillow and she might convince herself to change. Good luck, member for Churchlands, on that wish! The member for Bateman gave an excellent description and showed his understanding of the environmental impact and all the lengths that were gone to in developing and planning this major piece of infrastructure that have just been simply ignored. It has gone through all the rigorous processes, got all the approvals and work had started, yet as other members have said here—I might not go as far as the member for Churchlands in saying that—the agenda to push the green vote and agenda base that we have seen from the government is quite extraordinary.

Mr J.E. McGrath interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I will not go as far as the member for Churchlands, but it is quite extraordinary. Not only do we see it here. The government is going ahead with a decision it made on the run to win any vote possible at the last election to get the green vote on side. We now see the Minister for Agriculture and Food running her green agenda on wanting to shut down live export trading when she is meant to be the Minister for Agriculture and Food, defending the farmers. Now the Minister for Transport is not supporting the transport industry. We are seeing ministers not representing the portfolios that they stand for and instead pushing a green agenda.

The biggest issue is that instead of looking at road safety, the transport industry, the safety of local families with all the driveways and schools along this stretch of road, the government is ignoring all of that and going ahead with what it thinks is its mandate to get rid of this strip of land for access to this road. I will go back in history for a moment. Let us look at the last piece of infrastructure this government delivered; it was the Mandurah train line by Hon Alannah MacTiernan in 2004 to 2007. In the same time frame, a piece of land was also sold off under the same minister and that was for the Abernethy Road–Lloyd Street extension through to Midland. We have seen the devastating effect that has had on the growth of Midland, the freight corridor and the whole area of the Perth hills and the farming sector. The government has had to take back land—wait for it to get up to sale and pay back the landowners—because the minister of the day under a Labor government got rid of a road reserve. It has taken years to get back that road reserve.

I do not know what the machinations are right now, but I am sure the Minister for Transport is still working on getting that Lloyd Street extension happening because I am sure that she realises, as the member for Midland realises, it is vital to the town centre of Midland. Here we are again, with a Labor government getting rid of a road reserve forever, which means governments of the future such as ours will have to come back in and reinstate this. Everybody knows that this infrastructure is vital. I know that members on the other side do not want to listen to all of us, but I would like to give members a third party endorsement on it all. The member for Cottesloe ran out of time to raise this issue, but I refer to an article by Professor Fred Affleck. I am sure that most members in this place know who Professor Fred Affleck is. For those who do not, he is the retired chairman of the Freight Logistics Council of Western Australia; former chairman of the Midland Redevelopment Authority; board member of the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority; Professor for Transport Studies at Murdoch and Curtin Universities; deputy chair of the Fremantle Port Authority and commissioner of the National Transport Commission. If anyone knows anything about transport and Roe 8 and Roe 9, it would be Professor Fred Affleck. For the benefit of members opposite, I will read his five reasons that he outlined in an opinion piece in *The West Australian* —

First, the Perth Freight Link—of which Roe 8 is a key part— is not an economically flawed project. Its benefits will outweigh its cost (not only financial costs) by 2½ times.

This is not just opinion or spin. It is the independent calculation of Infrastructure Australia, which lists it among the six highest priority major transport projects in Australia.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

It is in the top six in Australia for vital infrastructure projects, yet the government is ignoring that. He continues —

The benefits of this long-planned project will include reduced costs to move all kinds of freight to and from Fremantle port ...

Second, the Perth Freight Link will give many trucks incentive not to use roads where they cause unwanted congestion and safety hazards ...

Third, rail cannot be a substitute for most road transport to and from Fremantle Port.

He continues —

The reason is simple: rail cannot serve the many dispersed locations needing pick-ups and deliveries.

Fourth, Roe 8 will also be needed to connect a new Outer Harbour port in Cockburn Sound with Perth's inland freight handling centres and industrial areas. So bringing forward the construction of a new port will not eliminate the need for Roe 8.

Fifth, the Outer Harbour port will not be needed for many years. In any case, up to two decades will be needed to plan, design, fund and build it.

Professor Fred Affleck, with all his credentials, said that this project needs to be done and that the government should not be ignoring it. It goes back to the statement I said at the very beginning: the only reason we can imagine that this government is not going ahead with this is that it is pushing its green agenda, and that is it. It is ignoring congestion. It is ignoring creating jobs. It is ignoring its promises to improve safety. We all know that the Liberals will build Roe 8 and Roe 9. We all know that Labor will ignore the transport, road safety and congestion needs of the state. It will ignore its own mantra and its own promise of delivering jobs. How do we know this? It was reflected in the federal election results. Prime Minister Scott Morrison said that he would deliver Roe 8 and Roe 9. He has offered \$1.2 billion to the state government, which has said that it does not need \$1.2 billion. It rejected the investment. Bill Shorten went to the election saying that he would not deliver Roe 8, and look at the result.

The government thinks it has a mandate to deliver this, but it does not. As other members have said, the Labor Party's election win in 2017 was not on the cancellation of Roe 8–Roe 9. Many other factors played into that. Roe 8–Roe 9 is a piece of infrastructure that is vital to our transport industry and vital to reducing congestion. The government says it is about creating jobs. This project could lead to up to 10 000 jobs, and the government is ignoring that. The Minister for Road Safety has said that one of the government's prime objectives is to improve road safety. Today we heard on radio 6PR that in this year to date, this state has had the highest number of deaths on our roads in 10 years. That is occurring right now. We have a solution to improve road safety, and the government is totally ignoring that.

One of the other reasons for Roe 8–Roe 9 was noise. If members listen to their constituents, they would know that noise is one of the biggest issues that people who live along a main road complain about. That is why we spend money on putting up noise walls along our main freeways and highways. The community along High Street is complaining that it cannot deal with the noise. A study in 2009 showed that the average daytime measurement exceeded the acceptable threshold by 10 decibels, and the average night-time measurement exceeded the acceptable level by nine decibels. I assume it has increased a lot since that time. Although there was a difference of only one decibel between day and night, the problem is not just general motorists but also trucks getting to and from their destination. In 2014, there were over 7 000 truck movements along this stretch of road. I assume that has also increased.

Many members on this side are well aware that in 2008, I went on two long-haul truck trips, one on an oversize truck, and one on a three-trailer road train —

Mrs L.M. Harvey: A B-double

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: A B-double—I thank the Leader of the Opposition very much.

Mr M.J. Folkard interjected.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: It was three trailers, a B-double, under 36 metres long.

Those two trips were one year apart. The biggest issue on both trips was getting out of Fremantle and through metropolitan Perth after loading up the truck. Pilot vehicles were at the front and back of the truck to enable it to get through the traffic lights. As we have all heard, there are 21 sets of traffic lights along this stretch of road. The most stressful part of the trip was getting out of the city. Truck drivers have to deal with general motorists who do not want to get stuck behind them and do silly things like jump in front of them. When they get to a set of traffic lights, they have to get the pilot vehicles to close down the intersection to enable them to get through. That delays all the general motorist traffic, as well as the truck driver himself—or herself, because, in my case, one of the drivers was female. Truck drivers have to get through the general traffic, during the day, during peak hour, and

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

during the evening. However, there is a solution. When I did those trips, their biggest ask was that we please provide them with a safe transport route—a route that has fewer stops and goes; is safe, with good shoulders; and does not involve all the general traffic, with people picking up their kids from school, or going to the shops, and the nine-to-five peak-hour traffic. Roe 8–Roe 9 will deliver safety for our truck drivers and our transport industry. As Professor Fred Affleck said, we will never be able to get enough stock on rail to alleviate the number of trucks along the main arteries of Western Australia. We have too many destination points and too many pick-up points to enable rail to do that. Even if we were able to do that one day, it would be a long time down the track and would be a massive task. We have an answer and a solution—Roe 8 and Roe 9.

The member for Bateman talked about the impact on the Beeliam wetlands. The impact would not have been as drastic as people have been told, because a bridge would have been built over the wetlands. The impact would have been minimal. He quoted a report—I cannot remember the name—that said that the bridge would protect that area.

The biggest issue is the transport industry. I am concerned that the Minister for Transport is not considering making an allowance to provide our transport industry with a safe route to its destination points. That raises concerns about the Tonkin Highway extension, and about the orange route, which are also required. These are big-ticket items. I am concerned that the minister is simply ignoring these big-ticket items so that she can get on with Metronet. Fine—deliver Metronet. However, that should not be at the expense of major road infrastructure that is crucial to our transport industry, crucial to saving lives on our roads, crucial to easing congestion, crucial to enabling mums and dads to get home more quickly, and crucial to our truck drivers getting home safer and less fatigued. We also need to remember that every time a truck stops, it causes wear and tear on their brakes and tyres. When trucks are sitting idle at traffic lights, it is an expense on their fuel. Most truck drivers are small business operators. Every cent that is added to their journey comes out of their back pocket. These truck drivers do not make big money. They do it hard. They work hard. They are honest and hardworking Western Australians. They hop in their truck and drive for days, away from their family. All they are asking for is a safe route to and from their destination. If we did an occupational health and safety check on truck drivers and compared that with our electorate officers or departmental staff, truck drivers would fail. That is because as a state we are not delivering enough to make them safe in their workplace.

Members, I started with the question, “Why?” If the Minister for Transport were serious about doing her job and easing congestion, this project would be a no-brainer. However, as we have said, a green agenda is being pushed. It is payback for the Greens’ support at the last election. The government should look at the result of the federal election. As the member for Dawesville has said, the member for the federal seat of Tangney, Hon Ben Morton, put material in letterboxes. He did telephone canvassing. He put out a petition, advising people, loud and proud, “I support Roe 8–Roe 9, and this is why.” He got 61.5 per cent of the vote, by advocating on Roe 8–Roe 9. If that is not indication that the community wants it, I do not know what is. The result is that 61.5 per cent of the Tangney community voted, front and centre, for the Roe 8–Roe 9 project.

I will close by thanking my colleagues for their contribution to the debate on this bill. It was a diverse contribution. We all learnt a bit more about different sections of the road. I thank them for standing in this place and supporting the 61.5 per cent of people in the federal seat of Tangney who said loudly and proudly that they support Roe 8–Roe 9. At the last election, the member for Riverton said front and centre that he supported Roe 8–Roe 9. In an election that saw many members on our side go, the member for Riverton was still standing. That is because he knows that Roe 8–Roe 9 is a real issue for his community, and one they want delivered. It will enable people to get to and from work more quickly, and get their kids to and from school more safely. It will also take trucks off the busy main roads in our community by giving them a safe route. I will be supporting my colleagues when we vote against this bill.

MR A. KRSTICEVIC (Carine) [8.59 pm]: I, too, would like to make a contribution to the second reading debate of the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliam Wetlands) Bill 2018. As I listened to the contributions of all my colleagues—I think pretty much everybody on this side will be speaking on this legislation—I had to ask why in the Assembly, and no doubt in the Legislative Council, every single Liberal Party member wants to speak on the bill. The reason is that we talk to people in our electorate and they tell us that the Perth Freight Link needs to be built and that we need to fight for it. Although I represent the northern suburbs, people in the northern suburbs know how important this road will be for good road infrastructure in the southern suburbs. In the north we have reasonably good road infrastructure. During our government some great upgrades were made to Reid Highway in my electorate that made an amazing difference for people in the northern suburbs to travel to the airport. Likewise, we are concerned that people in the southern suburbs also should get infrastructure that is critical to their future. That is why members will see, whether it is in the north, south or country, no matter what area we represent, that people know about this. People know about this for many different reasons, whether it is critical infrastructure in the southern suburbs or the thousands of jobs that it will create. The federal and state Liberal Parties have been

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

pushing for this project for a long time. We have heard so many great arguments and reference to material from all my colleagues who support this road. I would not be surprised to find that the Treasurer does not support this legislation. I cannot imagine him saying that \$1.2 billion in federal funding is not required by the Western Australian government. I would not be surprised if he were to speak against this legislation.

I am also interested to see whether every single member of the Labor Party gets up and speaks on this legislation because it is critical to each and every one of them. It will be interesting to see how many people get up, and whether every single member who gets up puts their case as to why this bill needs to get through. I can tell members, from my experience and from listening to my colleagues, that large numbers of Western Australians do not support this bill.

It is interesting when members talk about the last state election. People on the government side say that it won Bicton because of this; but, of course, when we make reference to other polling results, they say, "Oh no! It makes no difference. You can't say that they won on that basis." The same argument is used in two different ways. We all know that Roe 8 and Roe 9 had nothing to do with the Labor Party's victory at the last election. It had a very insignificant impact in that respect. Roads are important. When the Labor Party came to government, we heard the mantra about how important it was to create jobs. Thousands of jobs could be created with this project. People say that up to 10 000 jobs could be created at a time when the unemployment rate is 6.3 per cent. When the unemployment figures come out, the Treasurer says that we cannot look at only one figure and that we have to look at the participation rate and he makes all these other excuses. But in this respect, the trend is not the government's friend—and the trend has not been its friend. As a matter of fact, the trend is getting worse. The government has a chance to start to have a bit of a positive impact on that trend. Not that long ago, this road was considered by Infrastructure Australia to be a nation-building project, but all of a sudden the government took it off the infrastructure list. Now it wants to take it off the list completely. This project has been on the drawing board since the 1960s. It is nothing new. Roe 8 did not just pop up five minutes ago. It has been around for a long time and it has been built progressively.

When the Labor Party came into government, it opposed a whole lot of infrastructure projects. It was opposed to the Perth Stadium. But now, of course, the Premier cannot get enough photographs taken in front of the stadium. He is always saying, "What a wonderful infrastructure project! Look at the impact it has had on tourism."

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Let us not talk about his scarf! To be honest I was a bit surprised to see a man born and raised in New South Wales wearing a Maroons scarf. But, as we know, when the Premier gets in photos and puts his face all over the place, like he did in the Darling Range by-election and the federal election, people lose. It would be a jinx for the Premier to be front and centre of this, and that is probably why he is not in the chamber during this debate because he does not want to jinx this bill. He does not want the bill to fail in the Assembly by being in here and supporting it, when all his colleagues are saying, "This is not good for us and the state."

Of course, Elizabeth Quay was another piece of infrastructure that the Labor Party vehemently opposed, but now it is saying that the Ritz Carlton, Chevron and all these other companies are building massive pieces of infrastructure and all these jobs are being created. It also opposed the sinking of the rail line that opened up Yagan Square, a massive project that was yearned for by the people of this city. Of course, we delivered all these projects. It is hard to imagine a major infrastructure project that could have delivered unbelievable benefits for this state being put on hold, not temporarily, but being destroyed. The government is trying to delete it off the face of the earth so that it no longer exists and is not available for future generations.

We talked about trucks and cars, but of course let us not forget that attached to Roe 8 was another important piece of infrastructure, which the member for Armadale and the member for Dawesville would be very supportive of, and that is the bike path. There would have been a world-class bike path on Roe 8 and people would have been able to ride their bikes all the way to Fremantle.

Several members interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I am talking about the Roe 8 component and the bike path. Imagine people riding their bikes on Leach Highway! I do not know whether the members for Armadale and Dawesville have ridden their bikes on Leach Highway, but I imagine it would be very dangerous. I would be very scared.

Dr A.D. Buti: Not at peak hour.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: As it would be.

Dr M.D. Nahan: When? At midnight?

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Exactly! All of a sudden it has gone. Then we came up with a one-metre rule for cyclists' safety and now cyclists have to travel on Leach Highway, which is already —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: That is right. Imagine a truck trying to pass a metre away from a cyclist. I am sure people could tell us a lot of stories about how dangerous that is. We are encouraging people to get out of their cars and get onto bikes, but they take their lives into their own hands when they go down Leach Highway or Stock Road. Roe 8 would have made a huge difference in that respect.

We know that reducing traffic congestion is associated with massive economic benefits. By slowing down the flow of goods and services to the port, truck drivers must take much longer to get the job done. They work long hours and they work hard. They do not make a lot of money. They work hard for every dollar that they earn. Their hours are long and they do not get to spend much time with their families. We are taking that away from them as well.

I know that people have been calling this bill the “Bicton bill”, but I say that this is more about social, economic and environmental vandalism. We heard a lot of different arguments about why that is the case, but it is very important to understand that this bill will have an impact on every single person who would have driven on that road. It will impact their private and their business lives and there will also be environmental impacts. There are plenty of other developments that would have had a much larger environmental impact than this road would have had. As we have heard, there probably could have been a massive environmental benefit from building Roe 8. If it were built, all the other road projects would not be needed and trees would not need to be pulled out. Those trees are needed on those streets and in those suburbs. The area around Roe 8 was environmentally degraded. There were powerlines and sand.

