



Parliamentary Debates

(HANSARD)

FORTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION
2021

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 22 June 2021

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 22 June 2021

THE SPEAKER (Mrs M.H. Roberts) took the chair at 2.00 pm, acknowledged country and read prayers.

VISITORS — ST PATRICK'S SCHOOL AND GOLDFIELDS BAPTIST COLLEGE

Statement by Speaker

THE SPEAKER (Mrs M.H. Roberts) [2.02 pm]: On behalf of the member for Roe, I welcome students, staff and parents from St Patrick's School in Katanning and, on behalf of the member for Kalgoorlie, I acknowledge visitors from Goldfields Baptist College who are also in the public gallery today. Welcome to Goldfields Baptist College and St Patrick's School from Katanning.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON PALLIATIVE CARE IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

*Final Report — Palliative care in Western Australia—Progress report —
Government Response — Statement by Minister for Health*

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Minister for Health) [2.03 pm]: I rise to inform members of the house that the McGowan government welcomes the findings and recommendations made by the Joint Select Committee on Palliative Care in Western Australia in its final report released on 19 November 2020. We acknowledge the work of the committee in conducting this inquiry, including the extensive stakeholder consultation that occurred across the sector to inform the findings and recommendations of the report.

Palliative care, and end-of-life care more broadly, has been a major focus of the McGowan government in recent years, particularly following the release of the report, *My life, my choice: The report of the Joint Select Committee on End of Life Choices*. In 2019, the McGowan government invested a record \$224 million in palliative care services over the following four years. Although much progress has been made in palliative care throughout Western Australia, demand for these services will continue to grow with more people living longer with chronic life-limiting conditions. It is therefore important to continue working to achieve the system-wide changes required to improve access to and raise awareness of palliative care. These changes aim to improve the quality of life of people who are facing life-limiting illness and their family or carers through the prevention and relief of suffering.

Many of the findings and recommendations made in the committee's final report build on preceding and current work being undertaken by the Department of Health and align with the direction and objectives outlined in the *WA end-of-life and palliative care strategy 2018–2028*. The report noted considerable progress on a range of initiatives. It also highlighted gaps where further work is required, particularly around addressing workforce issues, further increasing access to palliative care services, facilitating system navigation and supporting community-based volunteer groups that provide invaluable support and services to patients with life-limiting illnesses, their families and carers. The report also addresses the need for better data collection to accurately record palliative care activity and better inform funding processes.

The McGowan government will continue to work with the sector around these issues to ensure that palliative care services are widely accessible to those who need them. Work has already commenced in the Department of Health regarding the planning, governance and resources required to support the range of activities that work toward achieving the recommendations outlined in the report.

I now table the government's response to the Joint Select Committee on Palliative Care in Western Australia.

[See paper [322](#).]

REFUGEE WEEK

Statement by Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Interests

DR A.D. BUTI (Armadale — Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Interests) [2.06 pm]: I would like to bring to the attention of the house that this week is Refugee Week, which runs from 20 to 26 June. Refugee Week raises awareness about the issues affecting refugees across the world and gives us an opportunity to focus on the contributions to all levels of our society made by those who have arrived in Australia as refugees.

First celebrated in 1986, Refugee Week is scheduled to include World Refugee Day. World Refugee Day is an international day designated by the United Nations to honour refugees around the globe. It falls each year on 20 June and celebrates the strength and courage of people who have been forced to flee their home country to escape conflict or persecution. World Refugee Day was first coordinated globally by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in 2001 to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees. Refugee Week is a global movement, although different countries celebrate it at different times.

Western Australia is a state that has benefited extensively from the contributions of migrants. Building on the foundations established by our First Peoples, we embrace migrants from every part of the world. This heritage has made Western Australia into a robust and prosperous, culturally and linguistically diverse state. Many Western Australians arrived here as refugees from Europe, Latin America, Asia and Africa. They brought with them a passion to make a success of their lives, to build a good life for themselves and their families, and to contribute to their new homeland in every way they could.

The theme for Refugee Week 2021 is “unity”—a reminder that we all share a common humanity, regardless of any differences in culture, language or background. Refugee Week 2021 is being celebrated through events across the community including at libraries, places of education, churches and non-government organisations. To mark Refugee Week, a number of government agencies are holding events, including the Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries, which is holding a morning tea and an appeal for the Foodbank of Western Australia. I am sure that members of the house will join with me in commending the initiative of Refugee Week and in encouraging others to take part.

BEDFORDALE VOLUNTEER BUSH FIRE BRIGADE STATION

Statement by Minister for Emergency Services

MR R.R. WHITBY (Baldvis — Minister for Emergency Services) [2.08 pm]: I would like to take this opportunity to inform the house about the new Bedforddale Volunteer Bush Fire Brigade Station and how the government is supporting local communities in the south-eastern corridor.

It was a great honour to attend the official opening of the Bedforddale Volunteer Bush Fire Brigade Station on 28 May, when I met with the volunteers and community members who have worked tirelessly to see the new Bedforddale station come to fruition. The station was completed in April this year. It replaced the old station that was built in 1985 and no longer met the brigade’s operational needs. The new facility will strengthen emergency response in the south-eastern corridor and also provide volunteers with a training hub to improve their skills and a place for the community to gather.

I would like to acknowledge the critical role that our emergency services volunteers play in helping to keep our community safe. They put their lives on the line to respond to the threat of bushfires or other hazards, any time of the day or night. It is vital that our emergency services volunteers have the facilities that enable them to build and maintain their skills. The new station includes four vehicle bays and improved training and communications facilities. It has been built to cater for new members and additional vehicles into the future. Its modern amenities and expanded outdoor areas will also benefit the Bedforddale Volunteer Bush Fire Brigade’s 20 highly engaged young cadets, who are developing emergency response skills. I hope that they will consider a role in our emergency services in the future. The state government supported the construction of the facility with a \$372 000 emergency services levy grant and \$51 000 for water tanks as part of the government’s WA Recovery Plan, while the City of Armadale contributed \$1.2 million and the brigade’s volunteers fundraised more than \$54 000.

In finishing, I would like to acknowledge the City of Armadale and the Bedforddale bush fire brigade’s extraordinary efforts in bringing this new facility to fruition. I trust it will strengthen its capabilities, enhance its visibility in the community and give the brigade room to grow.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

SYNERGY — FEES AND CHARGES — CYCLONE-AFFECTED AREAS

258. Mr R.S. LOVE to the Minister for Energy:

I refer to Synergy’s practice of using estimates to charge customers in cyclone-affected areas often far in excess of actual usage. Will the minister step in now and ensure that all customers in the affected area are granted the \$363 credit rather than just those customers who have spoken to Synergy’s representatives face to face or have registered for assistance on the website?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON replied:

Thank you for the question. Synergy, of course, has deferred collections activities for those customers directly impacted by outages during cyclone Seroja. In addition, Synergy does not read meters; they are read by Western Power. When Western Power does not do a meter reading, it provides an estimate bill to Synergy, and the automated computer system generates a bill from that transaction. Because Synergy itself does not read the bills, it does not know whether the amount being sent to it is either an estimate or an actual reading. This is one of the reasons that we are moving to accelerate the rollout of advanced meters with communications capability. The government has already allocated the resources for 180 000 advanced meters to be installed across the south west interconnected system. Of course, Horizon Power already uses advanced meters. We have also funded—unfortunately, it was not funded through the Economic Regulation Authority process—the communications infrastructure to support the advanced meters. We are now reviewing the rollout of advanced meters to try to improve this for the future. Obviously, a lot of other benefits flow from advanced meter infrastructure, including the detection of neutral faults, which I know my friend

the member for Willagee is very sensitive to because of the tragedy at a Department of Communities property. One of the good things about these advanced meters is that they detect neutral fault problems. Interestingly, the first one that was discovered after the installation of advanced meters was in an Anglican church. We even helped God on that issue!

SYNERGY — FEES AND CHARGES — CYCLONE-AFFECTED AREAS

259. Mr R.S. LOVE to the Minister for Energy:

I have a supplementary question. Thank you, minister. It is very interesting to learn of advanced meters, but I wonder whether the minister could address whether or not Synergy could apply a \$363 credit to all the customers in the cyclone-affected area?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON replied:

If the member is raising the fact that individual customers had a rebate provided by Synergy, that would be because after it investigated, it realised that there was an overcharging situation. We have to see it from Synergy's perspective: it does not read meters; the data is provided to it by Western Power. An automated system generates the bills. If a customer believes that there is a problem with any bill, Synergy appreciates them reaching out because it can usually help them.

One of the great changes that we have seen over the last couple of years with Synergy is its changed attitude to collection activity. I challenged the leadership at Synergy to reduce the number of customers it was disconnecting. I am really pleased with its response to that. Every customer who faces challenges paying their bill should reach out to Synergy. We see advertisements on bus stops and on television asking customers to reach out. If customers reach out to Synergy, we can usually resolve questions like that. It is a bit hard to agree with what the member is saying, which is that all estimated bills are excessive. That is not correct. As I said, Synergy stopped collection activity for those customers who had outages arising from cyclone Seroja. If there is a problem with an estimated bill, it is not just a question of customers impacted by cyclone Seroja; many people in Western Australia have had estimated bills, and that is why I am saying that the solution to that is the rolling out of advanced meter infrastructure.

CORONAVIRUS — WA ROAD MAP — PHASE 5

260. Mr S.A. MILLMAN to the Premier:

I refer to Western Australia's success in managing the COVID-19 pandemic and stopping the spread of the virus throughout the state.

- (1) Can the Premier outline to the house what the transition to phase 5 of WA's COVID-19 road map will mean for the Western Australian community?
- (2) Can the Premier advise the house how this transition will further support the WA economy and WA jobs?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for Mount Lawley for the question, and congratulate all Western Australians on the job they have done over the course of the last 18 months in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic and for overwhelmingly complying with the rules that we have put in place. As a consequence, we have had an extraordinarily low spread of the virus, plus one of the strongest economies in the entire world. We have the lowest unemployment rate of all the states—the lowest unemployment rate in eight years. We created over 88 000 new jobs in Western Australia. Jobs are above pre-pandemic levels. We are the only state that did not go into a recession. We have recorded the strongest consumer confidence in the country and the strongest business confidence in the country.

Now, because of the work of Western Australians, we are ready to go to phase 5 in our road map out of COVID-19 restrictions. From one minute past midnight tonight, we are lifting the remainder of the capacity limits on businesses across Western Australia. That will mean the two-square-metre rule and the 75 per cent capacity limit for hospitality and entertainment businesses will be removed. There will be no limits on the size of crowds for major events. However, businesses will be required to maintain contact registers and to ensure that COVID safety plans are updated and put in place. We expect people to continue to maintain good hygiene standards, physical distancing, and staying at home when they are unwell. Obviously, if we have an outbreak at any point in time, the state government will have to put measures back in place.

I know that businesses have welcomed the move to phase 5. I saw the head of the AMA, Bradley Woods, the other day —

Several members interjected.

Mr M. McGOWAN: That is his next job! I am sure Bradley would be a wonderful doctor! I would like to thank the head of the AHA—Australian Hotels Association (WA)—Bradley Woods, for his comments. He said that these

measures will create thousands of jobs and employment opportunities across the state. It has obviously taken a lot of work to get here. I would like to thank businesses all over the state that have coped with this. I know that we have the strongest retail and hospitality figures on record, but it has obviously been a difficult period over the course of the last 18 months. I would like to thank all small businesses and employees across the state for their forbearance and understanding over this period. I congratulate all Western Australians. We know the virus is difficult. We know that we have had to do difficult things, but this is part of the reward for doing difficult things over the last 18 months.

HOSPITALS — EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS — PRESENTATIONS

261. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Health:

I refer to the minister's comments in this place that attendances at Perth hospitals in the first half of 2021 had increased 13 per cent compared with the situation last year. Why does the minister continue to mislead the public about the true state of our emergency departments when the number of attendances in May 2021 was only 2.46 per cent above the May 2019 level and in line with population growth over the same period?

Mr R.H. COOK replied:

I thank the member for the question. The member is probably correct about the universal numbers. In categories 4 and 5 we have not had a significant increase in the number of patients coming to our emergency departments, but with category 2, for instance, we have had a significant increase. In fact, I think the number for category 2 is around 13 per cent. So far this financial year we have experienced about 1 500 more mental health presentations to our metropolitan hospitals than at the same time last year. As we know, the thing that really impacts on the efficiency of an emergency department is the beds that sit behind those emergency departments, which make them capable of getting patient flow so we can get people moving through the EDs smoothly. The significant increase in the number of these sorts of patients increases the length of the episode of care. That has had a significant impact on the demand on, and workload of, our EDs. As a result, we are trying to increase the number of beds we have available in the overall health system. As I have reported in this place before, 158 new beds will be opened as a result of our resourcing efforts to meet demand pressures. As of today, 101 of those beds have been brought onstream, with the final of the 158 to be brought onstream in August. But, of course, it is not just about beds; it is about the doctors, nurses and allied health workers who stand next to those beds. The government is undertaking a significant recruitment of nurses that will see an extra 600 nurses engaged over the next two years. That means 1 000 nurse graduate places this year and 1 000 nurse graduate places next year, which will produce significant input into the human resources that we now need in place.

The member for Vasse may like to stare at the numbers, but we can look at what is going on across health systems right across the country. Whether we go to an emergency department in Queensland, South Australia or Victoria, we will see a health system under significant stress. The member for Vasse might like to be in denial, but I am telling her what the doctors, nurses and allied health workers right across WA have told me, and that is our system is under significant pressure at the moment. A range of things contribute to that. It is that post-COVID period, with people coming to the hospital for a range of potential conditions that were left unaddressed during the COVID-19 period. It could be the level of anxiety that has produced a high level of mental health incidents in our community or that the overall disease burden in our community has increased. It could be the result of eating disorders, and we have seen an over 80 per cent increase in children coming forward with eating disorders since 2020. These figures are undeniable. The member for Vasse might be in denial of what is going on in our health system at the moment, but we are working closely with the Australian Medical Association, the Australian Nursing Federation, the Health Services Union, the United Workers Union and the Community and Public Sector Union—Civil Service Association of WA to make sure that we bring the resources to bear to ensure that we have the doctors, nurses and beds that we need to respond to this surge in demand.

HOSPITALS — EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS — PRESENTATIONS

262. Ms L. METTAM to the Minister for Health:

I have a supplementary question. We all agree that the system is under pressure. Regardless of the minister's political spin and comparisons with last year, will he immediately table the emergency department presentation figures for each month over the last four years to put an end to his claims?

Mr R.H. COOK replied:

I can do better than that; I can point the member to the website where all that information is. Once again, we see this lazy opposition coming to this place simply trying to undermine confidence in our health system, denying the fact that our health system is under significant pressure, denying the great work that the doctors, nurses and allied health staff are doing and denying the incredible work that they have done over COVID-19 when the opposition and its mate Clive Palmer were trying to tear down the system. We will continue to resource our health system the way it is necessary. The one thing we will not be distracted by is a lazy, inefficient opposition that refuses to accept the work that is going on in our hospitals at the moment, which is about bringing resources to bear to improve health services.

CORONAVIRUS — CULTURE AND THE ARTS

263. Mrs J.M.C. STOJKOVSKI to the Minister for Culture and the Arts:

Before I ask my question, I acknowledge the representatives from the Woodvale Little Athletics Club in the public gallery today.

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's continued efforts to support jobs and businesses in WA's events industry through the COVID-19 pandemic. Can the minister update the house on what the expansion of the WA government's Getting the Show Back on the Road program will mean for businesses and workers in WA's events industry, in particular those who rely on tourism events and regional agricultural shows?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN replied:

I thank the member for Kingsley for the question, and I also thank her for her very strong support of all things cultural, all things arts and all things tourism. It is wonderful and it is important. I am sure you would be interested in this too, Madam Speaker! The Premier, the members for Churchlands and Nedlands, the Minister for Agriculture and Food and I have just come from the Claremont Showground, where a very important announcement was made this morning that will see our Royal Show for 2021 supported strongly by the McGowan government. Our package will see that important historic show in Western Australia's history held again this year. It will be supported by the McGowan government. There will be a reduction in costs for families to attend. That is magnificent.

That also includes an expanded Getting the Show Back on the Road program, which has been very successful. I launched that program late last year with the Premier, and it has already provided tremendous support to the events and performing arts industries, but we are now expanding it to include regional tourism events, events in regional Western Australia, music and other events that people in Western Australia want to get to and enjoy. The Getting the Show Back on the Road program will see an extension of support, and that includes expanding the safety net for those events to go ahead. We will see agricultural shows in regional Western Australia supported and able to access this opportunity. That is very important, because as we know, last year, sadly, many agricultural shows, some of them having operated for over 100 years, could not operate for the first time in their history because of COVID-19. This program will assist those agricultural shows.

In the six months the Getting the Show Back on the Road program has already been operating, it has provided some \$4 million in risk-share support, and nearly 50 events have been supported through that program so they could take place. I remind members that other states and territories in Australia have not been able to hold many events at all. Western Australia has been able to, because we have kept the place safe through our very important safety protocols. We also want to make sure that regional and local economies are stimulated, and the people who work in those industries, who have been hit hard, have been supported. This Getting the Show Back on the Road program is focused on that. We have seen events happen in Kings Park, including concerts by Human Nature and John Williamson. There were also the West Australian Symphony Orchestra with the Birds of Tokyo and Missy Higgins. The Black Swan State Theatre Company has been able to hold its productions because of the support of this program. There were the Fairbridge Festival, the Fringe World Festival and the Perth Festival. All of those things were supported by Getting the Show Back on the Road. We are expanding that program now, and it means that a whole range of other events will be supported. This is a great initiative by the McGowan government. It is a demonstration of our commitment to culture, arts and tourism, and the importance of those industries to the state's economy, the people who are employed by them and businesses that rely on that income for their existence. We will keep doing it. We will keep supporting those things so we can have a vibrant Western Australia.

ROBINSON ROAD CLOSURE — BELLEVUE

264. Mr R.S. LOVE to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the proposal to close Robinson Road due to the Bellevue railcar facility.