Mrs A.K. Hayden interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: There were offsets. We know that there were many different ways to undertake this project, including building a bridge. The environment could have benefited so much from this development. It is quite unbelievable.

I can see that the Attorney General is probably flabbergasted, knowing that he has important legislation that he needs to get through Parliament that will save the people of Western Australia in so many different ways. He has listened to this debate. He knows how much time we have spent on it. If the bill is passed, it will destroy jobs and make people's lives more difficult. It will potentially create social unrest as it will impact on the unemployment rate and it will have other impacts on people.

We know about road rage. All of a sudden, road rage is on the rise. It does not surprise me to hear about the major roads that we are talking about that frustrate people. We have heard about the number of driveways and bus stops that will be impacted. Buses will have to stop on the road. Children will be trying to cross the road. If I were a parent and my child had to deal with that, that would be a real concern. Young kids would have to put their lives at risk. We can have a massive impact on that. We are talking about 0.49 of one per cent of an environmental impact that could very easily turn out to be an environmental benefit in so many ways.

As I said before, the money is on the table. The federal government has put it there. Not one vote will be lost by going ahead with this project. I say that because every single one of us is not supporting this piece of legislation. We know that we have no votes to lose by saying that this piece of legislation needs to be flushed down the toilet where it belongs, never to come back again. The government says, “We need to do this, otherwise it will take two years.” But the government won government on this piece of legislation. Why not leave it as it is and keep winning every election for the next 1 000 years on the back of defending Roe 8 and Roe 9 and saying that it will not touch the Beelihar wetlands? It will lose every election until it changes its mind. That is the government's attitude. It should not amend the metropolitan region scheme. The government should allow us to put it on our election platform and allow us to lose government on the basis of Roe 8 and Roe 9 and the Beelihar wetlands. It should give us that opportunity. It will not happen. We will win the seat of Bicton and other seats. We will win the support of the community at a broader level if we oppose this legislation. We have no doubt about that, but the government is too scared to do that. It is too scared for the people of Western Australia to benefit from such an important project.

Why does the government hate the people of the southern suburbs so much? I do not understand that. The eastern suburbs has massive road and infrastructure projects. The northern suburbs has massive road and infrastructure projects but the government hates the southern suburbs for some reason. I am not sure why. The people in the southern suburbs need to understand that the government has no support for them and that it is just treating this issue as some sort of political payback for the few extra votes it is getting for the people that it shipped in. The whole offset for the government is the outer harbour. There is no doubt that occasionally some of the greens

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

have a justifiable cause, yet on other occasions, they are extreme cowboys. Does the government really think that they will be supporting the outer harbour, destroying Cockburn Sound and damaging the environment while at the same time knowing that the port of Fremantle can work for another 50 years? With all the technological changes, future developments in IT and the other technologies that are coming up, that port may not be viable for another 100 years. If that is the case, the government does not need to build this outer harbour and destroy the environment. I reckon that the environmentalists know that. They know that the government will not find \$5 billion or \$10 billion to build this outer harbour. They know that it will never happen. They know that they can fight the government when the time comes. They can stop the government. They have the power to do that. They have the power to control the government.

We also know that the unions, and its good friends like Christy Cain and other unionists do not support —

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members on my right, I am trying to hear the member for Carine and all I am hearing is conversations. Could you keep your conversations lower or leave the chamber.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: We know that the unions do not support this legislation. They do not support it because it does not stack up on economic grounds. It also hurts the community. In this case, the unions are showing some compassion for the people of the southern suburbs, saying that they do not want the government to hurt the people in the southern suburbs. Also, the port is fine. It is working well. It has many more years of successful growth. The government wants to waste money on the outer harbour. It needs to reverse its decision and take the \$1.2 billion that it is rejecting for Roe 8. It should not worry about spending \$5 billion or \$10 billion in Cockburn Sound. It should not worry about destroying the environment. It should protect the environment and build Roe 8.

We have seen plenty of harmless and political bills come through this Parliament over the past few years. Some have not really changed anything and will not change anything but they are great from a political perspective; they are great for show-and-tell. This bill has serious impacts. It is not one of these mickey mouse bills that we have seen come through this Parliament. This bill will have a real impact on the community. It is important for us to get that message on the record and ensure that our colleagues in the upper house look at all the speeches that have been made in this place, look at all the facts, figures and data and the real reason this bill needs to be rejected. They need to ensure that they do the right thing by the people of Western Australia. As a minimum, I suppose they could send it to a committee, which could look at it. I am sure that they will come back with a very good case for why this legislation needs to be rejected. It does not take much to work it out. We know that the upper house is very thorough and professional. It does its homework. As has been discovered on many occasions, it will find other flaws and reasons that we have not thought of yet as to why this legislation needs to be rejected.

Since this government has been elected, it has not done anything significant. It has not started any major projects. It has just been cutting ribbons on the former government's projects. It has been talking things down when it suits it and taking the credit when it suits it as well, on the same projects. It is quite bizarre at times. One week the government talks it down and the next, it is all smiles and photos and saying how wonderful it is. It is quite amazing.

We know how dangerous the roads are. We know how many people have lost their lives. We know how many people become permanently injured with serious disabilities, which is why we have no-fault insurance. The introduction of no-fault insurance was very important for many people.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: We know the impact that has on people's lives. We have seen the statistics on Leach Highway and Stock Road and other roads where the level of accidents are much more elevated than on other roads. We have heard about the rear-enders. The trucks take a longer time to stop. We know how impatient people are on the roads. If they see a gap, they like to squeeze in. Trucks take a fair bit of time to stop. I feel nervous when I am driving around with lots of trucks and the danger that poses. I can only imagine what it is like for learner drivers or P-platers. As a parent, I would be very scared for my kids if they had to drive on the roads around that area.

People ask why we did not build the extension to Roe 8. We did start building it, but the environmentalists dragged it through the court system. That took about 12 months. A lot more could have been done had people not been trying to stop it going through. We know that there are a lot of issues. As has already been mentioned, the federal member for Tangney campaigned heavily on this project. He did not have any problem fighting the environmentalists. He was not as silly as Bill Shorten and his cronies, who said, "Don't vote for me if you don't like it." He was happy to say, "I'm supporting Roe 8; I hope you support me", rather than saying, "Don't vote for me if you don't like Roe 8. I'm supporting it and I hope you support me because I care about my community. I care about your lives. I want to make sure you get home safely. I want to make sure that you spend as much time as you can with your family and I want to make sure that as a business owner, you save as much money as you can."

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

We know about the environmental benefits of having a free-flowing road system. We have heard about the carbon emissions and all the impacts there. There is also wear and tear on vehicles. There are many reasons why this reckless decision should be reversed. A number of members on that side refuse to hold their executive to account. They are letting it run riot. The executive is doing its best to make bad decisions and those members are just following like sheep. Do they know what that means? It means they will lose their seats at the next election. The community will say, "You know what? You're not standing up for me, you're just a sheep. You're just following the leader and the leader's taking you over the cliff." Some members opposite are probably happy with that. They will be here for four years and they know that that is their term in Parliament. They have had their experience, they are one-time candidates, and they are happy to take one for the team and lose their seat. That is disappointing. If they stood up for their communities, they might actually have another term in government, but they are doing their best to make sure that that does not happen. Sometimes I feel how silly we are on this side of the house to point these things out to members opposite and try to tell them what they need to do to stay in government. They are so opposed to that advice; they work against it. Of course, we know that because we have been there and done that. We have gone through that experience, so we are trying to share our mistakes with members opposite so they can stay there longer, but they do not want to listen.

The minister knows this is a bad decision, but she is still going to do it anyway. That is the disappointing part about it. It is fair enough to say, "Let's not build it. Let's just leave it there, let it lie, and just see what the future brings." That would be a fair enough option; the minister could do that. It would not hurt anybody for her to just leave it on the table and let future governments decide whether they want to do it. If the community hates it so much, they will vote against it. Let them take the risk on that issue. I cannot see why the minister cannot do that—why she cannot say, "Let's just put it on the back burner." As the minister said earlier, she could go through the proper process; it takes two years, or thereabouts. But what does that involve? That involves community consultation. Heaven forbid the minister should talk to the community and find out what people really think. Heaven forbid that members opposite want to know what their communities think. If the member for Bicton and other members who are impacted by this road reserve thought it was a winner, they would be saying, "Let's go out for community consultation. Let me lead the charge in my community. I'll fly the flag, I'll have those community meetings. My constituents will come in hordes and hold me up and say, 'What a wonderful local member you are!'" Wait a second; it is the ones that drive in on the buses that members opposite are trying to get to do that, not the locals. The locals actually want the road built. Heaven forbid members opposite want to get them to a meeting and ask them, "What you think?" I know; I see these things first-hand from time to time. I know what it is like. Why does the minister not take that risk? She has nothing to lose.

Ms R. Saffioti: Did you vote for yourself?

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I should hope so!

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I do!

As I said, if the decision is purely environmental, the government needs to look at the environmental impact of this decision alongside the environmental impact of the outer port and the carbon emissions, and the costs associated with that. When we balance all that out, the experts do not agree with the minister. I am sure the ones that live in fantasyland agree with her, but I feel sorry for the member for Burns Beach; he will not be here after the next election. I feel sorry for the member for Joondalup —

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, enough! It is getting very late at night, and we would all like to get through this. I am sure the member for Carine has a very valuable contribution that we would all love to hear.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: The member for Kingsley unfortunately will not be here; she is obviously already looking in the paper for a new job! I encourage her to do a lot of research and I will give her some suggestions later on. A lot of members will not be here because of their lack of interest in this topic, in their communities and in the real issues. I hope the Treasurer is paying attention to the people who are trying to steal this money from him. When they line up saying, "Treasurer! Can we have some money for this?" he can say, "You find me that \$1.2 billion you stole from Roe 8, because I wanted that money. I wanted to create those jobs, I wanted to invest in this state. I wanted to improve the economic prospects of the state, so you go and find that money for me somewhere else, and then I'll think about giving you some money, once you've paid it all back." That is not going to happen. The Treasurer will not be able to give them that money. He will refuse because of members' lack of care for their communities.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

If the Attorney General were in opposition he would be out there with placards, saying “Roe 8 must be built!” Even though he is all the way out in Butler, I am sure he would be out there at Roe 8 with a sign saying, “This is important; I care about my community.”

Mr J.R. Quigley: I do!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: Exactly, he does!

Mr J.R. Quigley interjected.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: It is great to fire him up! See? He does care about infrastructure, so the Attorney General will no doubt vote against this legislation because he likes and supports infrastructure projects. He will vote against the Beeliar wetlands bill, which will destroy jobs. He does not want to see jobs destroyed. He does not want to see the Labor Party lose the next election because of its lack of interest in its community. I am really disappointed. I expected better from the member for Bunbury. I know Bunbury is a long way away, but trust me, regional members also have something to say on this. I will be very interested to see who speaks on this bill. I would suggest that some members will be very scared. Members should be careful about which side they vote on, because people will be paying attention and we will be sharing this out. On that note, I put on the record that I strongly oppose this legislation and I will be strongly lobbying members of the Legislative Council to scrutinise this bill, send it to a committee, look at it properly and, ultimately, put it where it belongs—through the shredder.

MRS L.M. O'MALLEY (Bicton) [9.27 pm]: It is a great privilege to add my contribution to this debate. The specific purpose of the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018 is to reserve and zone certain land within the metropolitan region scheme in order to protect several significant areas of wetland that make up the Beeliar Regional Park—that being the Beeliar wetlands. The intent, however, is much wider and deeper and carries far more significance than the four pages that have guided us through the debate in this house tonight.

The metropolitan region scheme is a large planning scheme that applies to the Perth metropolitan area. It includes a scheme text and a set of maps. The scheme text sets out the planning rules that apply to zones and reserves. The zones and reserves, which broadly identify what the land can be used for, are depicted on maps. Zones, maps and reserves are vital for the identification and specification of land and its use. As a reference, I draw members' attention to clause 4, “Metropolitan Region Scheme amended”. Clause 4(1) amends the metropolitan region scheme by deleting the primary regional roads reserve that traverses the Beeliar wetlands, and a small portion of the urban zone shown in the area, shaded dark green in the plan, and reserves the land for parks and recreation.

Those who would wish to see the area retained for road reserve see the area only in terms of hard lines and shading on a map. Their view is distorted—blurred by the myopia of short-sighted vision, or worse, no vision at all. Those who will not support this bill simply cannot move past 1963—that being the year of the adoption of the Hepburn and Stephenson plan, from which the MRS was derived. The plan was commissioned by the Western Australian government of the day in 1953, and adopted in 1963. It would lay out the blueprint for much of the development of Perth, and continues as the legal framework of land use through the MRS. My point in raising this historical reference is not to debate the merits or deficiencies of continuing to follow a plan that is almost 60 years old; I raise it in order to highlight the absurdity of those who, with an almost religious zeal, praise the Hepburn–Stevenson plan as the holy Bible of Perth and Fremantle road planning. It is a plan that they would have us believe must not be questioned, and is only ever to be challenged by those whom they consider to be ignorant or foolhardy. We on this side, however, recognise the importance of taking into account the changing needs of our growing city. We are not stuck in 1960s thinking. I call on those who would seek to defeat this bill in deference to the Hepburn–Stevenson plan to campaign for another crossing point of the Swan River, at the northern termination of Stock Road, to deliver increased freight traffic movement north through the western suburbs. I note the silence of members opposite.

For those who live near, recreate in, or care deeply for the Beeliar wetlands, the area is much more than hard lines and the shading on a map, and it is an integral part of the story of their lives. This bill is the beginning of honouring the McGowan Labor government's commitment to protect forever some of the last remaining wetlands in the Perth and Peel region. This bill is our way of getting on with the job that we promised to do to protect these vitally important remnant wetlands. It will ensure not only that the Perth Freight Link is dead under this government, but also that the fear of a future PFL is eliminated. I am deeply grateful to represent the electorate of Bicton in this house, and I am proud to be a member of a government that keeps its word.

I stand in this house today in no small part because of that disastrous, divisive and laughingly incomplete road project known as the Perth Freight Link. With its origins in the Beeliar wetlands, the place that we seek to protect with this bill, Roe 8 would lead to Roe 9, which in turn would lead to the destruction of many homes and businesses in my community. This would later be proposed to move to other communities adjacent to mine, as Roe 9 morphed

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

from road to tunnel, yet all the while never actually reaching the port. It is the story of the impact of these plans, these hard lines and shadings on a map, and how it would influence and change the course of many lives, including mine. This is the story of thousands of people committed to stopping the Perth Freight Link and protecting the Beeliar wetlands.

I find the Leader of the Opposition's comments deeply offensive to the thousands of mums and dads, young and old, everyday people, who came out to the protest lines day after day, week after week, month after month. The member shows utter disrespect and ignorance with her careless and false comments about professional protesters. I saw no evidence of this on the many, many occasions I stood side by side with the community protesters—people who came before or after work or while the kids were at school. One such example of the community campaign is the story of an elderly woman whom I met one day in Coolbellup. She was nervous but determined and I offered to stay with her as the police horses pushed close to us. I held on to her and she to me. She thanked me and vowed to return. Hers is just one of the stories of the many community campaigners. I acknowledge and thank the many community members and the community campaigns of Save Beeliar Wetlands and Re-think the Link. I call on the Leader of the Opposition and the other members opposite who repeated this mistruth to apologise unreservedly for those comments. I am absolutely gobsmacked by the ease with which the member for Cottesloe dismissed the clearing of around 40 hectares of bushland. As the chair of the rehabilitating Roe 8 working group, I can assure him that many large, old established trees and banksia woodlands were lost during that dreadful summer before the 2017 election. Important habitat for endangered Carnaby's and red tail cockatoos and other bird life were lost. Habitat loss saw these majestic birds migrate into Bicton to strip the cape lilac trees to avoid starvation. I am beyond angry at the member's arrogance and disrespect for people and place. I pity him for the utter lack of humanity shown in his contribution.