- (1) Does the minister support the closure of Robinson Road, a strategic route in Bellevue?
- (2) Have alternatives been considered, as called for by the local member?
- (3) When will traffic modelling be made available to the Bellevue Residents and Ratepayers Association that demonstrates how the Robinson Road closure will impact Lloyd Street, Clayton Street and the surrounding roads?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

- (1)–(3) I thank the member for the question. He is correct that traffic modelling is being finalised for the closure of Robinson Road. This issue has been raised with me by the member for Midland—the Speaker—and others in the community who are concerned. However, with all projects comes change and disruption. As I said, it is easy to do nothing and not to make any changes, like the former government. It did not have any disruption when it built the Metro Area Express light rail because the government did not build it. It did not cause any disruption when it built the Thornlie–Cockburn Link because it did not build anything. Of course, it did not cause any disruption when it built the Ellenbrook rail line because the former government never built it.

With all projects come challenges and issues. This is a massive new manufacturing facility and the new home of rail manufacturing in Western Australia. It is a significant project and there will be a number of train movements. Not only have we opened the new railcar manufacturing facility, but also the high-voltage testing facility is now being constructed together with a new diesel maintenance facility in that area. Yes, we are taking land in that entire area and we have tried to see how we can facilitate the continued movement of traffic on Robinson Road with all these projects and we will continue to see what we can do. But the current advice to me is that that road will need to be closed and modelling undertaken to look at the associated impacts. That is the challenge with building projects. When we build projects and bring back the home of rail manufacturing to Western Australia, there will be disruption and change. As the Minister for Planning and Minister for Transport in particular, I know that people do not like change, but as a government we want to bring rail manufacturing back to the Bellevue–Midland area. We are proud of our policy. It is a policy that the Liberal and National Parties never supported. They never supported bringing rail manufacturing to this state.

We will release that modelling once it is finalised. As I said, projects cause disruption and change, but this will be the home of hundreds of workers. This will support jobs and opportunities throughout Western Australia. It is one of the proudest projects to bring back rail manufacturing when no-one thought that we could do it and members opposite—in that corner—are opposed to it.

ROBINSON ROAD CLOSURE — BELLEVUE

265. Mr R.S. LOVE to the Minister for Transport:

I have a supplementary question. Will the minister meet with members of the Bellevue Residents and Ratepayers Association to discuss the traffic modelling and the effect it will have on their businesses in the area, and what compensation plans might be offered to them?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

Residents met with me at a forum that I gave before the election. As I said, I know that not everyone supports everything we do, but the feedback that I get around the place is, “Thank you for getting these jobs back to Western Australia. Thanks for defying the doubters.” The Liberal and National Parties were the biggest doubters. It was not easy getting rail manufacturing up from the two per cent that the former government left us to over 50 per cent. It was not easy to get that done, but I am so proud that we are creating local jobs and local opportunities. I am really proud that we brought rail manufacturing back to WA after the Liberal and National Parties sold Westrail Freight, closed the Midland Workshops and wanted to shut down the *AvonLink*. Can members believe that? When I came to government, one of the first things I had to do was overturn the National Party’s decision to shut the *AvonLink*. That is what I had to do.

Mr R.S. Love: There was no such decision. We kept it open.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: There had been a decision. There was no funding in the forward estimates and one of the first things that I had to do was reverse the National Party’s decision to shut down the *AvonLink*. We know that the opposition does not like rail lines and rail manufacturing, but we are proud of Metronet and we are proud of what we are delivering.

ROADS — GREAT SOUTHERN

266. Ms R.S. STEPHENS to the Minister for Transport:

I refer to the record investment in regional roads and road safety across Western Australia, including the upgrades to South Coast Highway and the construction of the Albany ring-road. Can the minister outline to the house how these projects have helped to create more jobs and support local businesses and also what these investments will mean for road users across Albany and the great southern?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI replied:

I thank the member for Albany for that question. Last week, I was in Albany with the member for Albany inspecting some of the projects that are underway. I have to start by acknowledging some of the damage that has occurred in Albany and its surrounds because of the very significant weather conditions over the past few days and provide the house with an update. The section of South Coast Highway from George Street to Marbelup Road was reopened to all traffic, under speed restrictions, at approximately 11.15 am today. South Coast Highway remains closed between Marbelup Road and Denmark–Mount Barker Road. A detour is in place. We will work as hard as possible to get that road open, noting the significant severe weather conditions.

When I was in Albany, we were discussing that it has been the wettest time in that area since records began. It has been very wet in Albany, which has made delivering some of these new projects a bit of a challenge. We were there inspecting the new South Coast Highway works and we still hope to finish those total works by the end of July. Work on the South Coast Highway was a significant commitment that we gave at the 2017 election—\$30 million to reconstruct the road, in parts, and also to construct new passing lanes. I am really pleased to see the improvement that will provide not only to Albany residents but also the farmers and producers in the area who will be able to travel along that road more safely.

We were also updated on the Albany ring-road. I note that construction has commenced and the pouring of concrete is underway for the footings and abutment walls at the side of the new bridge over Albany Highway. Over 35 local subcontractors have been engaged. Again, it is about employing local people, meeting some of the young local graduates in the area and making sure that we support freight efficiency and productivity in the area.

I want to put on record my thanks to the former Deputy Prime Minister Michael McCormack for his contribution to projects in Western Australia and the strong partnership that we had. I always found him a pleasant —

Mr P. Papalia: Respectful.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: — and respectful person who was very interested in WA. He did come to WA, although he did not always look me up. I know that he looked up members of the Nationals WA, of course. He came to Western Australia and he was very keen to understand WA's challenges and our projects. I acknowledge the federal government's contribution under the former Deputy Prime Minister.

We now have a new Deputy Prime Minister; Minister for Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Development. He says that he is a changed person. I hope he is and I hope that he takes an interest in WA, because I have never seen the new Deputy Prime Minister take an interest in WA. I have never seen him care about WA or its rail or road industry, so I hope that he is a changed person and takes an interest in supporting WA, our jobs and infrastructure throughout state.

CYCLONE SEROJA — BUSINESSES — FINANCIAL SUPPORT

267. **Mr V.A. CATANIA to the Minister for Emergency Services:**

I refer to the many struggling businesses in Kalbarri and the midwest that are on the brink of financial ruin, and the comments made by the state recovery controller, Melissa Pexton, who stated —

“I think with the scope and scale of the emergency, we are talking about 13 local government areas that have been impacted, we are going to see a significant time frame for this level of recovery ...

- (1) Does the minister consider grants of \$4 000 to be an adequate response for businesses facing years of financial ruin?
- (2) Will the minister listen to the concerns and meet with business owners so that he can better understand the financial support that businesses need in Kalbarri and the midwest?

Mr R.R. WHITBY replied:

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for the question. I do not stop meeting with people in the midwest. I have been there six times. My colleagues have been there scores of times. I do not know how there could be more engagement. To correct the member, it is actually 16 local shires—local governments—that have been impacted by this disaster, not 13.

The member asked about support for local businesses. There is, and there has been since the very beginning of this terrible disaster, enormous support for the community right across the midwest. There has been more than \$10 million in state government support alone to date and I am not counting federal government support and I am not counting, yet, the support that we are about to unlock with our federal colleagues in the form of disaster recovery funding arrangements with the commonwealth. I would rather see an approach from members opposite who represent these areas to be engaged with the communities themselves and to be genuine in their approach to helping these communities that need help.

This government's response has been swift, efficient and very considerable. That will be the way in which we continue to operate in dealing with this major emergency. But it is true—the state recovery controller was right—that this was a major storm event and one of the worst cyclones that we have had in Western Australian history over many decades. It impacted a large swathe of our state and it impacted many scores of communities. Unique and tailored responses are needed right across the community. We are getting on with the job of getting a response together, providing support, and providing joint financial support with the commonwealth.

I can also tell the member that the response is not over; it will take years. The member is dead right that it will take years. This was a significant event. The support is there; it is continuing every day. I was in Northampton on Saturday at a community event at which the community came together and worked together. I was there with the member for Geraldton and the upper house member for the region Hon Sandra Carr, and even Hon Murray Criddle was there. We were very much engaged in the community and speaking to leaders of the community, including businesses, and we will continue do so.

CYCLONE SEROJA — BUSINESSES — FINANCIAL SUPPORT

268. **Mr V.A. CATANIA to the Minister for Emergency Services:**

I have a supplementary question. Since the minister has not yet met with the business community of Kalbarri and the government is sitting on a \$5 billion surplus, will the minister meet with businesses to discuss the financial impact and ruin that they are now undergoing?

Mr R.R. WHITBY replied:

That was a false comment, with respect to the member. I have just explained to him that I have met with business leaders right across the community. I have been to the region, including Kalbarri, six times. I have met many business leaders and I will continue to do so.

ASIAN RENEWABLE ENERGY HUB

269. Ms J.J. SHAW to the Minister for State Development, Jobs and Trade:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's investment in establishing Western Australia as a world leader in renewable hydrogen and creating new jobs in this emerging industry.

- (1) Can the minister outline to the house what this government's response has been to the decision by federal Liberal minister Sussan Ley to reject the Asian Renewable Energy Hub?
- (2) Can the minister advise the house what this project will mean for jobs, businesses and industry in the Pilbara?

Mr R.H. COOK replied:

I would like to thank the member for the question and her ongoing interest and expertise in the area of energy.

- (1)–(2) We are all excited about the jobs that will be created and the expansion of new industries in the renewable energy sector. Whether it is for the generation, manufacture or export of hydrogen in the future, the future energy focus is the future for the Western Australian economy. We are excited about the changes in our energy and resources industry and what they will mean for the ongoing diversification of the Western Australian economy. We are excited about projects such as the Asian Renewable Energy Hub, which is tipped to be a world leader in green hydrogen production, particularly as we move responsibly towards a decarbonised economy. We are most excited about the potential for projects such as these to transform the Pilbara economy and to create over 5 000 jobs in construction and 3 000 jobs in its operation over the life of the project. There is one government that is not as excited as we are about this project. It is disappointing to see the federal government is not so excited about this project, particularly when it appears to have supported it thus far.

In October 2020, the first 15-gigawatt stage of the project received state government environmental approval. In December 2020, the federal government granted it major project status and conditionally approved the first stage under the commonwealth's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. At that stage, the project was going okay. After receiving approval for stage 1, the proponents submitted their expanded 26-gigawatt exciting second stage to the Western Australian Environmental Protection Authority and, only last month, the public consultation period commenced and they expanded the second stage under the commonwealth EPBC act with the understanding that the state environmental assessment was already underway.

I must confess that I am disappointed—I know the Minister for Hydrogen Industry in the other place is also disappointed—that the commonwealth government has decided to reject the second stage before any due process has been undertaken. Strangely, the federal Minister for the Environment leapt out of the box with a determination that the revised proposal was “clearly unacceptable”, despite the fact that the decision had clearly occurred without meaningful engagement with the commonwealth, the proponent or the government of Western Australia. It is bizarre that the commonwealth government is now turning its back on the new energy future. It is bizarre that it has almost unilaterally rejected this proposal and it is bizarre that after all the twisting and turning that it undertook in Queensland to drag the Adani coal project almost dying across the finish line, that today it would, without due process and without any meaningful engagement with the proponent, simply reject the second stage of what will be Australia's largest green hydrogen project and a flag-bearer for the energy future of Western Australia.

Perhaps the commonwealth Minister for the Environment had half an eye on the Nationals in Canberra and realised that the climate change wars are not over yet. Maybe she was anticipating Barnaby Joyce coming back into the fold, and is understanding that we do not need to take on a green energy future, investing in renewable hydrogen, making sure that we are creating the jobs of future and making sure that Australia is a leader in new energy proposals and is allowing Barnaby and the National Party to drag us back into the dark ages of coal, climate change denial and taking Western Australia's economic future backwards.

It is bizarre the way in which the commonwealth environment minister so quickly rejected out of hand this proposal that represents a significant and exciting future for a decarbonised WA economy. Only last month, the federal budget had in it an interesting funding commitment around hydrogen—\$275.5 million towards developing four more hydrogen production hubs, with potential sites including the Pilbara in Western Australia. What is going on? What is going on in the heads of those opposite? What is going on with the commonwealth government? Clearly, they are not prepared to embrace the future. Clearly, they are not prepared to back the WA McGowan government's commitment to renewable hydrogen and, clearly, the climate wars are not over yet. Barnaby and the National Party are dragging us back, but we will resist and the McGowan Labor government will take Western Australia forward as part of our green energy vision for WA.

OUTER HARBOUR — COCKBURN SOUND

270. Dr D.J. HONEY to the Minister for Fisheries:

Thank you very much for the call, Madam Speaker. I almost drifted off then.

I refer to the comments from the member for Cockburn in this place during the debate on the Aquatic Resources Management Amendment Bill on 3 June about pressure on Cockburn Sound, and I quote —

Mussel aquaculture has reduced in productivity from production levels of over 700 tonnes in early 2000 to below 200 tonnes in recent years ...

I also refer to the closure of the snapper and southern garfish fisheries.

If Cockburn Sound fisheries are already under pressure, what impact will the outer harbour have on recreational and commercial fisheries in Cockburn Sound?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, please!

Mr D.T. PUNCH replied:

I thank the member for the question. I am shocked that I have actually been asked a question in this place! Thank you very much, member, for my first question.

As I explained in the second reading speech on the Aquatic Resources Management Amendment Bill 2021, and in response to the member's question, this government has a very strong commitment to science and research. In response to the proposals for Cockburn Sound, we are investing significantly in researching the potential impacts, if any, on Cockburn Sound. This is one of the answers to the member's question. We have also invested in marine science research, which will start in July.

In regard to mussels, as the member will know, Cockburn Sound waters are considerably cleaner than they have been in the past, which makes it difficult to grow mussels, but I am very happy to provide the member with further information on the mussel issue should he wish it.

OUTER HARBOUR — COCKBURN SOUND

271. Dr D.J. HONEY to the Minister for Fisheries:

I have a supplementary question. As the Minister for Fisheries, will the minister stand up for the recreational and commercial fishing industries and oppose the proposed outer harbour and the 400 hectares of seagrass clearing?

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, please!

Mr D.T. PUNCH replied:

What a silly question! The decision-making around fisheries in this state is based on some of the world's best research and applied research undertaken by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. Those people work professionally and very hard to provide the best advice to get the best balance for both recreational and commercial fishers. That is why we have 95 per cent coverage from the Marine Stewardship Council for the quality of our commercial fisheries. That is why we are the most sustainable in the world, according to the oceanographic institute. We are doing amazing work in that space and we will continue, in all our endeavours, to rely on good research and good science to help inform decision-making.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

272. Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY to the Minister for Energy:

I refer to the McGowan Labor government's commitment to delivering more affordable energy for Western Australians and driving a cleaner energy system for the state.

- (1) Can the minister update the house on the McGowan Labor government's efforts in delivering reliable and affordable energy to households and businesses in Perth and the south west interconnected system?
- (2) Can the minister advise the house of what the Australian Energy Market Operator has said about this government's management of the energy system?

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON replied:

- (1)–(2) I am very pleased to answer that question. I know that the member is very interested in the continued uptake of renewable energy, which sets her apart from the Liberal Party, which has just rejected one of the most exciting renewable energy projects ever proposed in Western Australia! It would be interesting to know whether the federal government would reject the member for Cottesloe's plan to build a renewable energy project close to the coast. Having rejected a private sector proposal, would it also reject the member for Cottesloe's proposal?

It is interesting that the energy transformation strategy in Western Australia is dealing with the higher amount of renewable energy of 1 350 megawatts of additional capacity into the south west interconnected system in the last four years. We are now putting on one megawatt per day of new rooftop solar panels. That is incredible; basically, every year we are putting on the largest power station in the system. We are responding to those additions by making sure that our new system adapts to that new dynamic.

The Australian Energy Market Operator, which operates the south west interconnected system and the national electricity market, has just made some comments about the way our system is evolving. A media release published last Thursday headed “Positive outlook for Western Australia’s evolving power system”, includes this information —

AEMO’s CEO and Managing Director, Daniel Westerman said: “This is a profound transformation that calls for the highest levels of collaboration across the WA energy system—amongst market bodies, policy makers, industry participants and consumer groups.”

...

“It is pleasing that AEMO’s analysis in the 2021 WEM ESOO confirms sufficient generation capacity to meet forecast demand in the SWIS over the next decade ...

In other words, AEMO is saying that our careful planning will keep the lights on for the next 10 years. The media release continues —

AEMO Executive General Manager, WA, Cameron Parrotte said: “Our analysis shows that even with the expected staged retirement of coal generators, including Muja C ... in 2022 and ... 2024, connected and committed capacity is forecast to meet anticipated demand over the next decade.”

Again, our careful management of the exit of coal is being acknowledged by the Australian Energy Market Operator. Mr Cameron Parrotte goes on to say in this media release —

“AEMO is supportive of innovative solutions to help address these challenges, pointing to the importance of projects already underway, like the WA Government’s Energy Transformation Strategy, to help alleviate system security risks under certain conditions such as when minimum operational demand is low,” ...

Members can see that we are being acknowledged for the hard work that we are doing here in Western Australia. We are bringing together the market participants. As recently as yesterday, I held another forum with AEMO, Western Power and Energy Policy WA to make sure that we are properly identifying all the challenges that are coming out into the system, including the whole-of-system plan, laying out 20 years of infrastructure investment; the distributed energy resources road map, showing how we can integrate rooftop solar and make it part of the system, not an adjunct of the system; and a completely new set of rules that includes reducing carbon emissions as one of the objectives of running our system in Western Australia. This is the way to do energy policy, not the mad schemes invented by the member for Cottesloe.

The SPEAKER: The member for Roe with the last question.

TEACHERS — SHORTAGE

273. Mr P.J. RUNDLE to the Premier:

I refer to claims by the State School Teachers’ Union of WA of a statewide looming teacher shortage across the public education system with an immediate and pressing need for relief teachers.

- (1) Is history repeating itself, given that Western Australian classrooms were 600 teachers short at the start of the 2008 school year when the Premier was the Minister for Education and Training in the last Labor government?
- (2) What is the Premier doing this time to prevent a teacher shortfall?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

- (1)–(2) I thank the member for the question. One thing that occurs, inevitably, when there is an extremely strong economy is very low rates of unemployment. When there are very low rates of unemployment, there are demand pressures on a range of industries across the state. The last time that I was a minister in 2007 and 2008, we had an extremely strong economy and an extremely low unemployment rate, so we had labour shortages in various industries across the state. This time, now I am Premier, we have very strong economic outcomes and the lowest unemployment rate in the nation. We also have the added issue of closed international borders. To attract professionals into some of our industries and traditionally across Australia in a range of industries—for instance, in nursing, the medical professions, engineering and some of those areas—there has been a major program of acquiring and securing people from overseas to fill some positions. We cannot currently do that because we have closed international borders, which is under the control of the commonwealth government; it is not under our control whatsoever. Having said that, I support closed international borders. I support that regime. So we have a range of pressures.

I have not been advised that there is a significant issue with the teaching workforce. Obviously, over a long period, the country has trained a great many teachers, and teachers often stay in the workforce to an older age compared with people in other industries, but I have not been advised that there is an issue. But if an issue develops, it is a function of a very strong economy, which therefore develops labour shortages, and because we have closed international borders, which we do not control. The university entries for teaching is also a commonwealth matter. Universities are, basically, controlled by the commonwealth, so that is outside our control. We will monitor the situation, but with Western Australia being the strongest state in the country with the strongest economy and strongest labour market, obviously, we will increasingly have labour attraction issues, but that is a function of our success.

TEACHERS — SHORTAGE

274. Mr P.J. RUNDLE to the Premier:

I have a supplementary question. Is this just another part of the public service that is facing a crisis of the government's own making, along with the public sector price freeze?

Mr M. McGOWAN replied:

I am aware of one organisation facing a crisis, and that is the National Party! Are you one of Barnaby's men? Who in the National Party in Western Australia, apart from the member for North West Central and Mr James Hayward, is going to go out there and back Barnaby? Any of you? If the answer is Barnaby, I despair as to what the question was. Barnaby Joyce is an embarrassment to Australia. He should not even be in federal Parliament, let alone the Deputy Prime Minister of this country. The Prime Minister can no longer go overseas. He can no longer leave the country. He can no longer have a holiday, because every time he does, Barnaby Joyce is going to be the Acting Prime Minister of Australia. It is actually embarrassing. It is actually a risk to the country that Barnaby Joyce is going to be the Acting Prime Minister, so our Prime Minister can no longer go on holidays. He can no longer have a break. He can no longer go overseas. He cannot go on any trip to any other country, because Barnaby will be sitting there. How can he have faith?

Point of Order

Mr R.S. LOVE: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Which one are you? Are you one of Barnaby's boys?

The SPEAKER: Point of order, Premier.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Premier! Members! I am taking a point of order. Members, the point of order will be heard in silence.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I just draw your attention to the relevance. There is no relevance in the Premier's answer to the question that was asked.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Premier can answer as he sees fit, but I would ask him to perhaps draw his answer to a close.

Questions without Notice Resumed

Mr M. McGOWAN: Madam Speaker, the thing about the question is that I answered the member's supplementary in response to his original question. I find that this opposition cannot process the original answer and work out its supplementary based upon what I said in the original answer. I answered the member's question. Then he asked me what is written down in front of him because he cannot think on his feet. That is a common problem amongst the six of them. I segued, because he used the word "crisis" and I know an organisation that is in crisis, and that is the National Party of Australia.

The SPEAKER: Members, that concludes question time.

PROTECTION OF INFORMATION (ENTRY REGISTRATION INFORMATION RELATING TO COVID-19 AND OTHER INFECTIOUS DISEASES) BILL 2021

Returned

Bill returned from the Council without amendment.

Assent

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the bill.

PAPERS TABLED

Papers were tabled and ordered to lie upon the table of the house.

CYCLONE SEROJA — GOVERNMENT SUPPORT*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion***MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central)** [3.05 pm] — without notice: I move —

That so much of standing orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the following motion to be debated forthwith —

That this house condemns the McGowan government for its ongoing failure to provide adequate support to individuals and businesses impacted by cyclone Seroja.

*Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion***MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House)** [3.05 pm]: I move —

To insert after “forthwith” —

, subject to the debate being limited to 10 minutes for government members and 10 minutes for non-government members

Amendment put and passed.

Standing Orders Suspension — Motion, as Amended

The SPEAKER: Members, as this is a motion without notice to suspend standing orders, it will need the support of an absolute majority for it to proceed. If I hear a dissentient voice, I will be required to divide the Assembly.

Question put and passed with an absolute majority.

*Motion***MR V.A. CATANIA (North West Central)** [3.06 pm]: I move the motion.

We all saw the report in the paper, “Cyclone Seroja: Mid West towns feel forgotten by McGowan Government as rebuild continues”. To enlighten members in this place, I say that that rebuild is not going according to plan. If we look at the insurance issues that businesses and individuals are facing in places like Kalbarri and the midwest, we see that for some reason insurance companies have a foot on the hose and are not paying out those individuals or businesses. What is the government doing to ensure that those insurance companies provide the necessary support for people to rebuild their homes and businesses to ensure that Kalbarri can go back to its former glory? What is the government doing? We see that families are displaced. They do not have housing because there is no housing in places like Kalbarri or Northampton. Where are people going? We are seeing those individuals reside with families and friends. People who have kids are living on top of another family or friends in order to have a roof over their heads.

Many people have a tarp over their homes. I happened to assist many of those people putting tarps up over their houses. Bear in mind it has been three months since the cyclone hit and we still have house after house with tarps on. We have had all this rain, which is welcomed but not needed, and because there are tarps on the houses, the rain is creating mould and the houses are becoming unlivable. This is all due to the delay in insurance companies coming to the party. What is the Minister for Emergency Services doing to apply pressure to insurance companies? When 27 blocks with power and water owned by the state government through DevelopmentWA are empty, what is the minister doing to build houses on those blocks? What is he doing to provide the social housing that is desperately needed for people who are displaced or who want to come back to Kalbarri and cannot, simply because there is no housing?

Like I said, three months on, we have seen no action. In question time today, the Minister for Emergency Services spoke about \$4 000—a small amount of money that has been given to those businesses. If we look at the Lord Mayor’s Distress Relief Fund, up to \$25 000 is going to some individuals, but not all of them. People who own a house that may be their retirement house are not able to access that \$25 000 from the Lord Mayor’s appeal.

Mr R.R. Whitby: Isn’t it because that’s their second house?

Mr V.A. CATANIA: It is because it is their second house; nonetheless, it is their retirement house. People who live in a place like Yalgoo may have rented out a house in Northampton that has been destroyed by the cyclone. If they had planned to retire in Northampton over the next year, they will not get one cent. When the government is sitting on a surplus of over \$5 billion, we have to wonder why it is not supporting those people. Will the Minister for Emergency Services extend the criteria so that those people can access the \$4 000 and apply pressure for them to access the Lord Mayor’s Distress Relied Fund to make sure they are able to access up to \$25 000?

For those businesses who are struggling three months on, all they have is \$4 000. After three months, they have no certainty around their businesses or a campaign to ensure people who are visiting Kalbarri know exactly what is open and what is not open. It should not only be for the select few businesses that may be members of the visitor centre. It has to be for the whole of the business community in Kalbarri.

Minister, the government needs to do more. The marine rescue building is still not repaired. That shows the lack of government support for volunteers who are stretched. The volunteers in Kalbarri, for example, are at the point that they need help. They need relief to be able to ensure that they can continue to save lives.

MR R.S. LOVE (Moore — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [3.12 pm]: Today in question time, I asked the Minister for Energy whether consumers of electricity in the areas affected by cyclone Seroja could receive a \$363 credit on their power bill. I was told that it would not be possible for that to happen automatically and that they would have to make an application. I cannot see any reason at all that the minister could not ask Western Power to inform Synergy of each of the power bills that have to be estimated; it could be done automatically. There was outrage in the community last week because people were receiving power bills that had increased because they had been estimated, even though, obviously, the ability for these people to have power was somewhat curtailed—they had no power for several weeks in some cases. One constituent from West Binu, just out of Kalbarri, had been running two generator sets that used 3 000 litres of fuel over six or seven weeks. They received an estimated account for \$627 in that period. Obviously, his bill should have been zero dollars. I asked the minister today whether he could make that happen and he gave me a weak answer about automatic power meters. It was very interesting but, actually, the people up there want some assistance. They do not want longwinded answers about technology.

I do acknowledge that some measures have been taken by the state government. The Minister for Emergency Services was up in Kalbarri. As a result, the press release “Help available for Cyclone Seroja devastated communities” came out. It was just a rehash of exactly everything that we already knew. I was a bit disappointed that the minister went up there and did not have something further to say, because people in the community up there are somewhat devastated. They are looking for help.

There was flooding in Victoria recently. Conversely to the situation for people in Western Australia—my constituents are being charged even though they have no power—members of those Victorian communities who are without power are being offered a compensation package of up to \$1 680 per week per household for up to three weeks by the state government under the prolonged power outage payment scheme. A very different approach is being taken in Victoria to the needs of the community.

Last Wednesday, a motion during private members’ business dealt with some of the situation facing people in areas affected by cyclone Seroja. I raised some of the comments made by the CEO of the Shire of Northampton. The member for Armadale, who is some sort of minor minister—I do not know what he is minister for—launched into some sort of attack on the Northampton shire CEO. He alleged that he was a supporter of the Nationals WA and had been handing out how-to-vote cards for the member for North West Central. It was bizarre. I thought about it afterwards. It may have come from the fact that the CEO of the Shire of Northampton, along with the CEO of the Shire of Mingenew, had the temerity to actually be quoted in an excellent article in *The West Australian* titled “We have simply been forgotten”. The sentiments of the CEOs of the shires of Northampton and Mingenew quoted in that article are reflective of the situation on the ground. For coming out and making their sentiments known to the Western Australian population, they were personally attacked in this chamber. It was disgraceful. I want to put on the record that if members find that the CEO in question appears not to be very happy when they talk to him, it might be because his community has been smashed and he has been working all hours of the day, seven days a week, for 10 weeks to try to get his community back in order. He deserves respect, gratitude and thanks. He does not deserve to be attacked in this chamber, and I think an apology from the member for Armadale should be forthcoming.

Mr M.J. Folkard interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member!

Mr R.S. LOVE: I raised that with the member for Armadale after his effort.

Mr M.J. Folkard interjected.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I will point out —

Mr M.J. Folkard interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burns Beach, I call you to order for the first time.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Communities in that area need support. Today I spoke on the radio about how the National Australia Bank, of all times, is pulling out of Three Springs, which is one of the shires whose residents were affected by the cyclone. The National Australia Bank branch in Three Springs serves all the shires of Morawa, Perenjori, Three Springs and Mingenew. My constituents are facing these situations and they need support from the government. They do not need members of the government attacking the CEOs who represent them and work hard for them, as happened in this place last week. I believe we need to see some positive support on the ground for these people and a bit more recognition of their particular circumstances.

I also heard the Minister for Emergency Services say that nobody needed emergency accommodation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member. Your time has expired. Minister for Emergency Services.

MR R.R. WHITBY (Baldvis — Minister for Emergency Services) [3.17 pm]: I am incredibly disappointed by the attitude of those in the corner—I really am. The people of the midwest need cooperation and understanding. The misinformation, stirring and dirt throwing that goes on by members opposite to score cheap political points at a time when communities are distressed really distresses and amazes me.

I was in Northampton on Saturday. I sat down with the CEO and the shire president. I spoke with both of them at length and they were very appreciative and understanding of the work that we have done. I was able to tell them new information about the fact that we are working with the federal government on disaster recovery relief arrangements and the provision of multimillion-dollar assistance. I am in constant contact with the federal Minister for Agriculture, Drought and Emergency Management, who happens to be a member of the National Party. In fact, I talk to him regularly on the phone. I have his mobile number and he has mine. The cooperation and responsible attitude that he displays is in stark contrast with the nature of the behaviour of the Nationals WA in this place. There has been enormous support for those troubled communities. I am not going to go through the long list now, but it is extensive. What is more important is the support that is coming through the disaster recovery funding arrangements with the federal government. This will open up a range of support and we are working very closely with our federal colleagues to deliver that as soon as we can.

As I said, I was in Northampton on Saturday. I discussed the situation with many people—business leaders, community leaders and local government representatives. In fact, it was good to see the local Labor member for Geraldton; an upper house member, Hon Sandra Carr; and even a Liberal member, Hon Steve Martin. We did not see a member of the Nationals WA in Northampton, a town in a seat held by the Nationals, on Saturday. We did not have a member of the National Party at a major event.

Mr R.S. Love interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition!

Ms R. Saffioti interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister!

Mr R.R. WHITBY: The support we have given, and will continue to give, to the community has been extraordinary; it will continue to be so. My real concern for all the people who have been impacted in many of the communities right throughout that region—right into the midwest, the farming communities, and right down to Dalwallinu—is their mental health. A range of financial support is available. Accommodation has been provided. Grants of \$4 000 are available to businesses, and grants are available to individuals. Money from the Lord Mayor's Distress Relief Fund of \$25 000 and \$10 000 is available. There is a range of other commonwealth support. There are waivers on utility bills. The list goes on—and we have not even started to unlock the federal government's disaster recovery arrangements, which will provide multimillions of dollars' worth of support for those communities.

My concern right now is that if we continue to have the misinformation we have seen reported in the press for no other reason than to score cheap political points, it will have an impact on the welfare and mental health of people in that community. They have been through enough. They have withstood one of the major disasters in Western Australia of the last few decades. They want to see their members of Parliament working together in a cooperative way working hard to deliver support. That is what I am doing. That is what the federal government is doing, quite frankly. I wish that its own members, who should represent the interests of these people, actually stand up and do the right thing. It is a very cheap political shot to make extreme, misleading comments and make political capital out of a disaster. It is a very low and reprehensible thing to do. It happens time after time. The support that the state government has given is enormous. It also extends to hundreds, if not thousands, of volunteers and emergency responders—career responders and volunteer responders. I was with the BlazeAid team in Yuna on the weekend seeing the work that they do. I was with people from the Red Cross in Northampton to see the work that they do. They call it psychological first aid. They go to communities and talk to individuals on farms. They get up close and personal with these people. That is the kind of support that these people need, not cheap actions in Parliament designed to grab a headline and score a cheap political point. Some members need to start representing their constituents' best interests, not score political points.

MR W.J. JOHNSTON (Cannington — Minister for Energy) [3.22 pm]: I do not intend to speak for very long. Although the Nationals WA has brought much fake emotion into the debate, it has brought forward very little about the issues that are challenging its constituency. The member for Moore failed to understand the explanation I was giving about the billing system—that we have a legacy billing system left to us by the former government. This controversial billing system was introduced at immense expense by the former minister Peter Collier. I remember the criticisms that I made of that system when it was introduced. It is true that it was an inadequate billing system and means that Synergy does not have sight of whether a customer is getting an average bill—that is, an estimated bill from Western Power—or from a direct meter read. If we were able to change that system, which we are doing, that would eliminate estimated bills, but, more importantly, it would allow Synergy to give a more responsive engagement to its customers.

I remind everybody that Western Power paid out \$2.6 million to those affected by cyclone Seroja when we doubled the interruption payment for those customers who lost power during that terrible tragedy. I remind members that

the only time this payment has been increased has been when there has been a Labor government. Whenever there is a Labor government, it goes up. It never changes when there is a Liberal–National government. I also let people know that today, as we speak, only one customer is still without power, and they will be reconnected tomorrow. I want to congratulate Western Power for such diligent work to get every single customer reconnected.

It is interesting that the member for Moore contrasts that with what is happening in Victoria, when no-one knows when customers will be reconnected. The reason people have to pay out thousands of dollars is because the privatised electricity system in Victoria cannot reconnect them. Because we did not go down the Liberal–National Party privatisation pathway, we are able to deliver a higher level of service for customers here in Western Australia. It took longer than anticipated to have 281 customers of Western Power reconnected, but I remind members that they all received a \$1 000 payment to cover the fuel costs of running their gensets. I remind members that in most circumstances, those gensets were loaned to them through the emergency management system, either directly from Western Power or through the emergency management processes. I also remind everybody that Synergy is not doing any collection activities for those customers who have been adversely impacted by cyclone Seroja. I urge any customer to reach out to Synergy to make sure that they are engaged and can get support. I am pleased to say that over 300 customers are receiving a \$363 payment. They either have been or will be contacted today and it will be explained how that bill support will come to them. All those people will receive the payment by 30 June. That is an example of what Synergy can do for customers who reach out. The member asked why customers have to reach out to Synergy. That is because Synergy does not know the circumstances of each individual and it wants to. I make the point that obviously it is very important that people impacted by cyclone Seroja are assisted, and we are doing our best to do that, but other customers in the same position might also need support.

Division

Question put and a division taken, the Deputy Speaker casting his vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (5)

Mr V.A. Catania
Dr D.J. Honey

Mr R.S. Love
Ms L. Mettam

Mr P.J. Rundle (*Teller*)

Noes (43)

Mr S.N. Aubrey
Mr G. Baker
Ms H.M. Beazley
Dr A.D. Buti
Mr J.N. Carey
Mrs R.M.J. Clarke
Ms C.M. Collins
Mr R.H. Cook
Ms D.G. D'Anna
Mr M.J. Folkard
Ms K.E. Giddens

Ms M.J. Hammat
Mr T.J. Healy
Mr M. Hughes
Mr W.J. Johnston
Mr H.T. Jones
Mr D.J. Kelly
Ms E.J. Kelsbie
Ms A.E. Kent
Dr J. Krishnan
Mr P. Lilburne
Mr M. McGowan

Ms S.F. McGurk
Mr S.A. Millman
Mr Y. Mubarakai
Mrs L.M. O'Malley
Mr S.J. Price
Mr D.T. Punch
Mr J.R. Quigley
Ms M.M. Quirk
Ms R. Saffioti
Ms A. Sanderson
Mr D.A.E. Scaife

Ms R.S. Stephens
Mrs J.M.C. Stojkovski
Dr K. Stratton
Mr C.J. Tallentire
Mr D.A. Templeman
Mr P.C. Tinley
Ms C.M. Tonkin
Mr R.R. Whitby
Ms S.E. Winton
Mr D.R. Michael (*Teller*)

Pair

Ms M.J. Davies

Ms C.M. Rowe

Question thus negatived.