It is the story of the residents of Moody Glen in Palmyra; it is the story of the Smirkes, the Irvings, the Hoffmans and many others who live in the streets that run alongside Leach Highway in Palmyra. It is my story and the reason for my presence in this house and my election as the first member for Bicton. This part of the Perth Freight Link story began in Moody Glen in early 2014 when homes were targeted as part of a road plan. The Smirkes, Irvings, Hoffmans and others were told that their homes would be acquired to make way for a freight freeway. It is important to note that their homes were not part of a road reserve; they were not gazetted for any future road change. Their homes were, and, thanks to this Labor government, continue to be, their forever homes in happy family streets that formed close-knit communities. These were homes where families looked, first in confusion and later in horror and anger, at letters that arrived from a heartless Barnett-led Liberal–National government, telling them that their homes would be compulsorily acquired. I recall these families—my friends—expressing their lack of understanding of what the seemingly benign and sanitised term “compulsory acquisition” meant. These letters advised the Smirkes, Irvings, Hoffmans and many others in my local community that the life they had chosen, the life that they had known, would end with their homes being purchased by the government and that those homes were to be destroyed in favour of a road that would end around two kilometres short of its destination. It was a road to nowhere, to be built on the bones of much-loved family homes. In the midst of this shock, I recall vividly the young daughter of one these families attempting to reassure her mum, with an eight-year-old's optimism, that maybe everyone in their much-loved street of Moody Glen could all move together to a new street.

In the two years that followed, the Roe 9 plans may have morphed into a tunnel, thereby shifting the danger from Moody Glen and surrounds to other communities, but that made it no more acceptable or sensible. Shifting emissions from one community to another was not then, nor will it ever be, an appropriate or fair solution. This is the story of an arrogant and dismissive former Liberal–National government and the continued arrogance of the current Liberal–National opposition, which have learnt nothing from the lessons of the March 2017 election. Roe 8 and the Perth Freight Link was not acceptable to the electorate of Bicton, nor was it acceptable to the electorates that would have been directly affected by the proposed project, nor was it acceptable to many other voters across WA. Roe 8 and the Perth Freight Link were soundly rejected on 11 March 2017. I stand here today as testament to that fact.

I thank the members for Riverton and Nedlands for raising the issue of the health impacts of truck emissions on roads; it is an incredibly important consideration. I will also refer to the damaging impacts of truck pollutants on human health, and in doing so I will expand on, and make corrections to, comments of members opposite. It is also important to note that Roe 8 is the beginning of Roe 9 and beyond; it is not designed to stand in isolation and it is disingenuous, if not outright misleading, for members opposite to suggest that the building of one road, Roe 8, will somehow completely remove the dangers of another, Leach Highway. The members opposite who have made comparisons between Leach Highway and Roe 8 are telling only part of the story, leaving out the human and other impacts of Roe 9. In my submission to a City of Melville electors' meeting in 2014, my research looked

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

at the impact of the emissions from heavy vehicles on the health of some of the most vulnerable in our community—our children. Thirty-two primary schools, nine secondary schools, three tertiary schools and 26 day care centres are located along the route of the Perth Freight Link, being stage 1—Roe 8—and the two stage 2 options that were put forward. These 70 places of education and early childhood care are located within two kilometres of the Roe 8 and Roe 9 routes. Several are within 50 metres of the edge of the road reserve, and one day care centre in Bibra Lake is at ground zero—on the very edge of the road reserve.

Diesel engine exhaust is declared by the World Health Organization to be a group 1 carcinogen, meaning that there is no safe level of exposure for humans. Diesel particulates found in diesel exhaust have the ability to cause disease and death, and they disperse well beyond the point of origin. In an Environmental Protection Authority Victoria health bulletin published in 2002, diesel particulates were defined as microscopic particles found in diesel exhaust and are less than one-fifth the thickness of a human hair and small enough to penetrate deep into the lungs, where they can contribute to a range of health problems. The elderly and people with emphysema, asthma, and chronic heart and lung disease are especially sensitive to fine-particle pollution. The still developing lungs of children place them also at a particularly high risk. Most important, what the member for Riverton failed to mention was that diesel particulates are constant in the environment. A so-called free-flowing freeway that the Perth Freight Link was touted to be—in other words, removing the traffic lights on Leach Highway—would do nothing to diminish their prevalence. The member for Bateman's reference to diesel pollutants is therefore factually wrong. The only way to reduce diesel particulates in the atmosphere is to reduce the number of trucks, full stop. Roe 8 will not achieve this. I acknowledge and congratulate the minister on her commitment to freight on rail and to progressing plans for the outer harbour, because that is the only way to truly protect the health of the communities of the electorate of Bicton and right along the current freight route.

I was astounded to hear the member for Bateman talk also about the protection of animals by the removal of Hope Road. I expect the member is unaware of two very important facilities on Hope Road, Bibra Lake; those being the Cockburn Wetlands Education Centre and Native ARC animal rescue centre—two facilities that would be lost to Roe 8. I strongly suggest that members opposite familiarise themselves with the area and the assets within. The members for Riverton and Nedlands also spoke of vandalism. That is something that all members opposite who were part of the former Barnett Liberal–National government know a great deal about. In this case, it was the environmental vandalism by a belligerent and arrogant Premier in the face of certain defeat. To commence the clearing of the Beelihar wetlands was environmental vandalism of the highest degree, designed to inflict the most pain on the local community and those who fought to stop this wanton destruction. By beginning the clearing at the wetlands end, there can be no doubt of the vandalistic intent to create the most destruction. I am horrified by the attempts of many members opposite to present a convincing argument that building a road through a natural landscape would not have a detrimental impact and would actually enhance it. The absurdity of such a claim appears to be entirely lost on members opposite. Seriously! Since when did humans improve on nature? I will tell them—never! In the history of human existence, our impact has only ever been detrimental. Yes, we can offset and minimise our impact, but to make the claim that an infrastructure build—any infrastructure build—improves on nature is just ludicrous. It is an absurd proposition. I note also the member for Nedlands' bewilderment at the McGowan government's commitment to the protection of the Beelihar wetlands and to a future of sustainable, long-term freight solutions. It is possible that members opposite are unfamiliar with the concept of keeping promises.

In conclusion, this is the story of this government's commitment to protect the Beelihar wetlands —
Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members! Minister! I would like to listen to the member for Bicton.

Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY: I listened quietly and respectfully; I expect the same in return.

This is the story of the government's commitment to protect the Beelihar wetlands, homes and businesses from this nonsensical road project. Instead, this government is committed to a long-term, sensible approach to freight movements now and into the future, including planning for an outer harbor; investigating the opportunity for the development of intermodal terminals with long-term, sustainable, well-paying, skilled jobs; increasing freight onto rail, including the future development of a dedicated rail bridge; creating greater efficiencies on the current road network; and undertaking necessary upgrades to the High Street–Stirling Highway intersection. We know that the damaging Perth Freight Link, which would begin with Roe 8, is not the answer to future freight movements. I made a promise to the people of my electorate, as our government did, to stop the Perth Freight Link, protect the Beelihar wetlands and get the balance right between protection of the environment, homes and human health and future freight needs. This Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill is a crucial first part of that. I thank the minister for bringing this bill forward and I commend it to the house.

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

MR I.C. BLAYNEY (Geraldton) [9.45 pm]: I enjoyed listening to the member's speech on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. From my perspective, which is a bit different—members can rely on that—I have a heavy vehicle driver's licence, so I have been the person driving a truck, although not much of a truck, and dodging the coppers when going from A to B!

Mr M.J. Folkard interjected.

Mr I.C. BLAYNEY: No, you were not.

With Roe 8 and Roe 9, I think of the benefits that especially those of us from the northern part of the world thought about them, which was the ability to enter the North Link at Bullsbrook and drive 84 kilometres with no traffic lights until we reached Stirling Bridge at Fremantle. That was the big issue for us. However, the other big issue, of course, is the subject of congestion on Leach Highway, which has been an issue for some 20 years. It does not really matter what we do with the mythical port that will be built off Kwinana, in quite a long time, because we will have to get trucks in and out of the port of Fremantle. It is true that the decision to stop the project killed it when it was just getting to the point of starting to employ quite a lot of people. It would have taken trucks off suburban roads and put them onto a dedicated freight link. To my way of thinking, that would have been a good thing. Seven thousand heavy trucks a day is a hell of a lot of trucks to be driving on a road.

I suspect the port of Fremantle can be developed to handle Western Australia's needs for container traffic for quite a few decades. I will mention later that I will encourage the government to bring forward development of the container facilities at Bunbury. Speaking as a person from Geraldton, a port city, the last thing I think we want to do to a port city is take the port out of it, because it would kill it—it would collapse in on itself economically and its whole reason for existence would be gone. Fremantle is about halfway there now, and that would complete the process.

We cannot get away from the gradual increase in truck traffic. My understanding is that the Environmental Protection Authority has approved this project. Already a large number of accidents on these roads are attributable to too much traffic and too many trucks. I spoke last week about the experience in Geraldton with the North West Coastal Highway. It is always difficult when we mix heavy vehicle traffic with light vehicle traffic, because obviously the drivers think quite differently. Truck drivers cannot react quickly and trucks take a lot more effort to stop them. That is a lot worse in this situation, purely due to the sheer number of trucks and the amount of traffic.

There is a logical case to build and further develop Fremantle port. I think one of the things the government needs to look at as soon as possible—I understand the Barnett government was looking at it—is shifting the loading of live export sheep and cattle to Kwinana. I am told it could be done down there reasonably easily. I think proposals were put to CBH Group and were received with some interest during the time of the last government. I encourage the government to try to get the livestock export out of Fremantle as soon as possible and consider developing Fremantle port. I think we can put off just about anything else for quite a few decades. I remember a figure I heard quite a few years ago and that is that 90 per cent of containers are delivered to places within 30 kilometres of the port. That means we will be dependent on trucks in the main to deliver containers. We cannot do it any other way. Stock will be moved backwards and forwards by truck.

When I looked at the Westport proposal, I saw that the list of environmental concerns included seagrass, sea lions, fairy terns, little penguins, bottle-nosed dolphins, pink snapper, whitebait, blue swimmer crabs, Bush Forever sites, remnant vegetation, black cockatoos, possums and wetlands. Can all those issues be overcome from an environmental perspective? I am starting to have my doubts. I know that the seagrass beds are considerably smaller than they used to be. I suspect that our friends from Beeliar will be waiting for us when we get down there to do something.

The federal government has been quite generous with this project. I am told that it is still holding on to the money and is ready to go. When we look at the whole proposal that was put together on this, it went to the trucking industry and said, "If you don't encounter any traffic lights from the start of NorthLink all the way into the port, what is that worth to you? We will take half of that and you keep the other half." The industry agreed to that. We are looking at \$900 million for the tunnels into the port. The suggestion was made earlier tonight to tunnel under the Beeliar wetlands. If they are so important, we can tunnel under those wetlands and the figures for this project will still work. Everybody knows that interest rates are extremely low and are going lower—no doubt about that. Every time those figures go lower, this project stacks up better. If people criticise Roe 8 and 9, by implication they are supporting the existing situation. That is how it goes. The government is doing a good thing trying to get as many containers as it can onto rail, but the actual percentage that it can get onto rail is not that high. As the number of containers coming through the port increases, it will get harder and harder to increase that percentage of containers on rail. We will have the congestion that we have on roads now—feeding the port and taking containers away from the port—for decades and it will get steadily worse.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

I think if the government carefully did the figures, the figures would work now for this road and the tunnels. I think there are huge questions over the ability to build a new port at Kwinana, and it is about all those environmental issues that I raised just a minute ago. I have seen, for example, the metropolitan shark fishery basically put out of business because of sea lions. The case that was made for the sea lions was amazingly weak, but under the federal Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, it was no problem at all to shut down that industry. When we look at the figures that sat around it, I would go as far as to say that they were simply ridiculous. The logical decision is to build the road and tunnel, and go under the Beeliar wetlands if need be. We need to work on extending the maximum life we can get out of Fremantle port and try to shift the livestock exports to Kwinana. We should start planning to build up and to move the transfer of containers to Bunbury. That is quite a few years away, but let us start getting ready for it now. I agree that doing away with this land at the moment is economic vandalism. The project makes sense and the economics are better than the alternative.

For the people from the north who bring products down to Fremantle to be exported, this project is visionary. The thought of not having any lights all the way—87 kilometres—from the start of NorthLink to just about in Fremantle is quite amazing. There are other spin-offs from that. The trucking companies have worked out their savings in time, fuel and maintenance, but what they have not factored into their costs—because they do not really have to find a cash figure for them—is less pollution and more safety. When a truck is running at a steady speed along a highway, the amount of pollution it creates is a fraction of what it produces when it is having to accelerate away from a stop. Much less pollution is produced. I am told that when the figures were done for all this, it was quite amazing how positive they were. The project was cash flow positive. There was absolutely no problem with the figures to make this thing work. I congratulate the member for Bateman for the work that he did on this project. I think that it is a huge pity that the stars did not align for him to build this project. I challenge the government to do a study on this and prove me wrong.

Speaking briefly, a few people have talked a bit about the politics that sit around this project. I can see some parallels with the recent federal election. The ALP vote rose in the better-off inner-city type areas, but it dropped in the further out traditional blue-collar, safer Labor Party areas. I think Labor has fallen into the same trap here. Some of the better-off areas that it picked up in 2017 will be the first ones it loses in 2020–21. We know it; members opposite know it. The battleground seats will be the less well-off ones—more blue collar, further out, and the sorts of people who are likely to support a project such as this. They will use it and they will probably be the people building it. We saw in the last federal election what I will call the Adani choice—choosing to go with the inner-city green types versus the traditional blue-collar voters. The benefit–cost ratios that were done in 2014–15 for this project by Infrastructure Australia gave it a very good figure. I would say borrow the money and build it. Borrow the money long term, specifically for this project. Funds from the tolls will pay it off, just as Sydney Harbour Bridge was paid off. What is the government's alternative? It is no road, no new port—frankly, just more congestion.

MR T.J. HEALY (Southern River) [9.57 pm]: I also rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. This is a very important thing for our community, and it is certainly about family. I could not start my speech tonight without acknowledging that my brother had another child in the early hours of this morning. If the house will allow me an indulgence, first of all, to Don and Bridget, congratulations. They have named their child Terry—Terence Christian Chakulunta. I also congratulate Erin and Linus, my other brother and sister, who had Matilda last month, and Suzyo and Madaliso, who had Samuel last week. We are making our parents very happy grandparents as we do that.

It is very important that the opposition gets enough time to filibuster this bill as much as possible, so I will speak only very briefly. This bill refers to correcting something that was taken to the 2008 state election. As the member for Riverton has mentioned, it was raised in the 2008 election that the Liberals would build Roe 8. That is correct. At the 2013 election, it did not seem to play a large role. Then, all of a sudden, a few years out from the 2017 election, when Colin Barnett's ego was formidable and no-one could stand up to him, he decided to push through a road. This bill seeks to protect the Beeliar wetlands. This important bill will not only protect the environmental aspects, as other members have discussed, but also affects my community. As it was proposed at the 2017 election and as we can see from the majority in this chamber, the majority of Perth and Western Australia said no to Roe 8. When I speak to people in my electorate, some say, "It's not a bad idea." People do not always realise that it was to be a toll road. We can call it a freight charge. The member for Geraldton talked about the revenue. Forgive me, member for Riverton, but I think the member for Riverton said he expected \$350 million to come from that toll. That would have come from families in my electorate. It would have come from people who live in our community.

Dr M.D. Nahan: It was only for trucks.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Mr T.J. HEALY: The member for Riverton might say it was only for trucks. Members would have heard the term “the thin edge of the wedge”. It would have been the first toll road in Western Australia. The former government was running out of money and out of ideas. If it thought it could sell to my community the argument that the toll would not apply to families, it was greatly mistaken. The \$350 million that would have come from that toll road would have deeply affected families. If the former government had won the 2017 election, that toll road would be well underway. That would have hurt families in my community who have to use that road network.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

Mr T.J. HEALY: That argument is wrong. It was to be a toll road. The other argument is that Roe 8 would solve all the transport problems of metropolitan Perth. We know that is not the case. If the former government had won the 2017 election and built Roe 8, the funding would have been a bit skewed and a bit dodgy. I have a lovely media release from the federal government that I will quote. Roe 8 would not have gone to the port. I think the former government was hoping to finish that road in 2020. With the usual delays, it might have been 2022. Roe 9–Roe 10 were not planned and not funded. Remember that? Was it going to be a tunnel? Was it going to be a bridge?

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Riverton, I call you to order for the third time.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I do not want to disrespect the member, but it needs to be said that there was no plan for Roe 9–Roe 10.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Riverton!

Mr T.J. HEALY: The former government tried to sell —

The SPEAKER: Through the Chair, please.

Mr T.J. HEALY: The former government tried to sell it by saying, “Vote for us, and we will build Roe 8, and all your problems will be solved.” That was not the case. If the former government had won the election, Roe 8 might have been built by 2022, and it could then have started planning Roe 9, which would have taken another five years. My community—all our communities—cannot wait for 15 years. Would it have been a nice road to drive on? Probably.

The SPEAKER: Through the Chair, please.

Mr T.J. HEALY: It would have been a road to nowhere. There was no plan to finish it. The former government’s own figures and research stated that it was not planned, and it would not reduce truck numbers. I would like to quote from an article in *WAtoday* headed, “Documents suggest ‘figures fudged in Roe 8 rush job’”. It states, in part —

Major discrepancies between Roe 8’s environmental report and its business case have raised concerns that the project is a rush job based on massaged figures that would hang WA taxpayers out to dry.

Email and document exchanges between Main Roads WA and the federal Department of Infrastructure, made publicly available ..., cast doubt over the design and economic viability of the road.

The article states also —

“A key part of the viability of this project ... will be its capacity to maximise tolling revenue,” ...

As I have said, this was all about Colin Barnett’s ego. That was the same reason he had to move the stadium, and the same reason he had to have Elizabeth Quay. He could have built a road in my electorate and called it Colin Barnett Court, and we would not have had to go through this mess. Colin Barnett said, and I will quote him in a moment —

The SPEAKER: Member, continue with what you were saying, but please refer to him by his proper title.

Mr T.J. HEALY: The member for Riverton has said in the past that the former government knew three months out from the election —

The SPEAKER: No. I am talking about the former Premier, Hon Colin Barnett.

Mr T.J. HEALY: I would like to quote from *Hansard* of 15 June 2017, when the member for Riverton said —

Three months out, it was going to win the election without a doubt.

He said again —

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Three months out, members opposite were going to win—the polls were obvious.

The former government knew that it would lose the election. However, it still sent in bulldozers, on a scorched earth policy to destroy the wetlands. It knew that people were passionate about the wetlands. It sent police into that area and took them away from my community, when they should have been chasing criminals. People were arrested.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Who did that?

Mr T.J. HEALY: Colin Barnett, and members opposite stood by him. They wasted police resources and arrested people who were passionate about this issue. By the way, the destruction of that wetland is now affecting my community, and others. Because of the destruction of the Roe 8 wetlands, the surrounding wetlands are now more valuable to be preserved. That has had a ripple effect for all of us. The funds from Roe 8 were wisely placed into local jobs at Armadale Road bridge and Karel Avenue bridge, Roe Highway to Fiona Stanley Hospital, and the “John McGrath” Mount Henry Road on-ramp. That is absolutely fantastic. My community said, “Thank you, but no thank you”, to Roe 8. Members should be aware, as my community was, and is, that it was to be a toll road. It was a road to nowhere, with no plan. It was simply a road to inflate the former Premier’s ego. I encourage all members to support this bill. It is a fantastic initiative. Thank you very much.

MS M.J. DAVIES (Central Wheatbelt — Leader of the Nationals WA) [10.06 pm]: I wish to make a very brief contribution to the debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018 and to put the Nationals’ perspective. That may be slightly different from the view that has been put by other members today, although perhaps not from the view put by the member for Geraldton. As the member for Central Wheatbelt, I, along with the member for Moore, have a very strong connection to Fremantle port. Many of my constituents see Fremantle port as a vital piece of infrastructure, and it is, for the industries that drive the economies in our electorates. Certainly when we started to talk about Roe 8, our discussion in the National Party and with our stakeholders was around creating efficiencies in one of the industries that drives our state’s economy. From an agricultural perspective, it is important to ensure connectivity from our regions into the state’s port.

The Minister for Transport has moved forward with an investigation into Westport. I share the concern of members on this side of the house that that is a pipedream, or however we might like to describe it. I do not think Westport will ever happen. I say that because of the environmental sensitivities about that project when we were in government. It seems impossible, from the assessment and information that was provided to us, that Westport will get across the line. The National Party sees Fremantle port as having the capacity for further growth. I do not want to contradict anyone in this house tonight, because many numbers are floating around, but certainly the numbers I have seen suggest that Fremantle port will not reach full capacity until 2055, at best. We need to create efficiencies for the people who will use that port in the event that Westport is just a pipedream and does not come to pass.

I certainly support the comments of the member for Geraldton and those from our side of the house about looking into expanding our regional ports to accommodate some of the activities that go through the Fremantle port. If members talked to people in the livestock industry, they would find that there is no disagreement: we would like to see livestock shift from Fremantle port. But members have to understand that all infrastructure that serves that port is built around transport links that enable the livestock industry to access that port efficiently. Any shift away from Fremantle port in the middle to long term would result in significant expense for the industry because supply chain logistics along the way would have to be relocated. From our perspective on this side of the house, this road was welcomed by industry. In fact, they were quite vocal in their support for it. I have read articles in the *Countryman* on this matter dating from as far back as 2017. At that time Stephen Marley was the president of the Livestock and Rural Transport Association. He was quoted in the *Countryman* on 1 June 2017, saying that if the industry continues to grow and expand, traffic problems would only worsen in those suburbs that members have spoken about tonight. He commented —

“We are extremely disappointed Roe 8 is not going to happen,” Mr Marley said.

...

At full scale, Perth Freight Link would have connected Perth Airport to Fremantle port without traffic lights.

...

... potential to remove up to 65,000 trucks a day from local roads.

...

The route would have also shaved 16 minutes from the Reid Highway route to Fremantle.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

A previous member mentioned that there was some discussion about a toll road. The member was right when he said that it would have been the first toll road to be introduced into Western Australia. Every member in this house and every previous member knows what a significant move that would have been in a Western Australian context. It was not considered lightly by the previous government. However, industry was prepared to have that conversation with government at the time because they saw the efficiencies that it would deliver for their businesses. In relation to a very specific example in the live export industry, in particular—I will again quote from the *Countryman* on 1 June 2017—Stephen Marley said he was trying to give context to what the challenges were. He said —

About 68 livestock ships now berth at Fremantle each year with up to 200 truckloads of livestock required to fill a ship.

“As livestockers we are hit hard because of all the livestock that goes through Fremantle,” he said.

“That biggest thing for the general public is that the volume of trucks causes frustration for other road users.

“Every road user industry will bear the cost, it’s no win.”

A push to restart the project meant dozens of protesters gathered outside the WA Parliament last month ...

And he refers to the protesters about whom we have heard from earlier speakers.

I understand the concerns that come from the other side. When talking about changes to people’s houses and traffic patterns, there is always an argument of self-interest. I am not discounting the environmental concerns of those who protested, but I have to say that I suspect that many of those protesters are professional protesters. There were certainly a number of them that we would have seen when any number of significant issues that are put forward from an industry perspective have arisen around the nation, not just in Western Australia. But from an industry perspective, it would be remiss for the Nationals WA to not put forward that this was supported by key industries in our electorates and broadly across regional Western Australia.

The challenge will be to make a decision on what the options are after this. Certainly, when this matter was first raised, one of the debates that we had in this place was about the move by this government to remove the option—or, in its view, to be able to deliver this outcome into the future—by rezoning and that this government was unwilling to put this project through Infrastructure WA. The government’s argument was that significant projects should be put through a process to make sure that it is not making decisions that could disadvantage the state, the industry and the community that it impacts on going forward. The government has been unwilling to consider this. In fact, it has ruled it out completely. We find that rather remarkable, because it is a significant project and one that will have ongoing ramifications should this bill have a successful passage through both houses of Parliament.

We firmly believe that this project should be put through Infrastructure WA because that body was endorsed when legislation was passed by this Parliament. Although members on this side of the house have raised concerns about the purpose and some specifics about how that would be managed, we do not understand why the government would hide from its project being tested by an independent body that exists to assess projects just like this. It concerns us that the government is unwilling to carry out that assessment. I am not going to go any further into some of the very emotive commentary about the road to nowhere, the scorched earth policy and protesters. I think it was just a highly combative situation about a road. It was a road. People argue about Roe 8 and that there was a road to nowhere, but the connection was from Roe 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 and we would have built Roe 9, and ultimately it would have been connected to the port. I think that this government does not have a plan. It has put a plan in place to make a plan around Westport, which we ultimately do not think will come to pass. In the meantime, communities and industry will be disadvantaged because there will be no efficient transport links and no results for people in those suburbs that are impacted by increased congestion.

From an industry perspective, the Nationals are very supportive of Roe 8. We always have been. We urge the government to reconsider and put it through Infrastructure WA to make sure that the government is not making a terrible mistake for future generations. We put on record once again that we do not support this particular piece of legislation. We accept that the government took it to the election. We accept that it was a highly emotive issue, but we do not accept that the right decision has been made. We urge the government to reconsider and make sure that it is making good decisions for the long term and not pandering to a small group of people, ultimately, to make a political point. With that, I will sit down and allow the minister to respond.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Transport) [10.17 pm] — in reply: I thank everyone for their contributions to the second reading debate of the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018. There have been some interesting contributions. I will try to cover most of the key points raised by members across the chamber. I want to recognise the contribution of the member for Bicton. It was a very passionate and informed contribution. I wish people opposite had paid her more respect, as someone who lived and breathed the issue very

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

closely. The lack of respect, particularly from the member for Bateman, for what the member for Bicton had to say was very disappointing, because, largely, opposition members were heard in silence. There were a couple of breakouts, but we controlled it pretty well. During about seven hours of contributions, we listened broadly in silence, yet when the government's first member got up to speak, she was interjected on by the member for Bateman who said some pretty awful things, frankly.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. Given that the member for Bateman did not want to run for the seat of Bicton, I thought that was quite galling.

I want to make one key point. If this was such a good project, why did the other side not deliver it in eight and a half years? I am completely gobsmacked by the comments made by members opposite. They had eight and a half years in government. They spent a lot of money. We cannot say that they did not spend a lot of money, yet in eight and a half years they did not deliver this project. It was not their priority. The member for Riverton took two key projects to the 2008 election—Roe 8 and Shelley Bridge—and in eight and a half years he did not deliver those projects. If Roe 8 was so important and if the member for Riverton was so concerned about those children, why did he not build it? If members opposite were so concerned about the truck drivers and the industry, why did they not deliver the project? They had eight and a half years and they did not do it.

Mr A. Krsticevic: We can't deliver everything.

The SPEAKER: Member for Carine!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Members opposite came into this place and said that this is the highest priority project. Members from the southern suburbs, who are purportedly meant to represent the eastern suburbs, said, "Don't worry about any other project. This is the number one project for WA." Why was it not delivered in eight and a half years? I know that in their heart of hearts, those opposite never wanted to deliver it. The member for Bateman developed the plan. I disagree with the member for Southern River on this. The former Premier did not support the project because he knew that it was a divisive project that did not make sense in the longer term. I know that. Honestly, the former Premier was so strong willed. If he thought it was a good project, he would have done it. He did things like Elizabeth Quay, which was controversial, but he believed in it. If he believed in Roe 8, he would have done it. I know that he did not believe in it. He was stopping the member for Riverton for many, many years.

Mr W.J. Johnston: That's why they cancelled it out of the budget.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The former government cancelled it out of the budget—it did not fund it and it did not make it a priority. After eight and a half years, it did not deliver this project. Then what happened? The member for Bateman, absorbed in some internal policy debates, went out and tried to create this deal with the private sector. He basically developed an option. The former member for Cottesloe, the former Premier, did not support it. He created the Roe 8 and Roe 9 option. The former Premier smacked the member for Bateman down in the media. An online article stated —

West Australian Premier Colin Barnett has confirmed plans to shelve stage two of the controversial Perth Freight Link project, saying the State Government "might see where we're at in 12 months' time".

That was in November 2015. It continued —

Mr Barnett conceded the project ... was more "expensive" and "complex" than the Government had anticipated.

...

I'm not about to rush into a decision on a link from the end of Roe 8, yet to be built, to the Fremantle Port. Because it's incredibly complicated, incredibly expensive for what it does," ..

That is what the former Premier said. The member for Bateman was talking about benefit–cost ratios, but the former Premier did not support the project.

Again, on 1 November 2015, former Premier Colin Barnett confirmed that the second stage of Roe 8 would be shelved. Then we saw the member for Bateman having a counterattack against the Premier in the media. Another article states —

"The Premier has instructed me not to proceed with the second phase, the Fremantle Tunnel, and only proceed with the Roe 8 section ...

The article was headed "Dean Nalder says decision not to proceed with Roe 8 tunnel will result in \$1.1 billion black hole".

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

We listened to the debate presented by the other side. The member for South Perth, the voice of reason, said, "Maybe we should have done it earlier. Maybe we should have done it if we believed in it." They are hollow comments from members of the Liberal Party in this place. If they believed in it, they would have done it. No-one could tell me why they did not do it in eight and a half years.

Mr W.R. Marmion: You weren't listening then.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Why did the former government not do it?

Mr W.R. Marmion: EPA. There were challenges in the courts.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: When did the member for Nedlands get elected?

Mr R.H. Cook: In 2008.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It was 2008. When did the EPA carry out an investigation into Roe 8? It was in 2016, because that is when it seriously started looking at proposals. What was it doing? Members opposite stand up and say that this is essential infrastructure, but for eight and a half years they could not deliver it. In the last two years of the former government's term, the member for Bateman was running around doing deals with the federal government and talking to key businesspeople around town about how he had this super plan—the Roe 8 and Roe 9 combination, involving tunnelling—and trying to win the former Premier over. The former Premier was so desperate that on 15 January 2017 we saw the headline "... Barnett Freight Bombshell: 'We will build a tunnel'". On 15 January 2017, the former government basically talked about how Perth Freight Link was going to get into Fremantle. The former government was all over the place. It did not proceed with it for eight and a half years. Its plan changed all the time, from tunnel to no tunnel, and the final project still did not involve plans to reach the port. It was a road to nowhere because there were still no plans to cross the river. We still do not know how the former government intended to cross the river.

Dr M.D. Nahan: Stirling Bridge.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Another Stirling Bridge.

Dr M.D. Nahan: No, not another; the existing one. Have you ever used it?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: So the opposition would spend \$2 billion to get the road to Stirling Bridge.

Mr W.J. Johnston: To get it to a set of traffic lights.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It would get the road to a set of traffic lights under an existing bridge. Is that what the opposition would do? That is the cunning plan from the opposition.

Mr W.J. Johnston: A freeway instead of traffic lights; that's what their plan is.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Now we know exactly what the opposition's plan is, it is even worse than I thought. The opposition has no plans to improve capacity over the river.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Riverton!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Again, it would be a road to nowhere. For eight and a half years the former government did not do it. It was the member for Riverton's project. How embarrassed is he for being in government for eight years —

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Riverton, you are on three. I am not going to send you home early. We are all going to stay.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton made it a key promise to his electorate and he failed to deliver it, even though he was Treasurer for many of those eight and a half years. As I said, the former government rushed its proposal together over its last couple of years in office. Obviously, it did not realise that there was an environmental process. It did not factor that in. Then it was somehow shocked that it lost the election.

The member for Darling Range said that we have no mandate on this project. I remember the first week of January 2017, when we made our plans crystal clear. It was a key election issue. I know that we fought the election on a lot of issues.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Western Power.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They included Western Power and privatisations. There were a lot of issues. We can debate this versus that until the cows come home. We managed to gain members in all the seats that surrounded this issue. That is what I know.

Ms S.E. Winton: Is that a mandate?

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I have got a mandate—silence!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We made a clear election commitment and we were elected on it.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, I call you to order for the second time, and you are not going home early either.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We are implementing that mandate. Again, we had all those discussions. Why did the Liberal Party not build that project that was so important?

Mr W.J. Johnston: It didn't care.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As the member for Cannington said, it did not care. Now we have seen this false care for this project. I will just keep going. On 27 February 2017, an article stated —

Two weeks from the state election, the Barnett Government has yet to submit its full business case or receive any of the promised Commonwealth funding for its priority road project, the \$1.9-billion Perth Freight Link.

I will quote our good friend Mathias Cormann from *The West Australian* of 8 May 2017 —

“I wish the previous State government had got cracking faster,” he said.

...

... we'd have like to have seen it built more quickly.”

That is, Roe 8 and 9, because the federal government was aware that the previous state government was asleep at the wheel.

I gave the member for Bateman some credit for actually trying to deliver this project, but I know he was blocked all the way by the former Premier. A member read out some comments made by Hon Simon O'Brien, who had apparently done some research into this issue. He was a transport minister for a fair while—the first Minister for Transport of the previous government. Instead of doing research into the history of the project, why did he not deliver it? The clear answer is that the previous government did not care enough about the project. If it had, it would have delivered it. It is as simple as that.