BILLS

Notice of Motion to Introduce

1. Arts and Culture Trust Bill 2021.

Notice of motion given by **Mr D.A. Templeman (Minister for Culture and the Arts)**.

2. Animal Welfare and Trespass Legislation Amendment Bill 2021.

3. Courts Legislation Amendment (Magistrates) Bill 2021.

4. Legal Profession Uniform Law Application Bill 2021.

5. Legal Profession Uniform Law Application (Levy) Bill 2021.

Notices of motion given by **Mr J.R. Quigley (Attorney General)**.

McGOWAN GOVERNMENT — FIRST 100 DAYS — PERFORMANCE

Notice of Motion

Mr R.S. Love (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) gave notice that at the next sitting of the house he would move —

That this house condemns the WA Labor government for its abject failure to deal with critical issues facing the state of Western Australia in its first 100 days.

CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2021*Second Reading*

Resumed from 17 June.

MS E.J. KELSBIE (Warren–Blackwood) [3.36 pm]: I am pleased to support the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021. This amendment bill will help recognise the rights of Aboriginal people by broadening the purpose of marine parks to include the protection and conservation of the park's values to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal people. I am proud to be part of a government that recognises the importance of Aboriginal history and heritage in marine reserves.

Western Australia's marine areas are globally significant, with WA's coastal waters considered to be amongst the least disturbed in the world. We are fortunate to have in my electorate of Warren–Blackwood the Walpole and Nornalup Inlets Marine Park, which covers approximately 1 442 hectares with most of the area adjacent to the marine park forming part of the Walpole–Nornalup National Park. It is a beautiful part of our state. The marine park takes in the Walpole and Nornalup Inlets, and the tidal parts of the Frankland, Deep and Walpole Rivers that feed into the estuary system. Walpole Inlet is shallow, at most one metre deep, while Nornalup Inlet is larger and deeper at up to five metres deep. The estuaries are joined by a natural one-kilometre long, two-metre-deep channel bordered by steep granite hills and rocky shores. These are known as the Knolls, and are clothed with dense karri, marri and tingle forests. A major attraction of the inlet system is its remote wilderness feel, particularly in parts of the Nornalup Inlet and the Frankland and Deep Rivers. The marine park is a major tourism drawcard for the region. Hundreds of sailing enthusiasts travel to the south coast each March for the "In the Trees" regatta. A growing number of open-water swimming enthusiasts, myself included, are marking the new year with the "Brown Water Classic", an eight-kilometre swim from Walpole to Nornalup through the estuaries' tannin-stained waters. I will be taking this on in a team in 2022 and will be encouraging my colleagues in the chamber to join me.

The marine habitat has a high diversity of marine fauna and flora, including at least 44 species recorded there prior to 2012. The marine park serves as an important nursery area for many fish species, including juvenile pink snapper. Sharks and rays, which are less common in other estuaries, are also found in the marine park. New Zealand fur seals and dolphins also use the inlets, and have been seen in the Frankland River as far up as Nornalup. I have swum with a dolphin at Nornalup. Black swans, ducks, swamphens, cormorants, herons, egrets, oystercatchers, plovers and pelicans are all commonly seen in the marine park. The sand flats at the mouth of the Nornalup Inlet are an especially important roosting habitat for migratory shorebirds such as stints, great knots and sandpipers. Many of these migratory shorebirds travel vast distances from their breeding grounds in Siberia and Alaska to come to the marine park to rest and recuperate before beginning their return journey. Ospreys and white-bellied sea eagles also live and fish in the marine park. Seagrasses, algae, a diverse array of shellfish and other animals live on the estuary floor. Some prawn species, such as the blue swimmer crab and mud burrowing crab, are also found in the inlets. As members can see, the Walpole and Nornalup Inlets Marine Park is a special place, worthy of protection for future generations.

What may not be known to the average visitor is the Aboriginal connection to the marine park. Estuaries have long been culturally significant areas for Aboriginal communities in south western Australia. Aboriginal archaeological sites near the Walpole and Nornalup inlet system have identified middens, artefact scatters and fish traps on the inlet shore and in the surrounding region. Within the park, the Depot, Newdegate—or Snake—Island, and Coalmine Beach are registered as sites of Aboriginal significance under section 38 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act.

Traditional owners have worked with the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions to advise on the traditional naming of sites. They have developed a welcome to country for the marine park, detailing a traditional story that is now used at a site overlooking the park, and developed signage for a canoe launch site for the Kapagup–Nornalup paddle trail. Traditional owners help document sites and values that are then considered in future planning for the area. The traditional owners promote and support customary activities within the marine park and in the lands adjoining it, helping train DBCA staff so that they can understand and manage arrangements for these important activities in a culturally sensitive and appropriate way. Traditional owners are actively involved in the marine park's planning and management, collaborating with DBCA staff on management and interpretation opportunities. The traditional owners are also represented on the working group for trails development in the area surrounding the marine park.

It is important that sites of significance to Aboriginal people are preserved. Traditional owners are consulted on the planning of prescribed burning through the Wagyl Kaip Southern Noongar working party to ensure cultural values and sites within burn areas adjacent to the marine park are protected. An Aboriginal engagement officer actively monitors registered Aboriginal sites surrounding the marine park to ensure these sites are preserved.

The McGowan government will leave a lasting legacy for future generations by significantly increasing Western Australia's conservation estate. I look forward to seeing the proposed south coast marine park, and a further five million hectares of new national parks, marine parks and conservation reserves, added to our already rich collection of land and marine parks over the next five years.

Plan for Our Parks will also boost tourism in Western Australia, by providing opportunities for the development of nature-based and cultural tourism and recreation attractions. This will create jobs and further enhance Western Australia's reputation as a leading nature and cultural-based tourist destination. The initiative provides the basis for a new era in working with the state's traditional owners.

The plan will deliver on a number of existing strategic priorities and commitments, and create new, visionary opportunities for parks and reserves. Plan for Our Parks will provide long-term employment and joint management outcomes, supporting Aboriginal people's desire to manage country and respond to the growing demand for on-country jobs for Aboriginal rangers. It is designed to complement other initiatives, such as the successful Aboriginal ranger program, which was established in 2017 to protect the environment and leverage the social and economic benefits that employment provides in regional and remote Western Australia.

This amendment follows on from changes to the Conservation and Land Management Act in 2015 that enabled the joint vesting of reserves, including national parks, nature reserves and conservation parks, between the Conservation and Parks Commission and traditional owners, through an Aboriginal body corporate. This amendment will take the next step to ensure that marine reserves, including marine parks, marine nature reserves and marine management areas, will be jointly vested in the same way as land-based reserves. Joint vesting is important, as it recognises and respects the connection Aboriginal people have to country, while also providing a formal mechanism for traditional owners to contribute their knowledge, skills and expertise to the management of these important ecological sites. It does this through legally recognising a shared responsibility between the Conservation and Parks Commission and the traditional owners over a reserve. Joint vesting ensures that both parties' interest in the reserve is recognised, and the reserve title recognises the Aboriginal traditional owners alongside the Conservation and Parks Commission. It also makes clear that both parties have a shared responsibility for the future of the reserve.

Other amendments that the bill will make are administrative in nature and will update and modernise the CALM act in accordance with the government's goal of pursuing legislative reform to reduce red tape and ensure that legislation operates efficiently. These include amendments that will remove the requirement for permit and licence forms to be prescribed and other amendments to address miscellaneous minor anomalies and omissions.

I commend the bill to the house.

MS D.G. D'ANNA (Kimberley) [3.47 pm]: I rise to speak in support of the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021. This amending bill will continue the strong bipartisan support for including the engagement of Aboriginal people in the management of conservation reserves. This is an example of how the McGowan government will leave a lasting legacy for future generations by significantly increasing Western Australia's conservation estate. This comes from the government's Plan for Our Parks, which will secure a further five million hectares of new national parks, marine parks and other conservation reserves over the next five years. The five million-hectare expansion will see the conservation estate increase by over 20 per cent. The plan will deliver new and expanded parks in the Kimberley in the north, across WA's great lands, to population centres in Bunbury and Perth and to our south west forests and along our southern coastline. The plan includes existing priorities and identifies new and visionary opportunities to work with traditional owners to create, jointly manage and vest, and expand our parks.

Importantly, Plan for Our Parks will also boost tourism in Western Australia by providing opportunities for the development of nature-based and cultural tourism and recreation attractions. This will further enhance WA's reputation as a leading nature and cultural-based tourist destination and create jobs, which is core to the Kimberley electorate. The initiative provides the basis for a new era in working with the state's traditional owners. It builds on successful joint management arrangements that are being implemented with traditional owners elsewhere in the state. Plan for Our Parks builds on the government's election commitments and strategic priorities, and includes longstanding reserve proposals designed to contribute to a comprehensive, adequate and representative reserve system for WA.

This is important legislation that will see shared responsibility between the Conservation and Parks Commission and the traditional owners over waters, land or land and waters, legally recognised. Another way to see this is that vesting formally recognises traditional owners' interests in country on the reserve title. This means that both parties' interests in the reserve is recognised and both parties have a shared responsibility for the future of the reserve.

It is extremely important for traditional owners to play a role in maintaining and moulding the future of their lands. The 2015 amendment to the Conservation and Land Management Act 1984 enabled the joint vesting of certain reserves. I am proud to see this Labor government now extend that to enable marine reserves to be jointly vested under this bill. As the joint vesting party, an Aboriginal body corporate will have an equal role to the Conservation and Parks Commission in preparing the initial management plan and every other proposed management plan, and reviewing each expiring management plan for the jointly vested land, land and waters or waters, as well as an equal role in being consulted on the granting of licences and leases on the jointly vested land, land and waters or waters and providing advice to the Minister for Environment on proposals to cancel or amend the purpose of, or change the boundary of, certain types of CALM act reserves that are not class A reserves.

This is exciting for the Kimberley region as the joint vesting will be able to be applied to existing and new marine reserves. Consultation has recently closed for the proposed marine parks in the Buccaneer Archipelago in the Kimberley, which was a 2017 election commitment by this government and a component of the McGowan government's Plan for Our Parks initiative. This government has made a commitment to co-design these proposed marine parks with the Bardi Jawi, Mayala and Dambeemangarddee traditional owners. This will be Australia's first ever co-designed marine park. The parks will cover around 660 000 hectares in the West Kimberley within the Bardi Jawi, Mayala and Dambeemangarddee sea country. The co-design approach recognises the native title rights, the cultural heritage values and traditional practices of the traditional owners who live adjacent to the proposed marine park and rely on the resources of their sea country to maintain their lifestyle. This is specifically important to me also as I come from Bardi country.

The Kimberley Land Council worked with the state government and traditional owners to facilitate discussions over the parameters of the park, assisted with meeting logistics and provided legal support to make sure that traditional owners were at the forefront of negotiations. Over 200 traditional owners from the Buccaneer Archipelago played a part in designing the balanced and strong plan to care for sea country. The marine parks aim to conserve the outstanding natural and cultural values of the Buccaneer Archipelago while facilitating exceptional visitor experiences and providing ongoing access for site-appropriate recreational and commercial activities. Creating these parks will mean that traditional owners of the Buccaneer Archipelago are given a voice and opportunity to protect culturally significant areas.

Another exciting part of this bill is the amendment to the reserve purpose of a marine park to specifically include the protection and conservation of the value of marine parks to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal people. This will mean the protection and conservation of the value of the marine park to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons will be part of the reservation purpose. This will provide the certainty that special purpose areas can be made for the protection and conservation of Aboriginal culture and heritage values. Special purpose areas in marine parks are those areas where activities may be restricted, depending on whether they are incompatible with a conservation purpose. The amendment will provide the certainty to enable the incompatibility test to be applied to determine whether the activity is incompatible with a conservation purpose that includes Aboriginal culture and heritage. This will provide certainty to enable the making of special purpose areas in which commercial and recreational activities that are incompatible with the "protection and conservation of the value of the marine park to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons" purpose to be excluded. This will occur when the section 62 notice to create the marine park and associated zoning is gazetted.

I know that is a lot of words, but I would really like to end with some quotes from traditional owners who come from the sea country of the Buccaneer Archipelago, where one of these parks will be created. Lorna Hudson, a Mayala elder, said that she feels so happy about it. She is happy that her country has been recognised. That awareness that there are traditional owners for Mayala gives them the strength to continue to take care of country. They acknowledge that they are still there to protect country and pass on knowledge like their ancestors did. If they do not do these things, things will be forgotten, and she does not want Mayala to be forgotten.

Janella Isaacs, another Mayala woman, a younger emerging leader, said —

... our old people ... always wanted to find the best way to help manage Mayala Country ... That was an inspiration and a dream that our old people had. Through a jointly managed marine park that dream has become real for our people and that is a big achievement.

Rosanna Angus, a Bardi Jawi woman and a leader in her own right said —

These cultural zones protect our backyards, areas where we have our stories and our significant sites.

She also said —

The ... zones are very important for sustaining traditional practices like fishing, hunting and gathering and enable us to protect our saltwater culture ...

Daniel Oades, the Kimberley Land Council's Bardi Jawi Indigenous protected area coordinator, said that it is exciting to be on the forefront of sea country management, and that having a draft plan created with traditional owners is a significant milestone for Australia.

I look forward to the realisation of the Buccaneer Archipelago marine park. This bill is good news for the Kimberley electorate, and especially the traditional owners of the state.

MS H.M. BEAZLEY (Victoria Park) [3.57 pm]: It is our responsibility, as members of this Parliament, to protect our most vulnerable assets. Of particular importance in Western Australia is our long history of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture and our species-rich biodiversity. As such, it gives me great pleasure to speak today about the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021. In 2015, through bipartisan support, we saw the joint vesting of national parks, nature reserves and conservation parks between the Conservation and Parks Commission and Aboriginal bodies corporate. This allowed traditional owners to voice any concerns relating to, and have a say in, the management of these natural areas.

Given our First Nations' rich and deep history with country, this was a crucial move in providing these natural areas with the greatest chance of survival, for all species to flourish on a landscape dominated by the Anthropocene. However, this history also has a strong connection to water. The Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021 will allow for marine reserves to also be jointly vested with an Aboriginal body corporate, making them jointly responsible for the reserve's care, management and future. Joint vesting formally recognises traditional owners' interest in country by recording this relationship on the reserve title. It legally recognises a joint responsibility between the state, through the Conservation and Parks Commission, and traditional owners over land and, once this bill is passed, water.

Aboriginal people along the Western Australian coast have a strong connection with their land and sea culture, and joint vesting will support the practice of culture and heritage as well as participation in economic activities. The proposed joint vesting provisions in this amendment bill will provide an Aboriginal body corporate with a role that is equal to the Conservation and Parks Commission in preparing the initial management plan and every other proposed plan, and of reviewing each expiry management plan for the jointly vested lands, land and waters, or waters; an equal role in being consulted on the granting of licences and leases on the jointly vested lands, land and water, or waters; and an equal role in being consulted and providing advice to the Minister for Environment on proposals to cancel or amend the purpose, or to change the boundary, of certain types of CALM act reserves that are not class A reserves.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander elders, past, present and emerging, and Aboriginal communities maintain a strong connection to our waterways. These water bodies are central to many cultural and spiritual beliefs, and have served as meeting places, boundaries between tribal and language groups, and sources of food, transport and shelter over tens of thousands of years. Importantly, clause 9 of the bill amends section 13B(1) of the act, and will alter the reserve purpose of a marine park to specifically include —

... the protection and conservation of the value of the marine park to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons

By comparison, the current reservation purposes for marine parks in the Conservation and Land Management Act allow for recreational and commercial activity that is consistent with the proper conservation of the natural environment, the protection of flora and fauna, and the preservation of any feature of archaeological, historic or scientific interest. Although these frameworks are necessary and important to assist with the physical environment, they do not account for places of cultural significance to Aboriginal people. The proposed amendment to the act will allow for this fourth purpose—to justify the protection of a place based on culture and heritage alone. This will provide certainty so that special purpose areas—referred to as “special purpose zones” in management plans—can be made for the protection and conservation of Aboriginal culture and heritage values. This means that special purpose zones will be able to be created through the marine park management planning process in which activities that are not compatible with Aboriginal culture and heritage values can be excluded.

The amendments to the act in 2015 that included a share of responsibility and ownership with First Nations peoples did not include this connection to water on a cultural and spiritual level. It is crucial that we now incorporate this into the legislation. The only people on this land and these waters who have the benefit of tens of thousands of years of land and water management experience are our First Nations peoples. The proposed amendments will extend the 2015 joint vesting arrangements and enable marine parks, marine nature reserves and management areas to be jointly vested in the same way as national parks, nature reserves and conservation parks. The intergenerational value of including traditional owners in land and marine park management will greatly benefit how effective our vital conservation efforts are. For too long traditional owners have not been included in the management of land for which they know every story.

The McGowan Labor government acknowledges the importance of continual partnership with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples for sustainable conservation of all natural areas in Western Australia. This engagement has previously led to policy changes that have helped to ensure the effective protection of our endemic species. A wonderful example of effective policy informed by the expertise of traditional owners is how traditional knowledge is informing prescribed burning. Fossil records show that Australian landscapes have been burnt as a response to arid conditions for at least 30 million years. Our Noongar people in the south west of the state have used fire as one of the main tools in caring for country for tens of thousands of years. It has, in fact, been so integral to Noongar land management that the land that we all inherit today is one that has been shaped by our Noongar peoples through their use of fire. With this history of knowledge, our burning practices today are now informed by the importance of cool burns to reduce the mass of understorey organic litter to protect the mid-range and high canopy in fires of high intensity, and to maintain species richness to feed our local fauna through post-fire germination.

A concept held by First Nations peoples is that country is a living entity, alive with ancestral spirits, and it must be respected. Our First Nations peoples relate to country in the same way that they would a person: if you look after country, country will look after you. Yolngu elder Roy Dadaynga Marika said —

Our country ... will exist forever. It must be protected so that it will remain the same, so that it can be seen in the same way that the elders saw it in the past. Our vision and hope is that Yolngu will continue to use our country for all the generations to come.