I heard members on the other side say that somehow the government is not doing enough on roads. Let us go through that. As a result of a deal with the commonwealth government, it diverted \$1.2 billion that was in the budget—a contingent liability—together with state money, to a lot of road projects. I will go through them. The member for Carine will be happy to know that the southern suburbs are getting a lot of projects from this government. There is the Kwinana Freeway northbound widening from Russell Road to Roe Highway. Can anyone say that that should not be a priority? Members opposite do not believe that that widening project should be undertaken. They supported Roe 8 and 9. We used that money for these projects, and they do not believe that these road projects should be undertaken. There is the smart freeway project, for which construction is underway and completion is expected early next year. Again, members opposite do not believe that the smart freeway project should go ahead. The Perth Freight Link money was diverted to the Manning Road on-ramp, member for South Perth.

Mr J.E. McGrath: A great project!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: A great project! That project would not be underway had we not taken the stance we took. There is the duplication of Armadale Road and the Armadale Road–North Lake Road bridge—again, projects that would not be underway had we not taken that policy approach.

The member for Carine said that we are flooding the northern and eastern suburbs with road projects. I agree, member for Carine. We are flooding the northern suburbs —

Mr A. Krsticevic: I said we were flooding them.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, the member said that this government is flooding the northern suburbs and eastern suburbs with projects. I agree; we are. There are freeway extensions from Wanneroo Road and improvements to Tonkin Highway. Hopefully the commonwealth government will finally give us some environmental clearance for the Roe Highway–Kalamunda Road interchange. There are all those types of projects. We are delivering them

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

all. It seems that the opposition does not care about freeway projects; it does not care about any of that. With regard to the \$1.2 billion contingent liability, do members opposite think that the commonwealth government should just leave that money there, or should it divert it to projects that we want to build? Do they think that the commonwealth government should help us build more roads, and more regional roads, for example? It could divert that \$1.2 billion, if it says it is in the budget; it is a contingent liability, so it is not really in the budget.

Mr W.J. Johnston: They could give it to us anyway.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It could give it to us anyway. The member for Darling Range is keen on the orange route. Should the commonwealth government not just divert that \$1.2 billion into that? There is also Lakelands train station, member for Dawesville. The commonwealth government has not given us 80 per cent funding for Lakelands station. We would like to see that. Could it not divert some of that \$1.2 billion that is just sitting there into Lakelands station? The commonwealth government has not given us sufficient funds for the Hodges Drive to Hepburn Avenue project. Should it not just divert some of that money now and get those projects underway? The opposition is happy for the commonwealth government to sit there on \$1.2 billion without giving it to road projects in Western Australia. It supports the federal government withholding \$1.2 billion from the state. Shame!

As members can see, we are doing a lot of road projects around the state. None of these road projects would be happening if Roe 8 and 9 were happening. It is clear that that is all the opposition cares about. It does not care about the Mitchell Freeway widening and extension, the Kwinana Freeway widening, the Wanneroo road overpasses, Armadale Road, or Karel Avenue. Members opposite do not care about any of those projects, and neither do they care about Bunbury Outer Ring Road. They believe that the only congestion issue across the state is Leach Highway. It is clear that that is their only priority. We are trying to reduce congestion and improve safety across the entire network, and all the opposition cares about is Roe 8 and 9, after it did nothing for eight and a half years. If I was that local member, who sat on the government benches as Treasurer for years and was not able to deliver my core election commitment, I would be embarrassed, and I would probably resign. The member for Riverton has no shame. He stands up and talks about the importance of a project that he could not deliver, because the former Premier stopped him doing it. When the former Premier finally gave in to it, it was all a bit too late. Everyone knows that is true. I know that the member for Bateman knows that it is true, because I know that he was trying to get the plan done, for the member for Riverton. The member for Bateman really wanted to get the job done, but the former Premier stopped him, and by the time they got their act into gear, they could not manage to do it.

Ms S.F. McGurk: They went and cleared the wetlands anyway.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, they went in and cleared the wetlands anyway, but we took it to the election. I am not sure how anyone could argue that this was not clear at the election. I am really not sure how anyone could do that.

Mr D.C. Nalder: You are saying it is about this project, and we understand that, but you are stopping any future government from having the right to do it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The opposition is going to promise it, but it will not deliver it if it ever wins. That is my view. It could not do it for eight and a half years, when it had control of both houses of Parliament. There was a federal Liberal government for many of those years, since 2013. It could not do it when it had control of both houses of Parliament and billions of dollars in iron ore royalties coming through the door. If the previous government could not do it then, when will it do it? It will not do it.

Members opposite are saying that this is the most congested area across the network, but they are wrong. The most congested metropolitan intersections are Tonkin Highway–Welshpool Road, Morley Drive–Wanneroo Road, Thomas Street–Hay Street, Charles Street–Vincent Street, Kwinana Freeway–Canning Highway, Roberts Road–Thomas Street–Wellington Street, Leach Highway–Welshpool Road, and Mitchell Freeway–Hutton Street. I could go through the list, but they are not in the top 10. The opposition talked about crash blackspots, but the area in question is not in the top 10.

Mr D.C. Nalder: I did say it was number 11 when we were in government.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bateman, you had your chance to talk.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is not number 11, but it might have been under the previous government. No members opposite actually picked up the election commitment. They come in here and condemn us for not following a plan, but why do they not bring in the plan, and we will see how we have done, compared with that election commitment? I also want to talk about a business case, because the opposition still has not released the business case for the Perth Freight Link. What have they got to hide? Maybe that business case includes all those other roads that might need to be upgraded, like Curtin Avenue, member for Cottesloe. Maybe that business case highlights all the other roads that would need to be upgraded as part of the Roe 8/9 plan. The opposition pulls out the Stephenson plan

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

and says, "We're going to do this bit, but let's not worry about everything else that was there; let's not worry about those roads cutting through the western suburbs. We don't need those any more. Let's pull out this bit and not worry about anything else." The previous government reduced the corridor for Stirling Highway from six lanes to four lanes a few months before the last election. Why would it do that? Why would it reduce highway corridor through Stirling Highway, so that it can never be implemented again?

Mr W.J. Johnston: As they did with Canning Highway in South Perth.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, Canning Highway in South Perth. Why would the government do that? The opposition's argument that governments should not change reservations is absolutely flawed because it did it all the time when it was in government.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, we actually have a minister on her feet. You obviously have not noticed.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Listen to this. I refer to a 6 November 2016 article from PerthNow, which is headed, "Colin Barnett's Claremont home off Stirling Highway hit list as WA Government scraps six-lane plans". It reads —

Minister for Planning Donna Faragher said Main Roads traffic modelling confirmed Stirling Hwy's current two traffic lanes each would "sufficiently cater for future traffic volumes".

How does that happen? Why is it okay to reduce the reservation through Stirling Highway? Why is it okay to say that we do not need upgrades at Curtin Avenue and that we do not need all the other projects that Stephenson put out, but we need this bit? Member for Cottesloe, I remember the town hall meetings on this issue before the last election. The people in the member for Cottesloe's electorate were genuinely concerned about the implications of Roe 8 and 9 on roads through that whole area, and the member for Cottesloe was either not aware of the issue or he completely ignored it. The whole idea is that this will solve everything—"Don't worry about getting over to the port, don't worry about the impact through the western suburbs, don't worry about anything else. This stretch of road will solve all traffic issues across the metropolitan area and regional WA." That appears to be the claim from this opposition.

Why will the opposition not release the business case? I have written to the new Leader of the Opposition asking that the business case be released. Why will it not release it? The member for Bateman said, "We had a policy that we would release business cases after projects went into contract." Well, it went into contract and then it went out of contract, so why will the opposition not release it?

I will comment on the member for Riverton's comments about how we handled the contract negotiations. We basically kept the employment workforce and redirected it into other jobs, including the Murdoch Drive connection and the upgrades on Armadale Road and Wanneroo Road. The Wanneroo Road duplication has already finished. The opposition's argument is that the government has been doing nothing, but we diverted the workforce into other jobs and those projects are either finished or are about to finish. There is also the argument about job losses. I think today the number of jobs lost was 10 000.

The SPEAKER: Member for Darling Range, if you want to have a meeting, go outside.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Scarborough said during the campaign that there would be 3 000 job losses. The paper quoted 500 direct jobs and 3 000 indirect jobs and today the opposition is saying 10 000 job losses.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, let us get on with it. It is getting late.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The opposition's argument is that there were all these job losses when part of our strategy was to make sure that the workforce employed onsite was redirected to three other jobs, which, as I said, are either finished or about to finish. We have employed people and we have created more jobs through a range of different projects. Again, the claims made are completely false. Opposition members had the same speaking notes. I understand that that is what happens. The basis of those notes was pretty wrong. The same mistake was reiterated by different members on job numbers and the business case and intersection analysis. Indeed, everything that opposition members said was basically flawed. I am not sure where they got those numbers from. Maybe it was 2016 when things were created, but things have moved on and we are doing a lot of work to reduce congestion and create new jobs. Do members opposite know that 52 road projects across the state worth \$5 billion are currently under procurement and planning? Many of them are underway but we have so many more to come. The idea that we would stop everything and just build Roe 8 and 9 and ignore the plight of people travelling north on the freeway or people coming south from the northern suburbs, or using Tonkin Highway, is completely wrong.

The member for Scarborough made some comments about selling the land. She said the same thing on radio. We are not selling the land. She compared it to the sale of some high school sites after the former Premier had

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

closed them. She said that once we sell them, they will be gone forever. I agree, but we are not selling the land. Members asked why it should be zoned parks and recreation. Look at the map; it is parks and recreation. I am a little conservative on these sorts of issues, but when we look at the map, there is nothing else it could be. What else would it be? Of course, it will be zoned parks and recreation. We are not selling the land. The member for Scarborough said on radio that we would be selling the land and that we would never be able to buy it back. We are not doing that at all.

Other issues were that this government was ignoring other road projects that would be required as part of the Roe 8 and 9 strategy. The belief of the member for Riverton that we could build Roe 8 and 9 and keep Stirling Highway as it is would not be the advice the member for Riverton would have received. I am sure the member for Bateman had different advice. There is no way we could build Roe 8 and 9 and leave Stirling Highway Bridge exactly as it is. That is why the previous government was looking at tunnels and duplication of the bridge. They were the two options. It was investigating a sort of floating tunnel at the bottom of the seabed.

Mr D.C. Nalder: A trench.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It would have to be built as a tunnel. I understand it was called a floating tunnel because it would have sat on top of the seabed, but it was to be weighed down.

Mr I.C. Blayney: There is one in Sydney and in Hong Kong.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes. The technology is out there and those sorts of proposals were put forward to the government. However, of course, one issue about a tunnel option was that to surface on the other side, the route would have had to go past the port and come back. That was not an option that looked too good. Another option was duplication of the Stirling Highway Bridge, which would have to happen if Roe 8 and 9 were built. It is as simple as that. We have some evidence that some further work happened to show that.

Members opposite like Roe 8 and 9 because it does not affect any of their voters. If we talk about the need to build a road project such as Curtin Avenue, we hear nothing. They are happy to tell other communities that they should have this road but they are not happy to build the roads in their communities. That is something we will point out to everyone: "They want you to take this road but all the other connecting bits, the bits that go through the western suburbs, are off the agenda; you don't need them." If we work on the Stephenson plan, we get the Stephenson plan. They cannot pick and choose roads that are in someone else's electorate. As I said, there is Curtin Avenue. Planning work undertaken by Main Roads a number of years ago identified that the preferred concept was to realign Curtin Avenue between the substation and the rail line. This concept includes grade separation at Jarrad Street with both the rail line and realigned Curtin Avenue. It also includes a grade separation at the Eric Street connection. They are significant works through Cottesloe, which would all be part of any Roe 8 and 9 solution.

I will continue replying to all the comments of members opposite. I again outline the contingent liability. The opposition reckons that \$1.2 billion is there as a contingent liability. Federal Minister Alan Tudge said that the \$1.2 billion does not sit on the cash account as such; it is just a contingent liability that sits there in the budget papers. There is no cash. There is no money but if members opposite want to claim there is money there, I am happy to take it for other projects. That is my view now. People claim there is \$1.2 billion. Let us build those other projects that everyone is calling for.

Mr D.T. Punch: I can help spend it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Bunbury could help spend it. Imagine what we could do on regional road safety. We could widen every shoulder throughout regional Western Australia with that \$1.2 billion.

If the commonwealth wants to give us \$1.2 billion for roads and it knows we are not doing the Perth Freight Link, why will it not give it to regional roads, other freeway improvements and Thomas Road? Why will it not give it to us for those? I hope the opposition supports my call that we are not spending \$1.2 billion. Apparently, it is sitting there; the opposition says it is sitting there. Why will the commonwealth not be productive with that funding and give it to us for all those other projects people are calling for, such as the North West Coastal Highway, member for Geraldton? We were talking about the Oakajee Narngulu Infrastructure Corridor and the alignment past Geraldton. Maybe it could fund that project.

I quote another former Minister for Transport, Hon Troy Buswell, who, in 2011, said —

... the inner harbour was expected to reach its capacity to manage container trade in about 10 years and a long-term plan was required to secure future trade gateways.

He was talking about planning decisions to create a new outer harbour container port facility in Cockburn Sound. That was what the previous government was doing. It was not building Roe 8 and 9. For many years of its government it was starting to plan for the outer harbour. That is exactly what was happening.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Regarding truck movements and freight on rail, the opposition skips over the fact that we are getting so much freight on rail as if it is no effort at all, as if it was not some very good effort made by the department and industry to work together to increase freight on rail. We are increasing freight on rail. I will give members some quick statistics of total freight units going into Fremantle port. In April 2016, 47 025 road freight units went into Fremantle. In 2019, there were 46 159 units. In April 2016, there were 7 495 rail units, and in 2019, 14 336 rail units. We are increasing freight on rail to reduce truck pressure. Members opposite talk about natural caps and limits, but why were they not doing anything about this? They were so concerned about the children on Leach Highway that they did nothing to encourage fewer trucks on that road for eight and a half years. We came in with a plan to get more freight on rail. We are doing that. We are doing everything possible, including negotiating with the commonwealth for the new Fremantle Traffic Bridge and expanded rail capacity to keep those numbers moving up. Main Roads data has shown a stabilisation of truck movements and a stabilisation in average speed, with a slight increase, which means that the congestion is reducing slightly. I am not saying that that is a huge victory; I am saying that we are working hard to reduce trucks on Leach Highway. That means doing a lot of work with industry to get more freight on rail. That is a positive thing, and members opposite brush over it. Why could they not get these numbers? If they were so concerned about trucks on Leach Highway, why did they not do this work? We moved from 14 per cent of freight on rail to 24 per cent in two years. That is a massive increase. We are stabilising movements. As I said, this is not the endgame, but we are making sure that we implement what we committed to do. Members opposite all look down, they do not care, because it is real policy work that the department is undertaking with industry. I congratulate industry for working with the state on doing that.

I refer to intermodals and this whole idea that containers come from different sources and go to different destinations. Yes, but that will always be the case. Do not tell me we do not have more opportunities to develop intermodals across our network. That is part of our plan.

We are seeing some work in Kenwick and with the Forrestfield intermodal. There are plans. The industry is keen because it understands that these logistics hubs are good employment generators across the metropolitan area. Councils are keen. We create those hubs and help to distribute those containers across the wider area. That is what good intermodals do. This whole idea that somehow they are not a good idea completely baffles me, when every industry player and council is screaming out for them because they know that they are the employment generators of the future. Working with the right rail network, we can deliver some excellent results.

This whole idea that the opposition has not heard from the Westport Taskforce is surprising. It is doing more forums and consultation than I think any other task force group is doing. We set the plan and we are sticking to it. The plan was short-term road improvements, facilitate intermodal and get more freight on rail. We have more freight on rail. We are facilitating intermodal and High Street is a key component. The member for Churchlands mocked the fact that we are doing a new car park for the netball courts there. Again, that is a good outcome, because that is a dangerous area, as members —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I agree that it's a good outcome.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No, he mocked it.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: I mocked the fact that you have erased Roe 8 and put in a car park for netball.

The SPEAKER: Member!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Bicton was here. He mocked —

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: You are misleading because the netball community —

The SPEAKER: Member, you do not get a right of reply. You spoke before and now the minister is replying.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Churchlands mocked that we are providing a safer environment. If we look at some of the benefits from the High Street project, that, together with pedestrian access, is one of them. I think it is a good thing. The Liberal Party had it on its books and it could not deliver that. The previous government had this project on its books for \$118 million in about early 2010–11 or 2011–12, but it could not deliver that. It was another project that it cancelled because it could not work out how to deal with the City of Fremantle to get this project underway. We have worked with the City of Fremantle and we have a great outcome. We are in the final stages of processes and we are looking forward to proceeding with that. As I said, our short-term goals are to facilitate intermodal, which we are doing, more freight on rail and road improvements, and that is what we are doing. Of course, the Westport Taskforce is doing a very thorough assessment of all options and looking in particular at plans for the outer harbour. I think the member for Central Wheatbelt said that they want to start moving non-container freight out of Fremantle Harbour initially. We are looking at that. Again, that will reduce pressure.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

My point is a strong economic argument. Why spend \$2 billion for Roe 8 and 9—probably another \$500 million to get to the port, all the other associated upgrades, probably Curtin Avenue, and all the other ones, \$3 billion to \$4 billion, Stock Road, maybe going to \$4 billion to \$5 billion now. Why would we spend \$5 billion to get to a port that has a finite life for further expansions? That is the economic argument that no-one opposite addressed. The opposition is not looking at the future economic and trade vision for WA. We are a growing economy. We want to continue to grow and we need a port to facilitate that. The idea is to have \$5 billion worth of road projects, which is what it would probably add up to, to get to a port. Members can argue how many years Fremantle port has left, but a number of years are attached to that existing port. Our plan is an economically and financially responsible plan. It is not driven by emotion. The opposition's position has been driven by the member for Riverton's unhealthy obsession with this project since 2008. The only road that the Liberal Party cares about now is a road that it could not deliver for eight and a half years. Members talk about families. What were families doing on Kwinana Freeway, heading north to the city, when they were held up between Russell Road and Roe Highway every day? We are trying to fix that. We are trying to fix that with the smart freeways option, and we are fixing Armadale Road. These are the issues that saw Western Australian families in their vehicles missing out on family time, and members on the other side did not care about it. When I rode that freeway with one of the news organisations, we saw the reality that the freeway has never seen the amount of work that we have underway at the moment both north and south. We are delivering transformational projects on Tonkin Highway and across the network, such as Bunbury Outer Ring Road and Albany ring-road. These projects were never considered by the previous government.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Tom Price road!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: And the Tom Price–Karratha Road! Our argument is a solid economic and financial argument, which will preserve the Beeliar parklands and wetlands for future generations. The idea that a road could be built through a parkland or a wetland and it would improve it is something I have never heard before. If members opposite think that, they can build a freeway through Kings Park and see how they go with that.

Mr S.K. L'Estrange: You can go under it—a tunnel!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Is the new policy a tunnel under the wetlands?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Come on, members! It is getting to fairy time. Let us get on with it.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have outlined the plan that we took to the election and we are implementing that plan.

Mr W.J. Johnston: And it's working.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is working. It is my view that there is always more to be done. I am never complacent about road safety in this job. That members opposite stood up and said that people would die because of this bill is disgraceful. I will give them the comparison. They did not build the Ellenbrook rail line. When there is a car accident in the north east corridor and that person could have been using that rail line, I do not say that members opposite are responsible. That is the stupid logic that they are using. Saying those words is disgusting. For every road there is an accident on now that members opposite did not fix, I could say the same to them.

Dr M.D. Nahan interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Riverton!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Are members opposite responsible for every person who dies on a road they did not fix?

We have a very logical plan and we are sticking to it. Part of that is preserving the —

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, do you want to get up to talk? Do not sit down and talk. Minister, you have 34 seconds left.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This is a responsible plan for future generations. Members opposite do not believe we need an outer harbour or that, unlike any other place around the world, we need to look at how to continue to expand our freight movements logically over the years. They did nothing for eight and a half years to solidify a trade and investment plan for Western Australia. In opposition, their contributions today were pathetic and poor. Whoever wrote those notes was consistently wrong.

Division

Question put and division taken with the following result —

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]
p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Ayes (34)

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

Noes (16)

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

Pairs

Mr M. McGowan	Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr P. Papalia	Mr V.A. Catania
Mr Y. Mubarakai	Mr P.J. Rundle

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1: Short title —

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Clause 1 states —

This is the *Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Act 2018*.

The SPEAKER: Members! Minister for Sport and Recreation! Adjust your hearing aid.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That implies that this bill is an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme. The longstanding process for making amendments to the metropolitan region scheme is quite detailed. Indeed, the second reading speech states that the government is pursuing this bill to enable the amendment to the metropolitan region scheme to be made more quickly. Under the normal process for making amendments to the MRS, the government needs to undertake community consultation and environmental assessments, look at the alternatives, and analyse the benefits of its decision to excise this road. What work was done in preparation for this bill, in discussion with the community more recently, to assess the impact of this decision?

The SPEAKER: Members, if you want to have a meeting, go outside. I will hear this in silence, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I thank the member for Riverton for that question on consultation. This has been one of the most widely debated and discussed issues probably over the past two years. I do not think any area of land has been discussed as much or received more attention than this metropolitan region scheme reservation. For example, it has probably had more attention paid to it than the Stirling Highway reservation through the western suburbs that the member reduced. This reservation has had significant debate —

Mr A. Krsticevic interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Carine, you are not an expert on everything or anything.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: He interjects on everything.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: This has been subject to significant debate and discussion. If we look at the map, it is very hard to think of what it could be other than for parks and recreation.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Dr M.D. NAHAN: This issue has had a lot of discussion over many decades and the arguments have been overwhelmingly for it continuing as a road reservation. The minister is putting forward a bill to Parliament that will reverse a decision of 55 years and lock out a longstanding policy to build a road. The minister claims to be amending the MRS to do that more quickly. Just because the minister is doing it quickly does not mean she does not have to follow a certain process. Has the minister undertaken any more community consultation on or assessment of the environmental, social and economic effects of this decision? In the preparation of this bill, did the minister undertake any additional —

Several members interjected.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Mr Speaker, I seek your assistance.

The SPEAKER: It is the member of Carine who is arguing with the government member. Both of you, quiet please.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Has the minister undertaken any additional information gathering, in particular, by talking with impacted communities, on the decisions that relate to this bill? Saying that it has been talked about in the past is virtually irrelevant, because this is a new bill and an excision from the metropolitan region scheme. Has the minister done any preparation for this bill?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We have had the normal discussions on the general issue with councils and some of the community groups. As the member would expect, over the past two and a half years, we have talked to councils and community groups. My department has been liaising with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation and the relevant environmental agencies.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Can the minister provide us with information on those decisions?

The SPEAKER: Member for Riverton, this is just on the short title. If you have any other issues —

Dr M.D. NAHAN: She just made a statement in response to a question —

The SPEAKER: Member, we are talking about the short title of the bill; the rest can be discussed further on.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I am responding to her statement. She made a statement. She correctly responded to it.

Point of Order

Mr S.J. PRICE: This is a debate on the short title of the bill. What the member is going on about has no relevance.

The SPEAKER: I am sure that the member will get back to the short title of the bill.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The title of the bill is “Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill”. Amendment of the metropolitan region scheme generally follows a process. I am trying to ascertain whether the title of the bill is correct. Has the minister followed a process of information gathering in the preparation of this bill? The minister answered yes to that question. She said that she surveyed or had discussions with the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation, various shires and others. I would like to see evidence of that. Who was it and what did they say? What were their arguments? Did the minister document it? Could the minister give us some detail?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It must really irritate the member for Riverton that he had eight and a half years and he did not build this project. Look at him—the bitter man who in eight and a half years never delivered this project. He is standing up here making a fool of himself. In relation to this, this is legislation that we have brought in. The act allows for this type of process and that is what we are doing. If the member wants to say that this is illegal, say it. But the fact is that he spent eight and a half years, many years as Treasurer, and he failed to deliver Roe 8. I am sorry that he was so incompetent!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: If that is the type of response we will be getting from this minister, we will be here for a while. The second reading speech says that the government is pursuing this process through the bill to expedite the excision. We are trying to ascertain what work the minister has done to justify it. The minister said that she has had discussions with a range of people. I am following up and asking: who and what did they say, and could she provide the documentation?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The process was that we brought forward legislation to this place to preserve the Roe 8 reservation as parks and recreation. Through that, we had discussions, as would be expected, with a range of people. I can provide that list, but the member’s question is: is this illegal? It is not illegal.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is a new act of Parliament to preserve this reservation as parks and recreations.

As I said, it must really irritate the member for Riverton that he never delivered Roe 8 in eight and a half years of government.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister has offered to provide that information; could she provide us that information? She said that in preparation for this bill, she had discussions with a wide range of people or groups. In planning processes, generally, the discussions are extensive, detailed and written. Usually, one of the aspects of our planning process is there is extensive discussion with all groups impacted, and those discussions are documented. Does the minister have any documents that will back up her claim that she has had extensive discussions with interest groups?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will provide some information in relation to discussions by the end of the week.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That is not very good because we have to vote on it this week. The minister wants to provide information that provides the basis for this after we vote.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister has advisers sitting next to her, who I presume had input into the consultation process, who should be able to whisper into her ear and say, "You have talked with these people" or, better yet, provide the documentation that they would have provided to the minister about the basis of the bill. Here we are considering the excision of a piece of land that has been in the metropolitan region scheme for 55 years; has been a major part of the planning process for freight, truck and car movement for decades; has, as the minister says, been one of the most controversial and well discussed; and, as we have read out from this side, has been supported by almost every expert in the area. The minister comes in here and says, "We are going to put a bill through and expedite the excision process. We are not going through the normal process. This bill is going to expedite it two years early."

The SPEAKER: Member, you are getting away from the purpose of —

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I am not.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Excuse me, member for Wanneroo. Do you want to go home? You are the one I will send home early. Just be quiet and let the member have his say.

A member interjected.

The SPEAKER: No; no-one else is getting that leave pass!

Member, you are getting away from the bill. I have to be strict on this because otherwise you will do the rest of the bill during debate on the short title. That is not the way we do it.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: Certain standard, accepted processes are followed when a metropolitan region scheme is amended; that is, consultation and documentation. When I asked the minister, she claimed that she has consulted. She says she will give us documentation after the bill has effectively passed this Parliament, so it is useless to us. One would think that she would come in prepared. If they had documentation, an assessment of discussions, rationale for it, support for it, one would expect them to be ready in consideration in detail. Given the sensitivity and importance of this issue, she should have it ready in Parliament, but she has not. Her flippant answer was, "I will give it to you at the end of the week." That is not good enough.

If that is the case, we have to assume that she has done none whatsoever. The minister's first response was that this has been discussed extensively—yes, it has, but not this bill. This is a new decision by the government. It did not go out before the election and say it was going to excise the land. It did say it was going to rip up the contract, and it did, but this is a different one. This is the one before Parliament. What the Labor Party said in opposition is immaterial. This is a bill before Parliament to excise land.

Point of Order

Ms S.E. WINTON: Standing order 179 states—

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

I believe the member for Riverton is going to general debate on this bill.

Mr W.R. Marmion: I have a point of order.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Dr A.D. Buti: Let him answer the point of order!

The SPEAKER: All the experts I have in the chamber here tonight should let me answer the point of order first. I say to the member for Riverton, you are drawing a very broad brush on this issue. The point you are bringing up now can be brought up later in the bill.

The member for Wanneroo's point of order is correct, but I am sure that the member for Riverton will get on with it. We can sit here all night and talk about this. The member asked the minister whether she had done any research and she said she would get it to the member by the end of the week. We could talk here for three hours but it will not come any sooner. Are we going to try to pass the bill or are you trying to hold it up?

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I support what the Speaker said, but it is a very important point. She is essentially saying that she has information that might be germane to the debate here, but she is not going to give it to us. She is not going to give it to us now.

Dr A.D. Buti: The minister.

The SPEAKER: It is the minister, please.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister has decided that she has done research—community consultation—to support this bill. She brought the bill on; not us.

The SPEAKER: The minister.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister brought the bill on; not us. She is either not prepared or has not done the consultation, or is just hiding the information from us when we are debating this bill. As she said, this has been a widely debated issue. Many concerns were raised on this side during general debate.

Point of Order

Ms S.E. WINTON: I have a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: It had better not be frivolous.

Ms S.E. WINTON: No, it is not frivolous. I again point the Speaker to standing order 179. I believe that we are debating the short title of the bill. Unless the member is suggesting he cannot vote on the basis of needing further information—if that is what he is saying—I think we should focus on the short title.

Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup: Are you an Acting Speaker? If you are an Acting Speaker, that is a very big concern of mine.

The SPEAKER: I am very concerned about you talking across the chamber. I think that is even worse. You are not even an Acting Speaker; maybe you should be.

It is a point of order I am trying to get across to the member, but it is not a point of order.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister is not going to provide us with any of the information she says she has collected as the basis of the bill until the bill is voted on. I raise an issue. The minister said this issue has been widely debated. The report "Transport and traffic implications of not proceeding with Perth Freight Link and the broader economic and social consequences" was provided by the South West Group. The minister says she has had discussions with the councils. They would obviously be the councils impacted by this, such as Cockburn, Fremantle and Kwinana, which are part of the South West Group. The report was prepared by Greg Martin Transport Strategies in October 2016. The minister has it. Has she responded in any way to the issues in this report? The report raises a whole range of concerns. If Roe 8 does not proceed, there are all sorts of implications.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: I would like to hear more from the member for Riverton.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: As we have repeatedly said, all sorts of issues are impacting the city councils that the minister said she has had discussions with.

The SPEAKER: Member, it cannot be a general debate on this.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: We are looking for documentation to support the bill. She says she has it, but she is not going to give it to us now.

The SPEAKER: Member, it is not "she"; it is "the minister".

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The minister says she has the information, but she is not going to give it to us until after the vote. The minister said that the bill is based on wide discussions over years. I am highlighting a study that was done by the groups that she says she has consulted with, which have grave concerns about the excision of the land and its impact on them and the state. I am just asking the minister whether, in preparation for this bill—in deciding to have the bill—she or her department responded to the concerns raised in the study. Surely, the city councils, which funded and published the research and which will be impacted by the excision, would have expressed these concerns to the minister in no uncertain terms. Has the minister responded to this report or otherwise responded to the councils that she says she has had discussions with about their concerns about the impact on them, the roads they are responsible for and the roads they will have to upgrade, according to this report, if the minister amends the metropolitan region scheme as proposed?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton has never given this side of Parliament any respect in this place for any of the work we have done. He is quoting a 2016 report. I just spent 45 minutes outlining what we have done to manage trucks, freight on rail, and everything else we have done. The member can quote that report until the cows come home, but he has not accepted or understood any of the work we have done. The member will go through this process tonight disrespecting me and my team, because he always has. He has never rated —

Dr D.J. Honey: By forcing it at this hour, that's respect?

The SPEAKER: Member for Cottesloe, have a bit of respect for the Parliament, please.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member Riverton has never rated some members on this side. He does not think we deserve to be here—fair enough. But over the last 45 minutes I have outlined what we are doing. The member may not agree with it or he may not have absorbed it; I do not know what he was doing. He can quote the report until the cows come home, but we have implemented a number of strategies, which I have outlined.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I know the minister is doing a lot of things on roads, and she has outlined some of them. Most of them were funded by the commonwealth and the redirection of the \$1.2 billion.

The SPEAKER: Member, that has got nothing to do with —

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I am just responding to her statement.

The SPEAKER: That has got nothing to do with the short title.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: She responded to me —

The SPEAKER: Member, do you want me to sit you down?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, please!

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I take it that the minister has not responded to this study undertaken by the councils in the South West Group, which she says she has had some discussions with on this decision.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: The member for Riverton keeps making things up and he wants me to respond. If he wants to do this—if he just wants to make things up that are not related to the clause—I will stand up in response every time and say that he must be very embarrassed that he was in government for eight and a half years and never built Roe 8.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: Further to the point that the member for Riverton was making, the short title of the bill says “Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018”. Generally, when there is a metropolitan region scheme amendment, a process is followed, and we are trying to understand what kind of process was put in place during the drafting of this legislation. The minister, in her response, indicated quite clearly, and we all heard it, that she had consulted and that she was prepared to provide us with information about who she consulted with, but not until after we have voted on the bill. We think it is perfectly reasonable, as an opposition doing our due diligence in Parliament, to request from the minister information that could be relevant to our deliberations. I have sat on the benches over there and put legislation through this place, and have come to a point at which it is apparent that further information is required, and debate was adjourned to enable the provision of that information. Indeed, the minister herself did that when we were considering the strata titles and community titles legislation. Some issues needed to be resolved and, in the interests of the good-faith operations of this Parliament, she has taken the time to provide us with additional information in the interests of getting the legislation through this Parliament. That is all we are asking as an opposition. We are just asking for the consultation schedule that is usually provided in the file that comes to the Parliament. Who was consulted? When were they consulted?