In addition to joint vesting and informed prescribed burning, the Aboriginal ranger program implemented by the McGowan Labor government has been aided by fostering Aboriginal wellbeing and culture, along with improved environmental management and land restoration. I am very pleased that over 50 per cent of these positions are held by Aboriginal women. In addition, the McGowan Labor government also aims to increase the conservation estate in Western Australia by five million hectares over five years through new jointly managed parks and reserves. The corresponding agreement provides for the joint management and joint vesting of the existing Ningaloo Marine Park, covering 260 000 hectares, and Cape Range National Park, covering 50 000 hectares, as well as the creation of about 78 000 hectares of new conservation areas extending over approximately 215 kilometres of the Ningaloo coast. The World Heritage-listed Ningaloo coast is home to a range of biodiverse coral and fish populations, and is frequented by whale sharks, humpback whales and even the occasional blue whale, the largest animal on earth. Shared protection of these one-of-a-kind landscapes assists the safeguarding of threatened species. The Plan for Our Parks represents the single biggest expansion of the terrestrial conservation estate in Australia's history. This expansion ensures the resilience of our environment against the impacts of climate change and other threatening processes, and includes extending the protection of the Buccaneer Archipelago, and marine and national parks in the Kimberley.

Increasing the conservation estate by five million hectares is a big win for environmental sustainability, especially given the critical challenges we are facing in the age of human-induced climate change. The five million-hectare expansion will see Western Australia's conservation estate increase by over 20 per cent. Sharing these conservation efforts with traditional owners can only help with the conservation and care of these natural areas. Aboriginal knowledge of land and waters, and their connection to it, should be celebrated and harnessed to ensure that life within our waters and on our lands thrives. Extending these conservation areas and collaborating with traditional owners also provides a greater opportunity to focus on waste within these diverse areas. Reducing litter and inorganic material, such as plastics and metals, can reduce deaths of species that are ingesting, or getting caught in, materials such as plastic bags, microplastics and holes in metal drink cans. The existence of the Great Pacific Garbage Patch, a collection of marine rubbish that is slowly breaking into microplastics, is reason enough to enact stronger protections for marine parks. Marine debris can be very harmful to marine life. Sea turtles often mistake plastic bags for jellyfish and birds mistake plastic pellets for fish eggs and feed them to their young.

The McGowan Labor government is also making globally leading strides in the waste field, such as our fast-forwarded ban on single-use plastics and the introduction of the Containers for Change container deposit scheme. Before Containers for Change, only three in 10 eligible drink containers were recycled. It is estimated that Containers for Change will result in an extra 6.6 billion containers being recycled over the next 20 years, of which an estimated 5.9 billion would have ended their life cycle in continuously expanding landfill, and 706 million would have been littered. If 6.6 billion containers were laid side by side, that would be enough to lap our vast state of Western Australia over 30 times. Containers for Change stretches all over our urban and rural state, and aids in keeping the pristine Kimberley all the way to the biodiverse south west in its natural state—the way it should be.

The Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill will provide the basis for a new era of working with our state's traditional owners. Our land and waters are the well from which our First Nations culture and cosmology sprung. As Noongar man, and former chief executive of the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council, Glen Kelly has written —

We are of this land, and this land is of us. It has been that way for ... tens of thousands of years. Our knowledge base and cultural identity is closely intertwined with the land, and our people—especially our elders—still possess a vast pool of traditional knowledge. This, combined with our growing self-determination, means that we are more able to successfully fulfil our obligations to care for country. Obligations that are set out in our ... Dreaming ... to care for the land not only for ourselves, but for the sake of the health of country and all that lives upon it.

We see this relationship as a reciprocal one. If we take care of the country and maintain its needs, it will in turn take care of us—both on a physical and spiritual level. We are equal to what exists on our land, we do not have dominion over it, we are simply custodians.

...

I believe that with the combination of Nyungar traditional knowledge and modern scientific method, it will be possible to create an extremely robust and effective land management system. A cross-cultural land ethic —

And —

... that this can ensure the long term survival of the land we now share.

I could not agree more with Mr Kelly, and that the same applies to our waters.

The Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021 is an election commitment of the McGowan Labor government to improve connections to country and bring about myriad positive economic, social and conservation outcomes for all the peoples of this land. It is a practical and far-reaching demonstration of how this government responds to the call to care for country.

Like my colleagues, the members for Cockburn and Kingsley, who I listened to when they spoke to this bill in this place last week, I congratulate the Minister for Environment, the member for Morley, Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson, for bringing this bill forward early in this term of Parliament. I also congratulate her predecessor, Hon Stephen Dawson, for the work he did on this bill and in this space over the last term of Parliament and beyond.

I am proud, as the Labor member for Victoria Park, to commend this bill to the house.

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe — Leader of the Liberal Party) [4.11 pm]: I rise to make a brief contribution to debate on the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021. I made a more substantive contribution the first time this bill was introduced into Parliament, but I want to cover a couple of areas for the minister to speak to in her reply to the second reading debate.

As was said by our lead speaker on this bill, we support this bill. This bill will be an extension of the legislation that was introduced by the previous government that allowed the joint vesting of reserves and, I might say, the joint vesting of marine reserves. In the previous Parliament, I was a little intrigued about the definitions in the bill, which I raised when I gave my contribution when it was first introduced. If members look at the definition of “marine nature reserve” in the existing legislation, they will see that it specifically includes water. I do not think I received a satisfactory answer about what the difference was between the act and the bill. The definition of the areas that can be jointly vested specifically includes water. It is not a major point; it does not affect the bill, but my understanding in reading the bill was that the joint vesting of marine areas is possible under the act.

The obvious intent of joint vesting is that it recognises the cultural significance, and I think there is an underlying desire that it creates meaningful work for Aboriginal people, particularly in remote areas where meaningful work is hard to come by at times. Having joint vesting and being able to take part as rangers and the like provides good work for the Aboriginal people in those communities, and they clearly take a great deal of pride in that work.

An area of the bill that I am interested in is, in the first instance, the joint vesting of an area with an individual prescribed body corporate. I questioned this in my first contribution and during consideration in detail when this bill was last presented to the house. My concern is with the individual prescribed body corporate. It may be very obvious for a particular region; there may be an area where there is only one prescribed body corporate or at least one language group, typically, that has any historic association with that area. However, there are areas where there are, in fact, multiple users from different Aboriginal communities. The example that I previously gave, which I will repeat, is the Peel–Harvey inlet. This example relates to my previous employment before I came into this place, when I worked with Alcoa. Alcoa completed very substantial archaeological and anthropological studies in the Peel region, because that region was the sort of “New York central” of Aboriginal occupation in Western Australia. There is considerable evidence of very large groups of Aboriginal people using that area, but there were really three key groups. There was a group of people who lived permanently on the coastal plain, there was a group of people who lived in the foothills and there was another group of Aboriginal people from the Beverley–Brookton area. In summertime, just as members of the metropolitan area like to go down to that area to catch crabs or whatever, Aboriginal people did exactly the same thing, and there is a lot of evidence of that. There are some very significant ceremonial areas just to the south of Alcoa’s Pinjarra refinery where very large groups of Aboriginal people congregated. There are very large middens, comprising the shells from shellfish and other sea creatures there. It was a place where the equivalent of marriages and other ceremonies took place. Those three groups congregated there and used the estuary and nearshore environment for those purposes and then the groups would go back to their areas. My concern is that that area was very significant for all three distinct groups. We might say, logically, that the relevant prescribed body corporate is the prescribed body corporate that occupied that coastal plain area permanently, but, in reality, all three groups have very significant cultural interests in that area. That was an example that I gave in my previous contribution.

I do not know whether there is any concern between different groups about that area that would potentially be subject to this bill, but my concern is that there must be other areas that will be affected. Is that the case? I am not seeking an amendment, but I am seeking to get some reassurance from the minister of how that issue will be resolved. My understanding is that once a marine reserve is allocated to a prescribed body corporate, no other group has a say in the joint management of that area. Depending on the nature of that area, if it is vested for the exclusive use of Aboriginal people for cultural or other purposes, that means that Aboriginal people from other language groups or prescribed bodies corporate could be prevented from coming to an area that they actually have historic association with. As I say, I suspect that that is not an isolated case. I suspect that, just as we like to come down to the coast, those Aboriginal people would have done the same thing. Therefore, that is a potential issue. As I said, I do not see this as a fatal flaw in the legislation, but I am concerned that groups who have a cultural association with an area could be prevented from accessing it. I am interested in understanding that, as I think it is a potential issue. As I say, I will not go through all the issues.

The other area that is causing some contention, particularly in the north west, is, as members may know, that the boundaries for these marine reserves go three nautical miles beyond land, but, of course, that is beyond any piece of land, such as Rottnest Island, not just the coast. Areas such as the Esperance archipelago or the archipelagos in the north west, with the land being so close together, will inevitably cover hundreds of kilometres; they are very

large areas. The areas that will be vested for the exclusive use of Aboriginal people are very popular recreational fishing areas. People in those coastal communities in Esperance, on the north west coast and in other areas, currently fish there. There is great consternation in those communities that they will be excluded from doing that. Multiple generations of families have recreationally fished in that area for a long period, although, quite clearly, with nowhere near the history of Aboriginal people in the area. Nevertheless, their concern is that they will be excluded from fishing in those areas.

I do not know how much of an issue this is, but those people who feel they could be excluded from recreational fishing in those areas are also concerned that it may be possible for wealthy individuals to simply hire a person from the relevant prescribed body corporate or language group to take them out on their boat. Very wealthy individuals will be able to go out and fish in an area because they can afford to pay for a member of the relevant community to fish with them; therefore, they are just participating in that area. People are concerned that it would be seen to be unfair that someone who is very wealthy could fish in an area and individuals, non-Aboriginal people who had traditionally fished in those areas, would be excluded. I will say that this is purely in the spirit of genuinely trying to head off people's concerns, and I would appreciate it if the minister could explain whether that is an issue, because I think that concerns people.

Another area, which is worthwhile the minister outlining in a little more detail, is what is considered to be Aboriginal heritage. Our coastline has changed very dramatically. Climate change is seen to be a new thing, but, in fact, our climate has changed very dramatically over a long period. Some members may know that the coastline of Perth 6 500 years ago was on the other side of Rottnest Island. It was a long way away. The rate of sea level rise from then until now must have been quite phenomenal. On the east coast, there is Aboriginal oral history of the formation of what we now consider to be the Great Barrier Reef. The current Great Barrier Reef has only existed for a bit over 6 000 years. Prior to that, it was just land and the coast was some distance further east from the Great Barrier Reef. I raise that example because I know a bit about the Pinjarra area. Some of the stone tools found in that area were made out of a rock called fossiliferous chert. That fossiliferous chert occurs only on the seabed on the other side of Rottnest. That is a unique location. That is one of the factors that archaeologists use to date the sites around Pinjarra. They know that Aboriginal occupation of those areas goes back at least 6 500 years because those fossiliferous chert tools were there. Is that the sort of thing that is considered as significant and will that define where a marine reserve will be? What other factors will be considered to be significant outside oral history or ceremonial purposes? I will not go on. I made a few other points, but those are the key points I would like clarification on for this bill.

MR P.J. RUNDLE (Roe) [4.24 pm]: I wish to also rise to ask the minister to clarify a few points in her response. As the member for Cottesloe pointed out, generally, we are not opposing the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021. I look forward to some responses on issues that will affect my electorate that I am quite concerned about.

There are several issues and probably the main reason I am talking on this bill is the Recherche Archipelago near Esperance, a very important marine area, as the minister understands. I have had quite a bit of consultation with some concerned people in my area, which has the Esperance Deep Sea Angling Club, the Esperance Professional Fishermen's Association, the Shire of Esperance, Tourism Esperance and the Esperance Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and smaller fishers of the fishing industry. I would say that there is a lack of clarity and real concern about what I will not say is a lack of consultation but almost a methodology of divide and conquer—not getting everyone in the same room, not getting everyone together as often as should be and not getting a group approach. Unfortunately, the upper house member for the Agricultural Region Hon Colin de Grussa and I, through our office, have had to undertake that to some extent. It is unfortunate that we have been the ones who have had to bring people together, because we are getting questions from left, right and centre. That is my first concern.

In 2019, the state government announced the Plan for Our Parks, which was the initiative to create five million hectares of new national parks by 2024, whether it be made up of marine parks or conservation reserves. As I said, this will affect the Recherche Archipelago, which is a key priority as far as my electorate of Roe goes. Because we will have outer boundary, sanctuary, special purposes zones and general restricted areas, there is a question mark over the extent of Aboriginal heritage tenure and what the management arrangements over the proposed park will be. I would like some clarity because my understanding is that they have not yet been determined. The state government has advised that these will be developed following consultation with stakeholders and local communities. I am concerned about bringing in the legislation and consulting later. That is the fear out there amongst some of my constituents. The Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions commenced community consultation in 2020; however, this was discontinued as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. There may be some element of truth to that, but there is widespread belief from some of our stakeholders that it was halted due to the fact that there was some backlash. That is another one of my concerns. I do not believe, certainly from what I have been told, that the consultation process has been adequate. I am really worried that it is a “put the legislation in first, consult later” type approach.

Another thing that we are worried about is that a state government decision to establish a marine park on the south coast could lock away access for recreational and professional fishers and tourism operators. We certainly have no

clarity on what parts of the marine park will be locked away and who will have access to what. To be honest, the government is relying on a 27-year-old report—the Wilson report—to inform its marine parks scenario. It has been put there to reach the government’s targets, and I understand that. Government members want to reach their target of five million hectares, so they have plucked this report out from 27 years ago to use as their basis. I would love to see some more up-to-date —

Ms A. Sanderson: You will!

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I look forward to it.

Ms A. Sanderson: I am very excited about the up-to-date science, member.

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: I look forward to some up-to-date scientific evidence and research. We certainly hope to see that come through. We really need to see contemporary scientific evidence and have open and honest dialogue with the affected communities and industry groups. We also need a comprehensive analysis to fully understand any potential positive and negative impacts. They are the things I look forward to. As I said, I am not opposing the legislation but I would love some clarity.

I am in communication with the Tjaltjraak Indigenous group in Esperance. I congratulate this government on the range of programs it has in place. I was at the Fitzgerald River National Park a few months ago when all the rangers met before they got ready to spread out for the week into the various reserves and national parks. It is a great initiative. It is great to see proactive work being done in that space. From that perspective, I think the legislation will be a good thing going forward, but for the marine park side of it, we need clarity. I believe there has been a lack of transparency about the extent of the sanctuary and special purpose zones. I am certainly keen to listen to anything the minister can provide about that.

Another issue is the talk, during what consultation there has been, about the marine park creating substantial economic benefits to the region. We have seen no evidence to support that. People in the local community are worried about whether there will be a negative economic benefit, or impact, I should say.

Mr S.A. Millman: What’s a negative economic benefit?

Mr P.J. RUNDLE: Last week, I raised a grievance in here with the Minister for Fisheries. We have small licensed fishing operators on the south coast, with Albany over there and Esperance over here, but they are all being treated as being in one area, although the range is over 1 500 kilometres. It looks like the Minister for Fisheries is going to take away their multi-species licences. These are the sorts of things that worry small fishing operators. They are not only getting hammered by the licensing arrangement, which means that if they go out to catch one species, they cannot put in a line and catch some other fish to supply the local town, but also their futures are in no-man’s-land regarding the sanctuary and special purpose zones.

These are the elements of the bill that are stressing my constituents. As I said, we have had to bring together these people in one group to try to work towards, hopefully, getting some answers and solutions. I would love it if the minister and the department could focus on improving their communication as much as anything. As I said, I have concerns about the approach that is being taken. That is the feeling in the community. I am not necessarily against the program, but I am very much concerned that the government has not brought the community along with it. I think it has an opportunity to do that, hopefully in time to come, but I wanted to make the minister aware that there are underlying concerns about not only consultation but also using a 27-year-old report with no up-to-date scientific research—not that I have seen anyway. I look forward to the minister’s response. I just wanted to put that out there so the minister is aware of the feeling in my community of Esperance. We look forward to some quality consultation going forward.

MR S.A. MILLMAN (Mount Lawley — Parliamentary Secretary) [4.36 pm]: I rise to make a contribution to this very important piece of legislation, the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021. The purpose of consultation is not so that the member for Roe gets to decide what he wants; the purpose of consultation is to inform the community and then for a decision to be made that is in the best interests of the whole community.

One of the problems we have with the Liberal and National Parties is that their born-to-rule attitude determines that they should have the final say in consultation. Just because the member is unhappy with the consultation does not mean there has not been consultation. Just because the member is unhappy with the Aquatic Resources Management Act does not explain why he voted in favour of it. Just because the member is unhappy with this legislation does not explain why he voted in favour of it. One of the things I find quite surprising is that despite the fact that there are only six opposition members, they still cannot reach an agreement. I sat here and listened to the member for Cottesloe stand up and say that this bill does not make any changes and that, in fact, all the changes were made under his legislation so therefore there is really nothing to discuss. The member for Roe then stood up and said completely the opposite. I would have thought that, with such a tiny group, they would have been able to get on the same page.

One of the things I am impressed about with the Labor caucus is that we are replete with talent. I sat here and listened to the Labor member for Warren–Blackwood speak articulately and passionately about this legislation—and take up

most of my material, which means I will struggle to hit the time line, but that is okay. She demonstrated exactly why the people of Warren–Blackwood voted in overwhelming numbers to send her to represent them in this place. She spoke about the importance of protecting the environment and the importance of Indigenous rights. Then I heard the member for Kimberley stand up and give another passionate speech about why it is so important to her, as a member of the Indigenous community, to have the voice, power and representation that this legislation will deliver. Then I listened to the most self-effacing member for Victoria Park. When we think about the damage that plastics have done to our environment and look at the work that the previous Labor government’s Containers for Change legislation has produced, we know it was an incredibly important initiative. The member for Victoria Park gave an incredible contribution to this debate. She touched upon Containers for Change, but, so modest and self-effacing is the member for Victoria Park, she did not once mention she used to run the organisation Containers for Change. If there is a person in this chamber who can say, “I have delivered tangible, realistic, beneficial environmental outcomes for the people of Western Australia”, it is the member for Victoria Park through the work that she has done. I commend her. That is to say nothing of all the work that the Premier himself has done in championing the environment. The new Minister for Fisheries and new Minister for Environment are across their portfolios. They are articulate. They are responsible and they know precisely what they are doing. We are fine when it comes to ability on our side of the chamber; we are united in our purpose and we are speaking with one voice. It was such a disappointment to have such a small number of people on the other side unable to get together and understand exactly what they were trying to articulate.