This is an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme, and my research has shown me that there have been only two occasions in the current history of this Parliament on which the metropolitan region scheme has been changed

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

by an act of Parliament. Every other metropolitan region scheme amendment has followed another process that has gone through the WA Planning Commission. It has been managed by the WA Planning Commission. There has been an advertisement period for comments from the community and affected parties. They have given their input, and there has been an assessment and consultation during the drafting of the legislation. We are not being unreasonable. We have indicated that this consultation has occurred, but the minister is not willing to provide us with information about who has been consulted until after we have voted on the legislation. We cannot respectfully pass legislation in this place when we know that there is information that we do not have at hand to inform our deliberations. That is all we are asking for. The minister said that she had it and that she would provide it by the end of the week, but at the end of the week Parliament rises and this legislation will have passed through this place, if that is the government's intention. We think that it is not unreasonable to request that information.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I provided an answer to a question raised by the member for Riverton. As the member has outlined, this is not a normal MRS process. We are bringing legislation to the Parliament to amend the MRS, so the normal processes do not happen. That is the whole point of this. The Leader of the Opposition has raised this as an issue, so I do not understand why she thinks it is a normal MRS process when it is not. In relation to the commitment, I gave that commitment before, but the opposition voted against the bill, and it is going to vote against the bill. This is not determining anything, because the opposition has already voted against the second reading. We can pursue this. I will sit down and the member can raise another point, and we will just keep going.

Mr W.R. MARMION: My question relates to the short title, and it relates to consultation about the bill. Regardless of whether the metropolitan region scheme requires consultation, I would like the minister to advise me what consultation has happened on this bill, in particular with the transport industry, taxi operators and operators of bus fleets. Could the minister give us some indication of whether some of those bodies were consulted on this bill?

The SPEAKER: Member, you are debating, not asking a question.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am asking whether the minister can provide the names of the transport companies, taxidrivers, bus groups and industry groups that were consulted on this bill. There are only five clauses and the only way we can explore whether there has been consultation on this bill is in the short title.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As the members behind me said, the member for Nedlands should have asked that question during the second reading debate. This bill will change a reservation from roads to parks and recreation. We have had the debate on Roe 8 and 9 for two years, 20 years and 30 years. Everyone knew our position on Roe 8 and 9 before the election. Everyone continues to know our position. Everyone was consulted about this issue heavily during the election campaign. Since that time, people have been very aware of the government's policy. That is it.

The SPEAKER: Members, the question is that clause 1, "Short title", stand as printed—the short title.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Yes, everyone heard the debate about the road, but we did not have a debate about it becoming parks and recreation.

The SPEAKER: Member, that does not relate to the short title. We are in debate on clause 1, the short title. The member cannot go into any other debate.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Clause 1 is about the reserve becoming parks and recreation.

The SPEAKER: No, it is not. It is the short title of the bill.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Just referring to the short title, Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Act 2018, can the minister provide an answer about why Beeliar wetlands has been included in the title?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because the area that we are preserving includes part of the Beeliar wetlands.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Is it not true that 99.5 per cent of the Beeliar wetlands falls outside the Roe 8 road reserve?

The SPEAKER: Member, you are getting away from the title.

Mr D.C. NALDER: No, it is the title; it is right onto the title.

The SPEAKER: I beg your pardon. I am telling you that you are moving away from the short title. We are talking about the title, not the bill itself.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am talking specifically about the title.

The SPEAKER: Excuse me. I am telling you. Does the member for Bateman want to go home?

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am advised that parliamentary counsel came up with the title. With respect to the member's point, I cannot confirm that at all.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Given that the government has used Beeliar wetlands in the title and that 99.5 per cent of the Beeliar wetlands falls outside the reserve, is this not misleading to the community?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Is it not true that only three per cent of the Roe 8 road reserve is wetlands?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: No.

Mr D.C. NALDER: What is it then, please?

The SPEAKER: Excuse me; do it properly. You are making a mockery of the parliamentary system.

Mr D.C. Nalder: No, I'm not.

The SPEAKER: Excuse me. I call you to order for the first time. I can throw you out on one call; just remember that. You are disrespecting Parliament by not acknowledging me or the minister.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Mr Speaker, I seek clarification. Standing order 92 on page 51 refers to imputations and personal reflections. You just called the member for Bateman to account for making a mockery. I think he was just asking a question. I am not sure that he was making a mockery.

The SPEAKER: No. I accept the point of order, but he was standing up without acknowledging the Chair or the minister. He just got up and started talking without using the proper protocol that we use every day in Parliament.

Debate Resumed

Mr D.C. NALDER: If it is not true that only three per cent of the Roe 8 road reserve is wetland area, what is the area that is wetland? The bill uses Beeliar wetlands in the title. I have said that 99.5 per cent of the Beeliar wetlands falls outside the road reserve. I have said that the wetland area inside the road —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr D.C. NALDER: Prove it. I said that the wetland area inside the road reserve —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Mr D.C. NALDER: What I am explaining is that the government has used Beeliar wetlands in the title but it has nothing to do with the Beeliar wetlands. The majority of the Beeliar wetlands—99.5 per cent—falls outside the road reserve. Why are we including in the title “Beeliar Wetlands”? We are looking at the Roe 8 reserve, which is what we are looking to amend. We are not looking to amend the Beeliar wetlands. Ninety-nine and a half per cent of Beeliar wetlands falls outside the road reserve. I think the government is using this as a political pointscore exercise to say that it is saving the Beeliar wetlands when in fact 99.5 per cent of it falls outside. The six hectares of wetland area make up roughly three per cent of the Roe 8 road reserve. Three per cent of the Roe 8 road reserve is the wetlands area. I am trying to understand on what basis we are including “Beeliar Wetlands” in the title if it is not anything other than a political exercise.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There is no question in that.

Mrs L.M. Harvey interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Members opposite are treating this completely disrespectfully.

Point of Order

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Standing order 92 provides that imputations are not to be made against a member of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order.

Debate Resumed

Dr M.D. NAHAN: The short title is as written, Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Act 2018. We are trying to ascertain why the words “Beeliar Wetlands” are in there. This bill seeks to amend the MRS to excise a road reserve. We are not seeking to excise the Beeliar wetlands according to the existing scheme. We are seeking to excise

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

a road reserve, which includes Hope Road, I think, and other non-wetland areas. Why does the minister not amend it to be “Metropolitan Region Scheme (Roe 8 Road Reserve) Act 2018”? That would be an accurate description.

Ms S.E. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: That would be an accurate description of the bill.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There is no question there. The member for Riverton can move an amendment.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I did ask a question; I will repeat it.

The SPEAKER: The minister said there is no question. If you want to make an amendment, you can move an amendment.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: No, I do not. We are trying to treat this seriously despite the noise in the outer seats.

Why is the minister including in the title “Beeliar Wetlands” when she is not amending the MRS Beeliar wetlands? She is seeking to amend the MRS to excise a road reserve. Why does the bill not reflect that rather than the Beeliar wetlands? There must be a reason. That is a question.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Parliamentary counsel decided on the name. It is not some incredible conspiracy. That is the name. In many MRS amendments we do not say “remove road reserves”; we talk about the purpose of the amendment. That is what happens with MRS amendments.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I accept that the minister might have had advice from parliamentary counsel, but she is the minister; she chooses it. The title usually reflects a description of what is to take place. It is a reasonable question. Why does the minister just not be explicit about the metropolitan region scheme so that people who look at the scheme and this amendment know what it is doing? It will not amend the Beeliar wetlands. It will not impact on a substantial part of the Beeliar wetlands. It seeks to excise Roe 8 road reserve and people will want to know the purpose of it. The question is: why does the minister not amend it to include “Roe 8 Road Reserve”?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I have answered that.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I would like to understand why the minister did not think she needed to respond to the fact that this bill does not involve the wetlands, and that 97 per cent of it has nothing to do with wetlands.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because the member’s assertions are wrong.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Could the minister please explain why my assertions are wrong?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They are the member’s assertions.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am a little confused because —

A member interjected.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, you are not in your seat.

Mr D.C. NALDER: I am a little confused because it is a well-known fact that 99.5 per cent of the wetland area falls outside the road reserve, yet the minister refuses to acknowledge that and I do not understand that. It is not clear how the minister justifies the short title of the bill containing “Beeliar Wetlands”, when it has very little to do with the Beeliar wetlands, and 97 per cent of the road reserve does not have any wetlands in it. I am not sure that the minister is explaining why she is titling this bill with “Beeliar Wetlands” when it has nothing to do with Beeliar wetlands. Why is the minister ignoring the question? I think we are asking a fair and reasonable question.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is because the member keeps making assertions that are incorrect.

Mr D.C. NALDER: Can the minister please enlighten me as to the fact, if she believes my assertions are incorrect? What have I said that is incorrect?

A member interjected.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, go over to your seat if you want to talk.

Mrs L.M. HARVEY: The opposition is raising a valid point, because the government has obviously made a decision to never commence the Roe 8 project. This short title, Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Act 2018, suggests that the intent of this legislation is to name a part of the metropolitan region scheme as Beeliar wetlands, when the minister has made it quite clear that the purpose of this legislation is to delete the road

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

reservation that has been in place for 55 years. The Beeliar wetlands are two streams of lakes. The name for the collection of 19 coastal salt lakes gathered together is the Beeliar Regional Park. There are several different names that this legislation could bear. We are suggesting that this short title does not appropriately describe what the legislation does. The opposition will move an amendment to the short title, because this legislation effectively changes a portion of metropolitan region scheme land from a road reservation for the purpose of allowing a freeway to be built, and turns it into parks and recreation. In effect, the purpose of this legislation and what it will achieve is to remove a road reservation. It does not create a wetland. To that end, I move —

Page 2, line 2 — To delete “*Beeliar Wetlands*” and substitute —

Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion

Mr D.C. NALDER: It has been quite disappointing that the minister has not been able to explain to the chamber the short title of the bill when it has been pointed out that this is nothing more than a political exercise, trying to claim credit for something that is not true in its description. We have pointed out that the majority of the Beeliar wetlands falls outside the road reserve. I am not just talking about the majority; I am talking about 99.5 per cent!

When that is pointed out to the minister, she tells me that they are false assertions. When I say, “What is false about it? Please explain to me how I am incorrect. Was it 99.6 or 99.4 per cent? What is the percentage?”, she claims that I am making false assertions. The minister wants to play a bit cute around the title to make it sound like this massive environmental agenda, when the reality is, from a wetlands perspective, the Beeliar wetlands makes up about half a per cent of the road reserve. The Roe 8 road reserve is about 196 hectares and about six hectares of that is wetlands or swamps. I think one is called Dog Swamp. Another is called Horse Paddock Swamp. I think they account for about six hectares, which is about three per cent of the road reserve. I think the title is not appropriate if we want to be descriptive in the appropriate manner for the community to understand what we are trying to achieve here.

I think that it is incumbent on the minister to be a little more forthright in her responses to the questions that have been put to her on the short title and regarding this amendment being a more accurate reflection of the intention of this bill. I think that it is fair and reasonable of the opposition to put forward these arguments. There are not many clauses in this bill; there are only five. There is not much of an opportunity to get into a debate. I think that we are making a relevant point to the minister. I do not know what her point is—whether it is to try to make arguments with the opposition. I think that the assertions that she has made about the member for Riverton were totally inappropriate. She also said that I have made false assertions about “Beeliar Wetlands” being inappropriate, but she has not been able to describe to us why it is appropriate and the basis of the title including “Beeliar Wetlands”.

On that basis, I support the Leader of the Opposition’s amendment that changes the title by deleting “Beeliar Wetlands” and inserting “Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion”. That reflects more what this bill is about. I am sure the minister would agree that this provides a more accurate reflection for all people to understand exactly what we are doing. Otherwise, it is implied that all the Beeliar wetlands are under the Roe 8 road reserve, which is not an accurate reflection at all. I am sure the minister is not deliberately trying to mislead people and is trying to do the right thing. We are trying to help her provide people with a more accurate understanding of what the intention of this bill is all about.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I would also like to stand and support this amendment. The words of the amendment are that “Beeliar Wetlands” be deleted and “Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion” be inserted. The government is misleading Parliament. We need to be very careful in this place. We must abide by rules, regulations and guidelines, and go through certain processes when forming policy. The title of a bill should reflect what the bill stands for and we should make sure that we are not misleading Parliament and Western Australia. I am sure that the last thing the minister wants to do is deliberately mislead the chamber, even though she refused to answer questions that were put to her previously. I hope she is not misleading the chamber in any way. We all know what happened to the last member who did that. We need to make sure —

The SPEAKER: Be very careful with your commentary, please.

Mrs A.K. HAYDEN: I am being very careful and very respectful of the process of this place and our position. I think the minister needs to take the same position and honour the fact that she is a minister and that she owes the people of Western Australia not to mislead them. The title of the bill is the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2018, but it covers only a very small percentage of the Beeliar wetlands, and the minister cannot even advise how much it is. If the minister cannot advise us of how much of the Beeliar wetlands is covered under the Beeliar wetlands amendment, that goes to show that it should not be called the Beeliar wetlands amendment. It should be titled as in the amendment. The government is deleting the road reserve for Roe 8. The minister should not mislead the community or Parliament. She should make sure that this bill’s title reflects exactly what this bill

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

is intended to do. I support this amendment and hope that the minister will reflect on the comments and the decisions she is making in this place. I hope she represents the community of Western Australia and does not mislead it in any way.

Ms L. METTAM: I also support the amendment moved by the opposition and encourage members of the government also to support this worthy amendment, which has great merit. I call on both sides of the house to support the transparency of this place and what is being proposed here. This amendment is a move by the opposition to ensure that the short title of this bill is in keeping with what is being proposed. As the member for Bateman, the member for Riverton, and other members of this place have already pointed out, amending the short title and changing it to the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion) Bill, is more in keeping with what the bill is actually about. As other members in this place have stated, very little of the Beelihar wetlands will be affected by what this bill proposes. It is in the interests of Parliament and the community that the title of this bill reflects what is trying to be achieved, which is the removal of the Roe 8 road reserve. It has been clearly articulated by many members in this place. It is also well understood that the minister has not been able to provide information about to what extent the Beelihar wetlands will be removed from the metropolitan region scheme, which is the purpose of this bill. In the absence of that information, there is a very strong case in the interests of transparency to support the opposition's amendment. I encourage both sides of the Parliament to support this.

The introduction of this bill contravenes a process that would have involved a great deal of consultation with the community if the government had followed protocol and gone through the Western Australian Planning Commission. That process was not followed. Instead, we have an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme. It is unconventional to amend the metropolitan region scheme with a bill. As the Leader of the Opposition stated earlier, it has happened on only one other occasion. We should at least see in this place some support for transparency and for the short title of the bill to be amended so that it better reflects its intention, which is primarily to remove the Roe 8 road reserve. In light of the arguments that we have heard so far, I encourage all members of the government to support this worthy amendment.

Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE: Today, every member of the opposition spoke on this bill and gave very rational reasons for why the entire road reserve needs to be preserved under the metropolitan region scheme. The member for Bateman has highlighted that the short title of the bill does not articulate clearly and succinctly what the government is trying to achieve in this bill. That is a valid point. It cuts to the chase of what the public thinks the government is doing in this bill. We want the public, and, no doubt, the government wants the public, to know what it is doing. The government is backing this bill because it believes that is in its best political interests. The opposition is opposing this bill because we believe that is in the best political interests of the people of Western Australia. We disagree with each other. That is where we are at. However, we cannot disagree on the fact that this bill deals with the entire Roe 8 road reserve. That is not disputed and cannot be disputed. The member for Bateman has made that very good point.

Some time ago, there was a section of road reserve under the metropolitan region scheme called the Fremantle eastern bypass. The government will recall that it moved an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme to enable houses to be built on that land and thereby ensure that no road could ever be built on it. Through this bill, the government intends to turn the entirety of this road reserve into what it calls a parkland. People might think there will be a nice park. However, by using the title "Beelihar Wetlands", people will think that relates to the wetlands component. That is a very different thing for people in the community to reflect upon. If people think the government is saving a wetland, they might say, "That makes me feel all warm and fuzzy; I feel okay about that." However, if people see in the title of the bill that it will be the entire road reserve, they might say, "Hang on. I did not know that." If they find out, as the member for Bateman has pointed out, that the Beelihar wetlands comprises only three per cent of the total road reserve that the government is seeking to sanction, they might say, "Hang on. Ninety-seven per cent of this is road reserve that we are giving up." I think the title of this bill is very different from the reality of what will happen through this bill.

I fully support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I am grateful to the member for Bateman for highlighting this fact to us. We probably did not get the opportunity to explore this issue during the second reading debate, because we were too focused on the content of the bill and did not look at something that is glaringly obvious now that it has been brought to our attention. No doubt the government will also recognise that and vote with us to change the short title of the bill.

Dr D.J. HONEY: I support the excellent amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. When I looked at the bill and listened to the debate, my mind went back to my mother's sage advice, which was, "What a tangled web we weave when at first we do deceive."

Mr W.R. Marmion: That was said by Walter Scott.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Dr D.J. HONEY: There we go! I thank the member for Nedlands. He is a font of wisdom, as always.

Can I say that it is quite clear that the short title of the bill is exceedingly misleading. It states —

This is the *Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Act 2018*.

When we look at the detail of the bill, we see that all it does is remove the road reserve. It has been put very eloquently, and I believe it is worth repeating many times, that 99.5 per cent of the supposed wetlands is outside this area. Earlier I encouraged members to go onto Google Earth to look at the detail of the area. I am not sure whether the minister did that in the time that she has had, but I hope that other members have done so. If we have a clear look at this area, we can see that none of this path goes through any area that is wet at all. In fact, it is a completely graded path. Go and have a look, members. It is a completely graded path that extends a little into a cleared and degraded area.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You need braces. You keep fiddling with your belt.

Dr D.J. HONEY: It is comfortable for me, Leader of the House. Once we get past the gratuitous comments from the Leader of the House, and go even further, we can see that this area is only three per cent of the Roe 8 road reserve. We are really seeing a misuse of parliamentary process with this bill. I am surprised that the minister has not asked the parliamentary officers to provide some background information. We were told that this is an amendment to the metropolitan region scheme and that there is a process to follow to do that. None of that process has been followed here. It is very clear from the minister's response tonight that there was no documented consultation. She said, "Well, there was a general discussion. It was talked about before the election" and so on. The fact is that this is an amendment. Where is the economic assessment of this amendment? Where is the detail showing the economic impact that this decision will have on the community? Where is the analysis that shows whether there will be any environmental advantage of this scheme? There is nothing of the sort. This is a misuse of our parliamentary process.

That we are still here tonight being compelled to debate these points at this time of night is a misuse of this process. What is the urgency of this bill, Leader of the House? There is no urgency whatsoever because this government does not intend to do anything in the reserve —

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo, that is your last warning.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

This government does not intend to do anything on this for the next two years at least. I do not think the government will be lucky enough to be elected for another term at this rate, but, in any case, there is no urgency whatsoever for this bill. What is it? This is the government's attempt at a bit of spin to get a headline going out saying that based on the title of the bill they have saved the Beeliar wetlands. What a load of nonsense. Hope Road goes through the wetlands. A raised platform that is at least two metres high in parts goes through the area, completely dissecting it. We have the power easement and the track associated with it going completely through the area. We have all the area cleared for bushfire. Also, we had an excellent proposal before, as we know, that would not have affected this area at all. This short title is deliberately misleading. It does the minister no credit whatsoever to play little tricks like this and deliberately mislead the people of Western Australia with this disingenuous title.

Furthermore, when the member for Riverton asked perfectly proper questions, the minister simply refused to answer them. Again, she is not following the proper process in this place. Members opposite can guess that we are pretty cranky about this legislation. It is a misleading bill. The title of the bill is deceptive. The minister is not giving due respect to members who are asking proper questions. I strongly support this amendment put forward by our excellent Leader of the Opposition.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I have been listening with interest to the debate and, so far, I strongly support what the members for Bateman, Vasse and Cottesloe have said. Their arguments for changing the title of the bill to make it mean what we are doing have been compelling. I could still be persuaded that it is okay for the bill to refer to the Beeliar wetlands, but I have not heard the argument from the minister that explains why it should be included in the title of bill. Maybe it was suggested in the minister's consultation with some of the groups that Beeliar wetlands should be in the title of the bill. If that is the case, it would be useful to know. If the trucking industry, the taxi industry, bus groups, councils and even the Conservation Council believe "Beeliar Wetlands" should be in brackets rather than "Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion", I would like to know that before I vote. It would be handy if the minister could enlighten this side of the house—give a good reason—why the short title of the bill should be called

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill. So far I have been strongly persuaded by the arguments that have been put forward by members on this side, but I am open to support the minister if a strong case is put forward for Beeliar wetlands.

Dr M.D. NAHAN: I would like to participate in this debate because it is very important. This has been a very controversial issue for the people of Western Australia for many decades. The bill is amending in a very unique way the metropolitan region scheme, as the minister has indicated. People need to know what is being done. The first line of the second reading speech states —

The McGowan government is committed to delivering its election commitment to discontinue the Perth Freight Link project.

This bill is about the Perth Freight Link and taking the Roe 8 road reserve out of the metropolitan region scheme. That is what it intends to do, that is what it is doing, and it should be described as such. The Beeliar wetlands have virtually nothing to do with the land that is impacted. Most of the land, as outlined later in the bill, which we will get to, is not wetlands at all; it is a road reserve that has been degraded over time and it is not wet. It is not part of the wetlands. The bill claims to take the road reserve and reserve it as parks and recreation. The minister has not mentioned whether it will be in the Beeliar reserve more widely or whether it will stand alone. What about the sections of the land being excised that are not wetlands at all? The majority of them are not wetlands. The minister's use of the words "Beeliar wetlands" to describe the totality of the land being excised is not precise. More importantly, and this is what we are concerned about, the government when in opposition gave the impression that all the land is pristine and that we were proposing to bulldoze environmentally sensitive wetlands. That is not accurate. That is what we are worried about.

As we went into discussions, the EPA assessed, based on all the documentation in this debate, of which the minister said there has been copious amounts over the past 20 years, that the land we are discussing is not environmentally sensitive. Most of it is either completely degraded or degraded. The government is trying to give the impression that the Roe 8 road reserve lies in environmentally sensitive wetlands when it does not. It does impact some sections of wetlands, but they are minor. Of course, the road plan addressed those to the satisfaction of the EPA and, I might add, the commonwealth environmental legislation. We are concerned about the lack of precision in the short title of the bill and whether it describes what is being done, and whether it is trying to give the impression that has been given before, which is false. The people of Western Australia want to know what the government is doing. If the government is hiding it behind "Beeliar wetlands", people will look at that and ask what that means. Is the government going to change other roads? Is it altering Anketell Road, Russell Road, Bibra Drive and Farrington Drive? We do not know. They all go through the wider Beeliar wetlands. Many roads go from east to west and north to south. It is intersected by many, many roads. The title of this bill gives no indication that it is related to a single road reserve—that is, Roe 8.

We put this proposed amendment to the minister because we want to tell people what the bill will actually do. Although the minister says it was Parliamentary Counsel's decision, she really cannot adequately and appropriately hide behind her advice. It is the minister's bill. It is her suggestion and it is her short title. We think the minister should amend it to tell the people of Western Australia what she is actually doing. She should not hide behind glib words that will mislead the people of Western Australia about what she intends to do. I think she is doing this because she knows that a very large section of the population will be outraged by her decision to excise the land, but they would not be outraged if the minister were just adding to the Beeliar wetlands.

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: I would like to make a contribution on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. From listening to my colleagues, I think they have made some very valid points. If the minister were genuine in her support for this legislation, she would not have any issues with changing the short title of the bill to reflect exactly what it is about. We heard about the consultation process, but again we were not given any details about what that process was, who was spoken to and what their views of the short title of the bill were. I think it is pretty obvious that "Beeliar Wetlands" is not accurate and reflective of the bill.

When we go through the consideration in detail stage, most ministers answer the questions that are asked and are very keen to work with the opposition to make sure that we put the correct information on the record and that it is reflective of the intentions of the particular clause. It is not that difficult, I would have thought, for the minister to insert "Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion" because that is exactly what we are talking about. It is very concerning that the minister will not support the proposed amendment when it is an exact reflection of what the bill is about. The minister indicated earlier that she was not involved in the naming of the bill; that she did not have any input into that process. I am concerned that no-one else had any involvement in that. It is actually misleading Parliament and the people of Western Australia by indicating that it is to do with Beeliar wetlands when it is not about that at

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

all. As has been indicated, there are powerlines and there is lots of sand, but not so many wetlands in that road reserve; I think it is only three per cent.

During the second reading debate, everybody on this side made a contribution but there was very little contribution from members on the other side. I think only two government members spoke, apart from the minister. Members on that side are obviously not that interested in the Beeliar wetlands or they are not interested in substituting "Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion". Had government members known that the legislation was not to do with Beeliar wetlands but was to do with the Roe 8 road reserve deletion, maybe they might have spoken on the bill. Maybe they were confused. Maybe they did not understand what the legislation was about. I would be interested to know whether any government members went to a briefing on the legislation. I would say probably not. Maybe there is a broader issue here about the short title of the bill; that is, members were not adequately informed and were misled on what the bill was about.

Members might remember that I mentioned during my contribution to the second reading debate that the Legislative Council is obviously very good at scrutinising bills and referring them off to a committee. We can already see that there is a major problem with the short title of this bill. God knows what other issues would be discovered in this legislation if it went through a full committee process and committee members were able to scrutinise it. Obviously, a committee would try to talk to all these people the minister supposedly talked to about this legislation and would be able to review all the comments. We might find that the level of detail is very scant. There might not be a lot there, but obviously the minister does not have it in front of her. I cannot imagine that a minister would bring a piece of legislation to this Parliament for consideration in detail and then not have access to any of that information and not be able to give a broad overview of, for example, which councils were spoken to or on what days they might have been spoken to. I am sure the advisers would have that information if it were readily available. I am a little confused about how much that process was adhered to. I cannot imagine why the minister would not want to make this process easier. It is very simple. The amendment we are proposing is very simple and straightforward. It is 100 per cent reflective of what the legislation is about. It does not change the context of the legislation —

Dr A.D. Buti interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member!

Mr A. KRSTICEVIC: — therefore, it will be very easy to move on from this clause by accepting this amendment, and we can then get on with the rest of the bill.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I, too, rise to join the opposition in moving that the words "Beeliar Wetlands" be deleted and the words "Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion" be inserted. In her contribution, the member for Darling Range made a very good point. If everyone turns to page 4 of the bill, they will see that it contains in the schedule an indicative plan. The indicative plan shows that part of the metropolitan region scheme we are dealing with will define an urban area on both the east and west side, and exclude the primary regional road reserve and include it in the urban zone. We have a bill title that does not reflect the truth of what we are talking about here. I am surprised that the government would seek to do something so, I think, deceptive and include the words "Beeliar Wetlands", as if to suggest they are somehow being saved. Of course, that is not occurring here. The government is seeking to delete the Roe 8 road reserve and nothing more than that. If the truth of the legislation were reflected in the short title, I suspect it would not be quite as politically motivating for the seat of Bicton, because all this bill today is for is to save that seat. I look forward to shortly moving an amendment to the short title to possibly insert the words "to save the seat of Bicton" or something like that. I am sure there is much more we can go on with in that respect, because that is exactly what this bill is. If the government was to say that, if the member for Bicton or the government was to suggest that they are trying to save the seat of Bicton or to delete the Roe 8 road reserve, it would not sound nearly as politically enticing to people as including the words "Beeliar Wetlands", because those words resonate with the activist green groups that were out there during the campaign pushing messages of fear to make sure that people were not informed at all.

Mrs A.K. Hayden: Professional protesters.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Professional protesters, quite right, member for Darling Range.

I am sure that people were not informed at all about what was occurring during the election.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members!

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: What we see here instead is a government deliberately being deceptive to the people of Western Australia in a bid —

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Members, please, let us just hear the member's speech, even though he wants to be provocative and get some answers. You can always say that you do not want anyone to interject if you want.

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I appreciate that, Mr Speaker. I will continue as I am.

I think it is very important that we all accept the fact that the government is going to vote against an amendment that seeks to ensure that there is transparency and accountability for the people of Western Australia. If the government were to include the words "Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion", it would be far more up-front to the people of Western Australia and the people of Bicton. That is exactly what is occurring.

Ms L. O'Malley interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bicton!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: I absolutely do. This rolled-gold transparency that we were promised is not being reflected time and again in the decisions of this government.

Ms L. O'Malley interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bicton!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: Indeed, they are not being reflected in the short title of the bill we have in front of us. To me that is deceptive. I find that very disappointing.

Ms L. O'Malley interjected.

The SPEAKER: Member for Bicton!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: The Leader of the Opposition moved this amendment in the interests of accountability and transparency. It is a great amendment. It reflects the intent of the bill and what the government actually seeks to do, which is to delete the Roe 8 road reserve. This is nothing about protecting the 0.49 per cent of the Beeliar wetlands. It is nothing like that at all. Of course, we all know that what is manifest in the title is nothing but a political ploy—some might call it a political stance—to try to save the seat of Bicton. That is all this is about. In fact, if the government was up-front and followed the convention of governments time and again, it would make sure that the short title reflected the honest intent of the bill before us.

Mr D.A. Templeman interjected.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the House!

Mr Z.R.F. KIRKUP: If amended, the bill would have the words "Roe 8 Road Reserve Deletion" and not "Beeliar Wetlands". It is absolutely shameful that this government is seeking to mislead the people of Western Australia and the people of Bicton because, as I said, this is nothing more than a political stunt. It is a last-ditch attempt to try to save the seat of Bicton, because we all know it will be lost at the next election. We all know it is gone already, if we look at the federal result and the result in Darling Range. The short title of the bill is nothing more than a blatant attempt by the government to politicise this place, and ensure that the legislation before us is a political tool to seek the re-election of the member for Bicton. The opposition will not stand for that. The Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment that seeks to ensure that there is absolute transparency in the bill we have before us. I implore those on the opposite side who believe in accountability, integrity and transparency to join with us and vote for this amendment, because it will show that they are truly committed to being accountable to the people of Western Australia, and they will not be participants in this deceptive conduct by the government.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I will just quote from the explanatory memorandum —

The purpose of this Bill is to reserve and zone certain land within the Metropolitan Region Scheme in order to protect several significant areas of wetland that make up the Beeliar Regional Park (the Beeliar Wetlands).

In relation to the name of the bill, the member for Kimberley has just explained that Beeliar is an Aboriginal name, with a long history. Beeliar was used to describe Midgegooroo's country—as I understand, Midgegooroo was Yagan's son—with borders that ran along the Swan River to Canning, east to the hills and south to Cockburn Sound. The Beeliar wetlands, the Beeliar Regional Park lands, are well known to many people. This road reservation cuts it in half, and impacts a significant proportion of the wetland. A significant proportion of the reserve is conservation category wetlands. All the points the opposition made were false.

Extract from Hansard
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]
p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Mr D.C. Nalder: How do you know they are false?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Because they are. If the opposition wants to take out an Aboriginal name and insert another name, that is fine; I will leave it up to members.

Division

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (14)

Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr K. O'Donnell
Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr J.E. McGrath	Ms L. Mettam (<i>Teller</i>)
Mrs A.K. Hayden	Mr S.K. L'Estrange	Dr M.D. Nahan	
Dr D.J. Honey	Mr R.S. Love	Mr D.C. Nalder	

Noes (33)

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

Pairs

Mr P.A. Katsambanis	Mr M. McGowan
Mr P.J. Rundle	Mr P. Papalia
Mr V.A. Catania	Mr Y. Mubarakai
Ms M.J. Davies	Mrs R.M.J. Clarke
Mr D.T. Redman	Ms J.J. Shaw

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr T.J. HEALY: If we were to pass clause 1 today, would the minister agree that it would be passed on the member for Girrawheen's birthday?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I agree, member for Southern River, that it has just clicked over to the member for Girrawheen's birthday. Happy birthday, member for Girrawheen!

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for stunts!

Division

Clause put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (33)

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

Extract from *Hansard*
[ASSEMBLY — Tuesday, 25 June 2019]

p4542g-4615a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr Bill Marmion; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Dr David Honey; Ms Libby Mettam; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr John McGrath; Mr Zak Kirkup; Mrs Alyssa Hayden; Mr Tony Krsticevic; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Mr Ian Blayney; Mr Terry Healy; Ms Mia Davies; Ms Rita Saffioti; Mr Stephen Price; Ms Sabine Winton; Mr David Templeman

Noes (14)

Mr I.C. Blayney
Mrs L.M. Harvey
Mrs A.K. Hayden
Dr D.J. Honey

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

Mr W.R. Marmion
Mr J.E. McGrath
Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr D.C. Nalder

Mr K. O'Donnell
Ms L. Mettam (*Teller*)

Pairs

Mr M. McGowan
Mr P. Papalia
Mr Y. Mubarakai
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke
Ms J.J. Shaw

Mr P.A. Katsambanis
Mr P.J. Rundle
Mr V.A. Catania
Ms M.J. Davies
Mr D.T. Redman

Clause thus passed.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr D.A. Templeman (Leader of the House)**.