I can say that although the member for Roe might say that his community is concerned about the ramifications of this legislation, I know that my community—the people in Mount Lawley—are absolutely passionate about both the environment and the rights of Indigenous people.

Mr P.J. Rundle: How many fish do you think you’ve got in Mount Lawley?

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: Mate, we have plenty —

Several members interjected.

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: Member, I spoke on the Aquatic Resources Management Amendment Bill 2021. I invite him to look at my contribution to that debate. I am more than happy for him to do so. That was an excellent piece of legislation that was brought before this chamber and supported by the member’s party. It was advanced by the new Minister for Fisheries—a man who has demonstrated the depth of talent that we have on our side of the chamber.

I want to speak in support of this legislation simply because, as I said, the people of Mount Lawley are passionate about both the environment and Indigenous self-determination. I am glad to hear members opposite focusing on ranger parks. Legislation like this, which seeks to preserve our environmental assets in Western Australia, should be the sort of initiative that enjoys bipartisan support. It should be the sort of thing that goes beyond partisan debate. Sadly, the return of Barnaby Joyce means that everything is up for debate these days. Sadly, in Western Australia, I think it will have an adverse impact on the National Party, which is already struggling to come to terms with the outcome of the election result. It does not really know what it stands for. Hopefully, its ability to discharge its duties to the people of Western Australia and present a loyal opposition will not be further undermined by the appointment of Barnaby Joyce as the Deputy Prime Minister. It will be a case of “watch this space”.

I know that the people of Mount Lawley are passionate about these issues of Indigenous rights and protecting our environment. That is why I was so pleased to be able to put forward a number of proposals during the election campaign that got the support of the government, and which will now be implemented. They all speak to the importance of the environment to people in Mount Lawley. I ask members to do one thing as I run through some of the election commitments that we made and were endorsed by the mandate that the people of Mount Lawley gave me—that is, to think not only about the question of the environment, but also how much these grants from the WA state government relate to the question of education. Grants were given to Friends of Coolbinia Bushland, the Inglewood and Mt Lawley community garden, the Marjorie Mann Lawley Day Care Centre and Mount Lawley Primary School. I am going to speak about only those four for the purposes of my contribution today in support of this bill. Coolbinia bushland is an exquisite piece of rendered bushland right beside Coolbinia Primary School. It is an area of not only great environmental but also great pedagogical development, as the students at Coolbinia Primary School have the opportunity to traverse that bushland and learn the environmental stories that are advanced and also the stories of the traditional owners, the Whadjuk Noongar people, the original custodians of that area who lived upon that land for thousands of years. A contribution has been made for the preservation of the Coolbinia bushland.

I was grateful to the Mayor of the City of Stirling, Mark Irwin, for coming out to the community on 29 May. We contributed \$2 500 to the Inglewood and Mt Lawley community garden. I have spoken about this little community institution previously. Members can read the contribution I made on 21 February 2019 when I spoke about the terrific volunteers at the Inglewood and Mt Lawley community garden. It is right across the car park from the Inglewood Bowling Club and literally 50 metres from Mount Lawley Senior High School. Members may think that with the beautiful Federation-style-sized blocks that we have in a lot of areas in Mount Lawley and the suburban nature of the environment, people have their own backyards and the opportunity to grow their own vegetables. Infill and the sensible development of Mount Lawley has seen a greater number of people moving in and living in

apartments and more tightly constrained areas. This community garden provides a terrific opportunity for people to come together and engage with one another and the environment, and really harness the fruits of their labour. I was really pleased to see the mayor, Mark Irwin, come out and help open the community garden on 29 May.

Marjorie Mann childcare centre wanted solar panels on its roof because it recognised that as far as the preservation of the environment is concerned, we need to tackle the real threat of climate change. I was really pleased that we were able to make a significant contribution towards Marjorie Mann day care centre installing solar panels on its roof.

Mount Lawley Primary School received \$30 000 to put towards outdoor play areas and new vegie gardens. The reason I raised these four—Coolbinia bushland, Mt Lawley community garden, Marjorie Mann and Mount Lawley Primary School—is because those four grants from the state government went to two primary schools, one day care centre and one high school. Those educational institutions reflect the desire of the community to learn and do more about preserving the environment and tackling climate change. This is not something that has been driven from the top down; it has been driven by the community and by the students. They are coming to us and asking what we are doing to protect our environment and make sure that the planet is kept in a way that is safe for them to inhabit when they become the adults of the next generation.

I was so pleased to go to another great school in my electorate, Perth College, with the minister on 2 June. The minister and I had the great pleasure of meeting a team of dedicated young high school students who are focused on what they can do to both lobby government and change behaviour—I will come back to this issue of behavioural change shortly—to make sure that we reduce the amount of plastics in our environment. They wrote to the minister to express their concerns about what was happening with plastic recycling programs. This activist consultative minister was more than happy to go to Perth College—that bastion of the establishment—and say to these students, “This is exactly what your concerns are. We are hearing your concerns, we are listening to your concerns and we are acting on your concerns.” That is exactly what I would expect from a McGowan Labor minister and from this minister. It was a real pleasure and privilege for me to be able to participate in that.

Whilst I am on the question of how important education is to the two main benefits of this bill—Indigenous participation in land management and environmental sustainability—I want to talk about two more events that are coming up next week. Mount Lawley Senior High School will be conducting its NAIDOC assembly. A corollary benefit of this bill is that it delivers practical steps towards reconciliation. As we come to pass this bill, with the support of everyone in this chamber, let us reflect on how we all need to continue those steps on the path to reconciliation.

Next Tuesday afternoon, the member for Balcatta—I see him sitting opposite—and I will be going to the Your Move lab “pitch for the planet” session. This is brilliant. Not only are we talented, but also we are all here participating in the debate. The Minister for Transport is also deeply engaged in what I am saying. The Your Move program, which the Minister for Transport is responsible for, together with the City of Stirling local council, is a terrific initiative to try to encourage students to walk and ride to school. It does not just deliver health benefits to the students and their parents, who take them to school, but also it is safe, it creates a sense of community and it is better for the environment. It is hard to think of a better policy initiative that has so many benefits. It is good for the environment, good for mental and physical health, good for safety and good for building a sense of community. I will be very pleased to participate in that.

Mr D.R. Michael: It is so good. It is one of the benefits of living in Tuart Hill, as I do, as one of the areas that they look after. They provide a backpack and ring up and make sure they follow up. I went on a bit of a run over the weekend—well, we’ll call it a slow jog—around the footpaths around Tuart Hill, but I am presuming other parts in the City of Stirling also have got these round stickers on the footpaths showing how many minutes to walk to various local areas, parks and shops and all that kind of thing. It’s a very good program.

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: It is brilliant. It is fair to say that the mayor and I might not necessarily be on the same team, as far as political persuasions are concerned.

Mr D.R. Michael: He should be!

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: Absolutely he should be! But it is fair to say that through his conduct he demonstrates that state and local governments can collaborate effectively. In expressing that sentiment about the Mayor of the City of Stirling, I probably have the support of the member for Balcatta and the Minister for Transport. One complaint I have about the City of Stirling, and I articulated this previously when the Public Accounts Committee did a report on cyclepaths, is that there has not been necessary investment in cyclepath infrastructure in the Mount Lawley electorate part of the City of Stirling. I accept that the City of Stirling is an incredibly large area—not as large as the electorate of the member of Roe, but as far as metropolitan councils are concerned it is a very large area. It is important that as well as making the investments it has made, the City of Stirling also contributes significantly to investing in cyclepath infrastructure in the Mount Lawley part of the City of Stirling. That is why it was important for us to make it part of our election platform, and I am glad to see that the community of Mount Lawley has embraced and endorsed that in the way it has supported me as the candidate for Mount Lawley. That will be a work in progress. Consulting and engaging with community and making sure that we can identify the right routes and mechanisms to implement a cycling plan will be hard work, but this government demonstrates time and again that we are prepared to do the hard work in order to deliver the benefits for the community.

I have spoken previously about Create Ranger Parks. I need to mention Neta Knapp. Neta Knapp is an artist who during the 2017 election campaign, with the organisation Create Ranger Parks, put on a community gathering in Hyde Park between the electorates of Mount Lawley and Perth. Hundreds of people came from all over the Mount Lawley and Perth electorates to participate in a real exercise of community solidarity in painting a picture that is about three metres long by one metre high. I have said this previously. An artist was helping members of the community contribute to a community-oriented work of art in order to support, encourage and promote the campaign for Create Ranger Parks. This giant dot painting was designed by Indigenous artist Neta Knapp and proudly completed by over 200 Mount Lawley residents in support of the campaign for Create Ranger Parks. Create Ranger Parks is a community-based initiative to create a major network of new national parks managed by Indigenous rangers for all Western Australians to enjoy. I said previously and I say again that I strongly support the work done by Create Ranger Parks. I am incredibly gratified to be part of the McGowan Labor government and to know that that policy was implemented after the election in March 2017. To continue with this legislation, the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021, which is directed to that policy imperative, is a great source of personal pride.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: I have spoken about the importance of the local council working with the state government to implement a plan for cyclepaths, dependent upon committee consultation. Let me speak about remnant bushland. I have already spoken about the Coolbinia bushland. One of the reasons I know that the people in the electorate of Mount Lawley are passionate about the environment and will support this legislation is the three areas of open space and remnant bushland. One of them is just outside the electorate of Mount Lawley, in the Minister for Environment's electorate, Morley, and that is the Dianella Regional Open Space. It is a terrific testament to whole bunch of different groups coming together cooperatively and collaboratively. It speaks to that sense of community that we on this side of the chamber hold so dear. Remnant bushland has been preserved at the Dianella Regional Open Space. There are outdoor recreational activities that people can engage in. There is also the Yokine Regional Open Space, right the heart of the electorate of Mount Lawley. There are thousands of patrons there each weekend, with the Coolbinia Bombers Junior Football Club, the senior football club, the hockey club, the cricket clubs, the nature playground for the kids and the Yokine Districts Bowling Club. Thousands of people enjoy this open space. Between Yokine reserve and the Mount Lawley Golf Club is another area of remnant Bush Forever bushland. The final parcel is the Inglewood Triangle, just outside the electorate of Mount Lawley on the other side of Walter Road in the member for Maylands' electorate. These three areas—the Dianella Regional Open Space, the Yokine Regional Open Space triangle behind the Terry Tyzack Aquatic Centre and the Inglewood Triangle—all have terrific teams of volunteers who turn up to weed these parks, check them, audit them, care for them and nurture them. These community groups do not ask for any thanks, money, reward or praise. They just turn up time after time and make the effort to preserve these wonderful pieces of our remnant environment. When I think about the benefit that the community derives from that, I am so incredibly grateful to those groups for doing that. Any message we can send as a Parliament to those elements of our community who do this so selflessly must be worthwhile so that tomorrow they can say, "Yes, somebody has recognised the work we have done. Somebody appreciates what we are doing for the community." What they do is incredibly valuable. Passing legislation like this is about not just the immediate effects, but also speaking to the broader issues.

I want to come back to two more issues in the short time I have left to speak. One of them concerns an announcement from the Minister for Environment on 5 May. Let me put it like this: responding to the movement amongst our young people for information and action on the environment is vitally important. That is a duty that the government has right now. When we look at just how much of a lightning rod this issue has become, it should be a duty that resonates globally. It is so prosaic and it is hardly the flashy stuff of big announcements, but I was incredibly pleased when on 5 May, the minister announced that more than \$37 000 in grants would be made for Waste Wise schools across Western Australia, and applications would now be open for the next round of Waste Wise school grants. Nine schools will share more than \$37 000 for projects to reduce waste disposed to landfill. Obviously, the minister can speak more to this, but the Waste Wise program helps to develop positive environmental values in students and school communities throughout Western Australia. It supports meaningful, hands-on activities for students that help to reduce the amount of waste disposed to landfill and educate the whole school community about sustainable waste practices. I speak to this even though there was not a school from Mount Lawley in the list, and I will come back to why I think that is. The schools are Baldivis Secondary College, Bold Park Community School, Bullsbrook College, Cassia Primary School, Dunsborough Primary School, East Wanneroo Primary School, Osborne Primary School, Rockingham Montessori School and the South East Metropolitan Language Development Centre. I think these initiatives funded through the Waste Wise program that the schools are putting in place are fantastic. I am a bit biased and proud, but a lot of these initiatives have already been implemented at some of the fantastic primary schools in the Mount Lawley electorate. Mount Lawley Primary School has a three-bin system. It separates organics and recycling and has programs to try to minimise the amount of rubbish that children bring in their lunchboxes each day. Another school is trialling a worm farm. Schools have veggie patches. Schools are trying to put more and more money and effort into their nature play areas so that students can really have the opportunity to get stuck into them and understand what it means to be waste wise about their impact on the environment.

Further to that, there is something that came out not as a result of but subsequent to the visit the minister and I paid to Perth College. There she announced with the Premier that WA's plan for plastics was going to be fast-tracked by four years. I think the member for Victoria Park was talking about the massive amount of plastic waste in the Pacific Ocean at the moment.

The McGowan Labor government has fast-tracked its plan for plastics by four years, with single-use plastic bowls, cups, plates, cutlery, stirrers and straws; polystyrene food containers; thick plastic bags; and helium balloon releases to be phased out by the end of the year. This announcement was well received in the Mount Lawley community. It was incredible. This is something that, as I said earlier, should have bipartisan support. The Minister for Environment did an interview on Triple M's morning program with Jenna Clarke. After the minister finished the interview, I continued listening and Jenna Clarke said that something similar was being done in New South Wales. She made the point that this enjoys the support of both the Labor Party in WA and the Liberal Party of New South Wales. I accept that the New South Wales Liberal Party is probably at a more sophisticated and mature stage than the Western Australian Liberal Party.

Ms A. Sanderson: It was a very generous comment.

Mr S.A. MILLMAN: Yes. We can only hope that its Western Australian brethren move in the same direction.

This is a terrific initiative and it is greatly supported. One of the things that I cannot stand—I do not know what is to be done about it—is the ubiquitous Tetra Pak juice boxes. The plastic that the straws come in has to be some of the worst stuff on the planet. The way it breaks down is incredible. As a community, what we do to direct our attention to these issues is incredibly important. It might be from something as small as the plastic straws on the Tetra Pak juice boxes all the way up to legislation like this through amendments to the Conservation and Land Management Act to make sure that we recognise Indigenous rights and preserve our environment for future generations. Whatever we do, my point is this: the conversation about protecting and preserving our environment is a conversation that is being driven by not just the leaders of Western Australia, but also students and children.

I will finish with a final mention of an organisation that I have mentioned previously—Millennium Kids. Catrina-Luz Aniere and that organisation are doing incredible work raising and promoting these issues. It was a great privilege for me to attend with Professor Lyn Beazley towards the end of the last year a lab the Millennium Kids put on, which I have spoken about previously, so I do not propose to go into that at any great length. I urge members who are interested in this topic and in just how engaged students and young people in Western Australia are on the topic of the environment to go and have a look at some of the work that Millennium Kids is doing. This is not the last time that I will speak about the environment and Millennium Kids in the chamber. As we see how our young people and students are driving the conversation, we should look to and learn from them. It is for that reason that I commend both the minister and this legislation to the chamber.

MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Minister for Environment) [5.02 pm] — in reply: I rise to respond to the second reading debate on the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021. I thank members for their contributions and their questions, which, largely, were very well informed. I am very pleased to see that the opposition is not opposing the bill, because that really continues the bipartisan support of successive state governments on engagement with Aboriginal people to protect and conserve their lands and waters, support their culture and heritage and participate in social and economic activities. I have to pay tribute to and thank my predecessor in the environment portfolio, Hon Stephen Dawson. He started the delivery of an election commitment to reach five million hectares of conservation estate within Western Australia by 2024, which is an absolutely enormous undertaking when we think about the size of the estate. It is not simply drawing lines on a map or expanding the estate, but is the joint vesting and joint management of that estate with traditional owners and Aboriginal people. We are currently undertaking a multitude of Indigenous land use agreement negotiations as we seek to progress the joint vesting and joint management plans. Those negotiations can be complex and time-consuming but also are incredibly important. That work is being undertaken by the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions at the moment. The bill's title is not sexy, but, as many members have pointed out, the bill is incredibly important as a manifestation of the principle of Aboriginal self-determination. That is what this is. I am incredibly proud to be able to continue that work.

I want to acknowledge the contributions from the government members who outlined their support for the bill and spoke about the significant initiatives around the Aboriginal ranger program that complements the Plan for Our Parks initiative. I will address some of the opposition's questions, particularly those of the member for Roe, who spoke specifically about the proposed south coast marine park, as opposed to this bill, as we move forward. The member for Moore raised a number of questions and issues. I will try to run through those. Obviously, we can progress to consideration in detail if that is not quite to the satisfaction of members.

Firstly, the member for Moore questioned how the joint vesting will affect existing tourism operators and fishing charters. It is important to note that joint vesting will not change any of the approval processes for tour operators and fishing charters that are already operating in marine reserves under the Conservation and Land Management Act. The lease or licence process for applying for these authorisations will be the same. There will be no change to the

actual application for those processes. The CEO of DBCA issues the CALM act commercial tourism operators' licence, and grants are leased with the approval of the Minister for Environment. That is the existing process. Ultimately, it is approved by the minister, and that will remain the same. Joint vesting will also provide Aboriginal bodies corporate with an equal role to the Conservation and Parks Commission in providing advice to the minister on the leases and licences, and this will provide Aboriginal people a formal role in advising government on the management of their lands. But the ultimate decision-maker in whether to grant a lease or issue a licence will continue to be the Minister for Environment.

The member also asked how joint vesting would affect existing commercial fishing operators. Commercial fishing authorisations are issued under the Fish Resources Management Act 1994, which is administered by the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. Existing provisions in the CALM act preserve commercial fishing interests in the marine parks—for example, section 13D—and commercial fishing can occur in marine parks if it is covered by these provisions. Commercial fishing can occur where it is determined to be a compatible activity under a marine park management plan. These arrangements will not be affected by this bill; nor will they be affected by joint vesting. When a marine park becomes jointly vested, there will be no changes to the decision-making processes in approving the grant or renewal of any authorisations under the Fish Resources Management Act and there will be no need to reapply for commercial fishing approvals or to renegotiate with the Conservation and Parks Commission or with the Aboriginal body corporate to undertake commercial fishing activities that are already subject to an existing authorisation.

Importantly, joint vesting will provide improved opportunities for the relevant Aboriginal body corporate to be consulted on commercial tourism and commercial fishing activities in a marine park. Joint vesting will provide the Aboriginal body corporate, along with the Conservation and Parks Commission, the role of advising the Minister for Environment on the preparation of the marine park management plan and the minister will continue to approve the management plan that is required to create the marine park, including the zoning scheme and associated compatible activities. The management plan itself will be subject to significant community consultation. The first step will be the joint vesting and the next step will be the joint management plan, which in itself already will be subject to considerable consultation and input. The Minister for Environment's approval will require the concurrence of the Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum, and will represent a whole-of-government position.

The member for Moore also raised concerns that there was no definition of culture and heritage for Aboriginal people. The term "culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons" is not a new term in the Conservation and Land Management Act. When the previous government amended the CALM act in 2012, it introduced the term seven times into the act, having implications across both lands and waters. This is not new; it was introduced by the previous Liberal-National government and supported by this house. When words are not defined in legislation, they take on their ordinary meaning.

Since 2012, Ministers for Environment from both sides of Parliament have approved management plans that expressly include the objective of conserving and protecting the value of lands and waters and the culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons. No concerns have been raised to date about this approach.

Aboriginal cultural and heritage values can be tangible and intangible and can extend beyond specific places and objects. In the context of marine parks, tangible values could include seascapes, landscapes, other coastal and geological landforms and features such as fish traps. They could include sites such as men's sites, women's sites, law sites and birthing sites. Intangible values would include specific cultural associations that tell a story about an area such as songlines, cultural obligations and customary practices. Associations with plants and animals, including totem animals, food and medicinal items and on-country care practices are also considered values.

I turn to the question raised by the members for Moore and Cottesloe of why the government is inserting "waters" into the definition of "joint responsible body" and why we are even proceeding with this bill. We are certainly not in the business of drafting and introducing unnecessary legislation. The CALM act currently provides only for the joint vesting of land or land and waters. Land includes tidal land; tidal waters in any inlet, estuary or lagoon; or the waters of any swamp, stream or creek. It does not specifically cover waters—for example, those waters commonly referred to as marine waters or coastal waters or open ocean. Given that land does not include waters, the amendment was required so that waters of a marine park that are beyond tidal waters could be jointly vested with an Aboriginal body corporate.

The member for Moore also raised questions about the wider implications of extending the purpose of the protection and conservation of the culture and heritage of Aboriginal people to marine parks. Marine parks are established on the basis that there are multiple uses, and management plans are prepared to enable multiple uses and a range of activities. The activities are managed through zoning schemes for the marine park, and in special purpose zones proposed activities are tested against a conservation purpose, adding protection and conservation of the value of the marine park to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons as a new conservation purpose. Recognising it through the identification of special purpose zones for cultural and heritage protection will not impose any additional restrictions or limitations on activities, other than in the special purpose area where those activities are declared to be incompatible with that purpose.

The identification of special purpose areas for cultural protection will conserve areas of highest Aboriginal cultural value and are not intended to be applied across the breadth of the entire marine park. Importantly, not all activities will be incompatible with that purpose. This is to be determined through the management planning process. For example, an area might be determined as being culturally significant for Aboriginal people, but that does not preclude other activities that are considered compatible with that cultural heritage value. There might be an area of sea country that is significant culturally, but that does not preclude a charter boat going through it or for there to be fishing in that area. Ultimately, it is a matter for the Minister for Environment in approving the plan who needs to be satisfied that it conserves the values of the marine park and provides for access and use and addresses relevant management issues.

The member for Cottesloe confused joint vesting with exclusive rights. Joint vesting does not provide exclusive access to TOs.

Dr D.J. Honey: I wasn't confusing them; it is the vesting of those exclusive access areas.

Ms A. SANDERSON: Let me clarify: there is no exclusive access or exclusive rights over the park. It is the right to advise the minister on approvals and management plans and leases and licences. That is what the bill will do.

The member for Moore also asked about competing interests when more than one Aboriginal group holds an interest or where potentially there is contested native titles. Several native title determinations cover sea country along Western Australia, including determinations over intertidal areas and areas also out to the limit of the state waters, so around three nautical miles off the coast. Processes are in place under the commonwealth Native Title Act to evaluate and determine native title claims of those waters, land, or land and waters where there are multiple claims to the area. The evaluation and determination of native title rights does not occur under the CALM act and this amendment bill has no bearing on the native title determination process.

The focus of joint vesting will be with Aboriginal people through an Aboriginal body corporate on lands and waters where native title has been determined in their favour. Although typically not done, joint vesting could be considered for other traditional waters, lands, or land and waters such as when native title has been extinguished or it is determined not to exist. I have to say that the government will take a very cautious approach in these circumstances and joint vesting would not be undertaken over areas where there are competing native title claims; the native title would have to be settled in that area. This approach provides the government with flexibility in noting that the final decision to jointly vest a CALM act reserve will rest with the government of the day. Recognition of the joint vesting arrangement on any reserve title would typically be achieved for the creation of separate reserves for each determination area. This would be considered during the management planning process for a proposed marine park and be agreed with the relevant Aboriginal bodies corporate.

The member for Moore also asked about existing uses and how they can be accommodated and the potential for grandfathering in the context of compensation. The compatibility of activities and special purpose zones for the protection of culture and heritage will be considered through the management planning process for each respective marine park and on a case-by-case basis. The management plan will be subject to extensive community consultation and the minister will approve the management plan with the concurrence of the Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum. Existing provisions in section 13D of the CALM act recognise the validity of existing authorisations under the Fish Resources Management Act 1994 for commercial fishing operations in marine parks, marine nature reserves and marine management areas. These provisions will not be affected by the passage of this bill. If the commercial operators are excluded from their usual activities as a result of the creation of or an amendment to a marine reserve, the Fishing and Related Industries Compensation (Marine Reserves) Act 1997 may apply. If there are any adverse consequential effects on commercial fishers or aquaculturists due to the introduction of special purpose zones for the protection of Aboriginal culture and heritage, they may be able to access compensation under the FRICMRA. Importantly, the administration of the FRICMRA will remain under the jurisdiction of the Minister for Fisheries and the Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development, and both are extensively engaged during the marine park management planning process.

In relation to third parties, such as tourists, accommodation providers, tackle shops and other businesses, I can say that marine parks conserve marine habitats and biodiversity as well as cultural heritage values while allowing for a range of ongoing sustainable uses, including fishing, diving and boating. The benefits of marine parks to regional tourism are well documented and they support a growing marine ecotourism industry, including wildlife watching, diving and snorkelling, kayaking, glass-bottom boat tours and charter fishing. This bill will support the values that underpin marine parks and help to drive regional outcomes and regional economies and jobs.

The member for Moore indicated that he required an explanation on exactly how the incompatibility test of activities against heritage significance in the marine environment would be applied compared with terrestrial areas. In the course of debate, the member for Wanneroo read out a section of the *Proposed Bardi Jawi marine park indicative joint management plan 2020*. The Bardi and Jawi people's identity and existence is intimately connected to the sea. For Bardi and Jawi people, their country is more than a simple geographic location; it includes all living things incorporating people, plants, animals, seasons, stories and spirits. It is a place both of belonging and a way of

believing. Bardi and Jawi people believe powerful and creative ancestral beings roamed the sea, creating islands, reefs, sandbanks and marine species, which is recalled in songs and stories. It is clear that these same cultural and heritage connections occur across both land and sea country.

The government consults extensively with a broad range of stakeholders when preparing marine park management plans to ensure that they accurately and appropriately depict the full suite of environmental, social and economic values. This includes areas of proposed reserves where customary practices occur or existing sites that may contribute to the conservation value of that marine park to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal people. The members for Moore and Cottesloe asked whether protection and conservation of the value of marine parks will extend to archaeological sites underwater—for example, when sea levels were much lower. It is understood that the culture and heritage of Aboriginal people has changed and will continue to change over time. Similarly, the value of the land to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons will also change over time, so shifts in culture and heritage values, or shifts in understanding and recognition of those values, will be addressed and managed with the consultation process undertaken for marine park planning. They will also be addressed by the ongoing engagement processes for joint management of the reserves with Aboriginal people.

As a society, we are always learning more, and will continue to learn more, about the culture and heritage of Aboriginal people. That is why the purpose of marine parks in the CALM act includes the conservation of the natural environment, the protection of flora and fauna, and the preservation of any feature of archaeological, historic or scientific interest. If the government were to learn or be advised that there were significant archaeological features or songlines relating to an underwater landscape dating back thousands of years, it would be consistent with the purpose of a marine park to conserve those values.

A number of members talked about the alignment of the Plan for Our Parks and this bill with the Aboriginal ranger program and some of the incredible work that that program is doing. In 2017, the McGowan government announced a \$20 million initiative for an Aboriginal ranger program. It delivered that initiative in the last term of government and it is a fantastic program that employs and trains rangers to carry out land and sea management and tourism activities across a range of tenures. To date, 435 rangers and support staff have been employed in the program, largely through traditional owner groups and Aboriginal bodies corporate. It is fair to say that the state government should be proud of the Aboriginal ranger program. I am glad to see that members on all sides of the chamber support that program.

In 2019, the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions commenced a case study to evaluate the benefits of the ARP and associated outcomes, including social, economic, cultural and environmental outcomes. It has been an outstanding success, with a reported increase in sense of self, personal pride and purpose for employees and trainees in the program. As the member for Cottesloe pointed out, it provides employment opportunities in areas where there are few employment opportunities. Western Australia also has a nation-leading Aboriginal women's ranger program. I think it is the biggest in the country and I look forward to expanding it. We have increased jobs for Aboriginal women in land management, which has resulted in heightened family and community aspirations for women and girls.

I had the opportunity a few weeks ago to visit Murujuga Aboriginal Corporation and Aboriginal rangers showed me around some of the harder to access areas of Murujuga. It is such an incredible and unique place. It is an honour for Aboriginal rangers, the traditional owners, to share and protect, here in Western Australia, some of the most important petroglyphs in the world relating to the human race. A woman named Sue showed us through some of the areas, and I took her aside to ask how she found the program and what she got out of it. She was glowing. The comment that struck me—I think I have said this in the chamber previously—was, “When things go wrong in town, I come to work, I come to country and I feel really healed. I feel healing and peace.” That really struck me. The value of re-establishing that connection and providing economic access and economic opportunities cannot be understated. Another \$50 million will be provided for the ranger program in this term of government. I want it to provide enduring cultural and economic opportunities for Aboriginal people on their land. We will continue to work very closely with Aboriginal people to make sure that we learn from the lessons of the previous program and to improve that program going forward.

The member for Wanneroo commented in her contribution on her time living in Fitzroy River and the opportunity she had to share culture with traditional owners and how it left her with an enduring understanding of Aboriginal people's deep connection to country.

The member for Kimberley is a great champion of the Plan for Our Parks, in particular, the Buccaneer Archipelago that covers her country. She obviously has a connection with Bardi country. She read out responses from traditional owners about what the prospect of joint vesting and joint management will mean to them. It does not mean that we are necessarily locking up, as some members have described it—in fact, we are opening up—economic opportunities. It is not so much about locking up, but opening up those economic opportunities to traditional owners.

I have covered off on the member for Cottesloe's question about exclusive access. The member for Roe talked about consultation on the proposed south coast marine park in particular. I want to put front and centre the idea that not all stakeholders are treated equally. First of all, I want to say that this government does not consider traditional owners

to be stakeholders. I have been very clear about that. Traditional owners are not stakeholders; they are native title holders. They are custodians of the land and we are unashamedly working with them hand in hand to create those zones as a first point. That was the strategy employed in the last term of government and it will be our strategy moving forward: traditional owners are equal partners with government in the initial design of the marine park. It will then go to consultation, and everyone will be consulted. The idea that traditional owners are somehow stakeholders is offensive to me and my views, and it is just not the way in which we are moving forward with this plan.

I understand and I am sympathetic with the anxiety of a number of stakeholders and the uncertainty surrounding that. Initially, the first round of consultation on the proposed south coast marine park was put on hold due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It is not a COVID conspiracy, member for Roe; it was put on hold due to COVID. A whole range of Indigenous land use agreement negotiations for Plan for Our Parks were put on hold due to access to some vulnerable communities. They were all put on hold, including negotiations on the south coast marine park. Consultation on that marine park has not yet started. I know that there has been a lot of talk, but we have been consulting on the consultation process. We have been talking to peak bodies, local groups and communities about what they want the consultation process to look like. We have listened and we are taking on board community feedback. We will design the consultation process with the community. The department has also employed a community engagement officer to engage and consult with the community in Esperance. We are consulting on the consultation right now. That is where we are at in that process. There will be plenty of opportunity for people who have a legitimate interest in the outcome of this marine park. The ultimate aim for the government is, as I said, to open up opportunity—not lock up opportunity, as the member has stated—to everyone in the community, but it is also an area of extremely important biodiversity and we have to conserve that.

The member for Roe mentioned the Wilson report. There was a request for an updated scientific review and that has been done. It will be shared and I look forward to hearing the member's response on that. Again, the department listened. It went back and did a more contemporary review, which will be made available through the consultation process. This is not about putting the cart before the horse. This is an ambitious program and we require the legislation to vest those open ocean waters, but the consultation will take time and we need to make sure that we do it appropriately and properly.

I conclude by acknowledging that many Aboriginal people along the Western Australian coast have a very strong connection to the coast and sea. Aboriginal people have expressed a strong desire to have this connection recognised and acknowledged to ensure that the management of their land and sea country conserves and protects their cultural heritage, not just the environmental value.

The member for Cockburn talked about the self-determination of Aboriginal people in relation to this bill. The self-determination of Aboriginal people is supported across the Parliament, across parties and is well accepted. How it is implemented is done with varying enthusiasm across the political spectrum, would be my observation. Hand on heart, Labor is enthusiastic about implementing policies that provide self-determination and opportunities for Aboriginal people. This bill is a manifestation of that policy and a manifestation of the self-determination of Aboriginal people and their right to be partners in the management of their land. By amending the CALM act to enable joint vesting and including the protection and conservation of the value of the marine park to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons, the McGowan government is introducing two important initiatives that will meet the aspirations of Aboriginal people and improve the management of our marine parks for all Western Australians.

Again, I commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

[Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.]

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Section 3 amended —

Mr R.S. LOVE: The minister briefly touched on the matter raised about why it is necessary to include “waters” in the bill. I just wanted to, again, get an understanding of this, because I am still struggling with why specifically “waters” needs to be included in the bill when “land and waters” is already included in the legislation. The minister said the inclusion implies that water is enclosed by land but she also said that some state waters are already incorporated into such reserves. So can the minister explain why, if that is the case, we need to have this word inserted?

Ms A. SANDERSON: As the member rightly points out, the existing act covers land or land and waters together. “Land and waters” refers to tidal land, tidal waters, and waters of any inlet, swamps, streams or creeks. The addition of “waters” as a standalone word, if you like, as opposed to “land and waters”, was considered to be a required amendment because it gives unequivocal clarity that it refers to open ocean waters.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5 put and passed.**Clause 6: Section 8AA amended —**

Mr R.S. LOVE: Clause 6 is at the heart of what we are talking about. I note that the clause itself is very expansive and includes five subclauses, so I think we will probably be able to get to most of the relevant discussion while we are dealing with this clause.

I am intrigued to know how the land and waters vested with the Aboriginal body corporate will be treated in the south west land division with the single Noongar claim? I asked this question during the briefing and an answer was provided, but perhaps the minister could put on record how that will operate in the various discrete areas that subgroups, if you like, or boodja look after. Will some of the groups be involved or will the responsibility sit with one body? How will this operate, in practice, in the south west land division area covered by the single claim?

Ms A. SANDERSON: The south west native title settlement does not permit the government to jointly vest, it commits it to joint management of the land. Currently, there are six Indigenous land use agreements with the Aboriginal bodies corporate in that south west title claim. As negotiations progress and those Aboriginal bodies corporate develop and appear or settle, the government will identify those and negotiate with them.

Mr R.S. LOVE: When the minister says that there will be no joint vesting but there will be joint management, will the eventual aim be joint vesting, or will it remain at some level of joint management forever? At what point would it become joint vested; and, if so, what is the trigger?

Ms A. SANDERSON: Under the south west native title settlement, the state is committed to enter into 12 joint management agreements across the six Indigenous land use agreement areas within 10 years. There are no commitments nor plans to jointly vest any marine or terrestrial conservation reserves within that settlement area with an Aboriginal body corporate. There are no commitments or plans. The bill does not prevent it, but the government has no plan to do that.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Do any of the changes that are highlighted in these amendments to the Conservation and Land Management Act have any effect on the waters lying off the area of the claim?

Ms A. SANDERSON: Under the south west settlement, there are no proposals to jointly vest any of the areas whether they are within or without.

Mr R.S. LOVE: I am not sure which particular subclause this is involved in, but I understand that the practical method of involvement of an Aboriginal body corporate in the joint management of a park in a place where it is joint vested will be through the development of a cultural management plan. I think that is what happens in parks that are already established in the terrestrial areas. Will that process be followed here? I am asking this as a matter of policy, rather than law. Will that development of the cultural management plan be considered in those other areas in the same way, again getting back to those single native title claim areas that do not have the benefit of being vested with the Aboriginal body corporate? In other words, will the same method of joint management apply, and will the indicative original management plan set up the ongoing practical operations of the joint vested area? There is a fair bit in there. I can break it down.

Ms A. SANDERSON: The process of developing a cultural management plan will be the same process for the marine areas as it is for the terrestrial areas.

Can the member repeat the second part of his question for me? I am trying to get some clarity on what he is seeking.

Mr R.S. LOVE: As a matter of policy rather than law, in the development of those same plans would that opportunity also exist for areas that will not be a vested interest but will be intended to be joint managed?

Ms A. Sanderson: Where it is managed but not vested?

Mr R.S. LOVE: Yes.

Ms A. SANDERSON: The answer is yes, it is a similar process and those management plans are done on a case-by-case basis, working with the traditional owners of those areas at that time.

Clause put and passed.**Clauses 7 and 8 put and passed.****Clause 9: Section 13B amended —**

Mr R.S. LOVE: This clause is the other main part in this matter of vesting reserves for the protection and conservation of the value of the marine park to the culture and heritage of Aboriginal persons. I want to ask briefly about the effect once a management plan has been developed. I understand that it will not affect existing management plans for fisheries in the affected waters, but what will happen if there is the need to review a particular management plan for a fishery? If that review would trigger the opportunity for that fishery to be, shall we say, curtailed or stopped in a particular area where it might have had a grandfathering provision already in the act, which makes it clear that it continues, what will happen when it comes time to review that particular fish management plan? At that point,

would there be a possibility that that particular activity may not be allowed to continue into the future? Just for clarity, I think the relevant section I am looking at is 13D(6), which refers to a management plan made under the Fish Resources Management Act.

Ms A. SANDERSON: Bear with me, member, while I explain this appropriately. If there is a lease or a licence, for example, that has been issued under the Fish Resources Management Act, since that lease was approved or issued, a management plan was approved under the Conservation and Land Management Act. If that lease expires whilst there is a management plan under the CALM act, the renewal of that lease would be determined against compatible and incompatible uses, whether it is in a special purpose zone or general area zone, so it may or may not be, but it could be deemed incompatible. If it is deemed incompatible, that would trigger potential for compensation under the Fish Resources Management Act.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Thank you; that is what I wanted an understanding of. Regarding the general situation for other activities, most of section 13 refers more to fishing and petroleum and those types of things—commercial activities. However, we know in many areas, especially popular tourist areas, other commercial activities might take place. They might be charter fishing businesses, or swimming with dolphins or whale sharks—whatever. Does the government envisage that this particular bill will affect any of those types of activities in the future? Those activities are not really being undertaken in a way that is invasive, but they might be in areas that are perhaps seen to be of particular importance for a group of Aboriginal people under the management plan.

Ms A. SANDERSON: Commercial tourism licences are issued under the CALM act, so there is no change there. The traditional owners provide advice on those leases and the commercial uses of the CALM act. It would have to be compatible. Having said that, when the government is putting together a management plan, tourism opportunities are incredibly important and seen as a key priority in the opportunities available for conservation areas, so those activities will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis depending on the area. For example, if the area was particularly culturally significant, 20 jet ski groups may not be approved to zoom through it. That might be deeply objectionable to traditional owners, but they might approve other, less impactful activities in that area. It is to provide opportunity for the areas, it is on a case-by-case basis, and it is in consultation with the traditional owners.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Are there any guidelines on how impactful the management plans are to commercial activities other than those ones just outlined, say for licence holders? Will there be some effort to maintain a level of competition neutrality so that, for instance, the Aboriginal group that might be in the area will not be able to use a particular part of the plan simply to rule out other commercial operators and develop a superior business position for themselves at the expense of the general commercial interests in the area? That is going to be a bit hard because some of the government's stated objectives in bringing this legislation were, as the minister spoke about, major programs and economic opportunities. Is it possible that a particular plan could be exclusive for the Aboriginal body corporate or associated persons to the denial of other people having the ability to put forward ideas or take up licences and undertake activities in the future?

Ms A. SANDERSON: Essentially, the CEO grants the licences and the minister approves those licences. The issue of commercial neutrality would be seriously considered. The joint vesting and joint management does not provide a veto of the traditional owners to other businesses. For example, if an operator put in an application for a licence for an activity and a traditional owner group put in an application for a licence for an activity and they were both the same and both compatible with the use of that area, both licences would be granted, not just one. Essentially, access would be allowed for those compatible activities regardless of the group. There is no implied veto, if that is what the member is asking.

Mr R.S. LOVE: This is the final point I have. Are there proposals to make the indicative management plans subject to the normal, I think, section 14 provisions that set out the notice for how advertising takes place in consultation?

Sitting suspended from 6.00 to 7.00 pm

Mr R.S. LOVE: I was on my feet just before we got up for dinner. Unfortunately for the advisers, they have had to stay for the last hour, so I have been scratching my head trying to think what I could do to make it worth their while to stay a bit longer, just to make the intrusion worth the time.

We were talking about the advertising of proposals and the indicative management plans. I guess that begs the question: how will those management plans interact with and be reflected in the management plan that already exists for the reserve or the marine park? Perhaps I will ask that question for a start and then get back to asking about advertising et cetera.

Ms A. SANDERSON: I will just clarify the question. The member asked how the management plans are interacting. Does he mean how a management plan or licence that is approved under the Fish Resources Management Act interacts with the joint management plan?

Mr R.S. LOVE: I mean the management plan that exists for the marine park already and the indicative management plan for the preservation of Aboriginal culture and heritage. That comes in. Is that reflected straight in the plan so there is an amendment to the management plan that exists? Does it just encompass the entirety of that cultural plan?

Ms A. SANDERSON: I ask the member to let me know whether I have his question wrong. I think he was asking: if there is an existing management plan and a decision to joint vest, will it go through a process of a joint management plan? Essentially, the joint management plan would be developed in the usual way, with consultation through that process. They are prescribed in the act, so what has to occur is prescribed. It has to be circulated in the newspaper. It obviously has to be released for a minimum period of time—three months—and it would be approved or not approved, and that would become the management plan.

Mr R.S. LOVE: There is a description in the act about that advertising and consultation. I think it is in section 14. I confirm that that is appropriate. That will also reflect the incorporation of the management plan that is looking at those cultural management issues as well. In drawing up the cultural management plan as such, will there be a requirement for consultation at that stage or will there be consultation only at the point it is incorporated in the joint management plan? There will be a two-stage process: the Aboriginal body corporate will make up a plan, which it will seek to then incorporate in the management plan. At what stage of that two-stage process will this other consultation take place?

Ms A. SANDERSON: This question goes to what exactly is a cultural management plan. Essentially, a cultural management plan is the development of a plan by the traditional owners with the department about the cultural values of an area and what is important to them, which will be articulated clearly in a document. If you like, it is a subsidiary to the indicative management plan overall. The cultural management plan is not developed in consultation with people who are not TOs because it is not their culture. It is a subsidiary document to the indicative management plan. If that goes to consultation, the cultural management plan may go as part of the consultation process that is prescribed in section 14(2) of the act. The TOs may deem that aspects of the cultural management plan are not appropriate for public release because it contains restricted cultural practices and those parts would not go with that.

Mr R.S. LOVE: Thanks, minister. The cultural management plan sits somewhat on its own. It is the creation of a document only for a certain group that is responsible for an area. That will then be married with the existing plan, which has the allocation of special use areas, general use areas or special reserves for the different definitions that are in the act about what can be reserve. It would be only at that point that the general public or other stakeholders would be involved in the consultation. Is that what the minister is confirming?

Ms A. Sanderson: Yes.

Mr R.S. LOVE: My final question is: what interaction will there be between the Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum? Would they be directly consulted by the Minister for Environment's department? Would the interest groups go to the Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum or would they go to the Minister for Environment? People may be interested in fishing or petroleum, so how will the three ministers interact in a practical sense when the government is trying to determine a fourth group, being the traditional owners, who will have equal vesting rights with the state of Western Australia?

Ms A. Sanderson: Can I just clarify: is it when those ministers have questions about the cultural management plan or the indicative management plan?

Mr R.S. LOVE: It is about the indicative management plan's incorporation of issues in the cultural management plan and the effect on stakeholders.

Ms A. SANDERSON: The joint indicative management plan will go through a consultation process and it will go to the Minister for Environment. In approving the plan, the Minister for Environment will need to seek the concurrence of the Minister for Fisheries and the Minister for Mines and Petroleum. Essentially, the plan will be sent to them and their offices and they will go through and identify any potential issues or say, "Yes, that's fine." Interest groups, or stakeholders, will participate in the consultation of the draft plan. There is no formalised role for them in approaching the other ministers, but there is nothing at all to stop them from approaching the Minister for Fisheries or the Minister for Mines and Petroleum if they feel they have interests that have or have not been taken into consideration in the management plan. They would speak to those ministers because they would have to have concurrence.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 to 19 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

[Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.]

Third Reading

MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Minister for Environment) [7.16 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

MR R.S. LOVE (Moore — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [7.16 pm]: I very much thank the minister, and the advisers for coming in tonight and sharing their expertise on the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021. As I said at the outset, we are not opposed to the bill. There are issues about which our communities

have expressed some concern, but some of the answers that the minister gave tonight and in discussions that have been had along the way have helped to explain some of those matters. I am sure that when the bill gets to the Legislative Council, the lead speaker for the opposition alliance will no doubt want to interrogate more fully some of the issues that we have spoken about, such as what it means to preserve Aboriginal culture and heritage and how that will interact in a practical sense with the marine parks as they exist at the moment and as they might in the future, and with other industry groups and recreational and commercial users of those areas. Some of the questions at the back of my mind both in previous discussions and since have been answered tonight. I am happy with the discussion that took place. I look forward to reading what happens in the other place, where those very experienced upper house MPs, who we know play a valuable role in interrogating more fully the legislation that comes through this Parliament, will go into the fine detail to understand exactly how matters will impact the Western Australian community, and seeing how they view some of these matters. I am sure they will contribute something to both the understanding of the bill and perhaps other matters.

I thank the minister. Thanks to the advisers and to everyone who contributed to the debate. I must admit that I listened with great interest to some of the contributions that were made in the second reading debate. The contribution of the member for Cockburn in particular, who is not here at the moment, was particularly enlightening. Some people have a deep understanding of the matters we have been talking about and it was quite interesting to listen to some of their contributions. I would not go so far as to say that all members of the government who spoke were as educating as him, but I think some very important points were brought out tonight and in previous days of this debate from both sides of the chamber. Members brought their own personal experiences to the debate and talked about effects on their electorates and their personal understanding of the matters we have been discussing. I thank everybody for their contributions and I look forward to the passage of the bill to the other place.

MS A. SANDERSON (Morley — Minister for Environment) [7.20 pm] — in reply: I thank all members for their contribution to the debate on the Conservation and Land Management Amendment Bill 2021 and for their interrogation of it. When we go through that process, it helps to clarify things and enlighten the whole chamber. Many government members have articulated very well how important this is in terms of the government's key election commitment, Plan for Our Parks, and its interconnection with the Aboriginal ranger program, which aims to provide ongoing economic opportunity and access for traditional owners. It is a new way of developing parks. Some members have alluded to the process of consultation. It is challenging for various interest groups and commercial operators, and I understand that challenge. It is the government's aim to open up access and opportunities with this bill. We want people to be able to operate in good faith with good relationships, but build those relationships with traditional owners when they are operating on land and sea country. As I said, it is an important manifestation of that really well established principle of Aboriginal self-determination. It is the natural next step in native title and the establishment of Aboriginal bodies corporate.

I thank the advisers. This is now the second time around for this bill, and I am confident that it will get passage through the Council. I thank the advisers for their patience and appreciate their work. I thank the chamber and commend the bill to the house.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILLS

Returned

1. Building and Construction Industry (Security of Payment) Bill 2021.
2. Supply Bill 2021.
3. Sunday Entertainments Repeal Bill 2021.

Bills returned from the Council without amendment.

METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME (BEELIAR WETLANDS) BILL 2021

Second Reading

Resumed from 2 June.

MR T.J. HEALY (Southern River — Parliamentary Secretary) [7.23 pm]: I rise to speak on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2021. I place on record my opposition to the Liberal Party's plan for Roe Highway to become a toll road. There have been two elections on this matter, and the result of those elections was very, very clear. I would like to quote the former member for Carine from the previous Parliament, who made a contribution to the debate on the former bill in *Hansard* of Tuesday, 25 June 2019—almost two years ago today. He said —

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 ...

He predicted —

It will lose every election until it changes its mind ... The government should allow us to put it on our election platform ...

Well, we did. He also said —

The government should allow us —

The opposition —

... to lose government on the basis of Roe 8 and Roe 9 and the Beeliar wetlands. It should give us that opportunity. It will not happen.

The former member for Carine, Tony Krsticevic, whom I thank again for his service, predicted —

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.

Again, I thank the former member for Carine for his service. I would like to welcome the new member for Carine. Not only did we not lose the seat of Bicton, but also we won a number of other seats. I would like to thank the current member for Carine and ask him to please pass on my appreciation to his predecessor!

Friends, the community's view on this bill is very, very clear. It has been entrenched at several elections. My community, your community, do not want a toll road. They have said what they want. They do not want to pay \$5 or \$10 a go. They are aware of what needs to happen. We will always oppose toll roads. We will always oppose the Liberals' plan to do that.

If I can also quietly thank and acknowledge the two constituents from my community in the public gallery today. Deputy Speaker, thank you very much.

MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Child Protection) [7.26 pm]: I am pleased to contribute to the debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2021. Like many people in this house, I have been involved in this campaign to oppose Roe 8, in part to save the Beeliar wetlands, which I care about, as do many of my constituents and many in the community, but also because the road project on which the destruction of the wetlands was based was deeply, deeply flawed. As others have observed, there was public comprehension of the flawed nature of the road project that was Roe 8 and the successive roads that would take the highway through to the port. It made no sense and was not well thought out. It certainly was not costed, but mostly it would not do what it was purported it would do, which was to make it easier for freight and normal passenger vehicles to move easily throughout the southern suburbs.

In particular, the bill before us today will protect the Beeliar wetlands. I thank the Minister for Planning for bringing this bill before the previous Parliament and now to this Parliament to protect the wetlands once and for all. I was the member for Fremantle in the summer of 2016–17 when we had what some in my neck of the woods called the battle for Beeliar. It was a battle to stop the Perth Freight Link and save the Beeliar wetlands. I, along with many I see in the house, stood shoulder to shoulder with our local communities at those wetlands to fight to protect and preserve the precious place of Beeliar and its wetlands for future generations. I remember the period very well. Five years and two resounding election wins on, it is time to finish what we started in that battle. The McGowan Labor government promised to protect the Beeliar wetlands, and this bill ensures that we can deliver the mandate we have now twice been granted.

At present, the metropolitan region scheme, which guides land use decisions in Perth, includes a primary regional roads reservation for the construction of the Roe 8 extension. By changing the primary regional roads reservation to parks and recreation, we will be able to better reflect both the government's and the community's hopes for this site. Our role here is to protect and preserve the place for future generations. That is precisely what this bill will do.

The Beeliar wetlands are named after the original Beeliar people and includes Bibra Lake and North Lake, or Wallibup and Coolbellup. The wetlands are home to fauna species like the splendid fairy-wrens, oblong turtles and quenda. The banksia woodlands house flora like spider orchids and the Christmas tree, and are where the endangered Carnaby's black-cockatoo forage. Migratory birds like rainbow bee-eaters use the sandy ground to make shallow burrows. I quote from an Edith Cowan University study by Danielle Brady and Jeffrey Murray —

Massive flooded gums and paperbarks grow in a swampy peat basin believed to be hydrologically unique on the Swan Coastal Plain ... The high biodiversity of this area has been recorded by successive studies, both in terms of plant communities and in total number of species.

Due to the widespread clearing of the Swan coastal plain post-settlement, there is precious little significant wetlands left here in Western Australia. The Beeliar wetlands account for a considerable portion of the estimated 10 per cent of wetlands remaining on the Swan coastal plain. The ecological significance of the wetlands is unquestionable, which is why the bill will transfer approximately 34 hectares of land to the parks and recreation reservation. The 34 hectares is a key part of the Roe 8 reserve, and thanks to the McGowan government is now classified as an A-class reserve. Of the Beeliar area, approximately 13 hectares, or 38 per cent, is identified as conservation category wetland.

A small area of Bibra Lake will be zoned urban to be consistent with the surrounding urban zone for this local road. After the bill has passed, we will use a standard metropolitan region scheme amendment to engage on rezoning the remaining 84 hectares of land located to the west of North Lake Road that is currently designated as primary regional road. I know that many people in the community, particularly in Hamilton Hill, are keen for this discussion to take place and to have some certainty around an area that has had significant uncertainty around it for many years. That includes the City of Cockburn, which is enthusiastic to be engaged in that process.

I have spoken briefly about the biodiversity of Beeliar. The wetlands are not only rich in flora and fauna, but also a place for people. Generations of people have gathered at this place for many years, both settler and Noongar. At the intersection of Hope Road and Progress Drive there once stood two Norfolk Island pines. Reaching over 25 metres and situated 10 metres apart, the trees were planted by dairy farmer John Dixon in 1900 to celebrate his marriage. I am indebted to my federal colleague Josh Wilson, MP, for his retelling of this story. For 117 years, those pines stood proud against the backdrop of Bibra Lake, but in March 2017 it took just minutes for the Liberal government's bulldozers to tear those Norfolk Island pines down. In fact, the destruction of those trees was not necessary to clear the land in preparation for the road—not at all. It stood quite apart from that. Still, it was characteristic of the spitefulness of that clearing in January, February and March 2017 that those two Norfolk Island pines were pulled down. The remains of those two pines now stand as a shameful reminder of the wasteful clearing of the wetlands in 2017.

Thousands of years before John Dixon planted those trees, the Noongar people lived on Beeliar land. For women, parts of the Beeliar were a birthing ground, while at the men's site, young boys learnt to hunt. Revered community leader and passionate campaigner to protect the sacred sites, the late Reverend Sealin Garlett, minister of the Uniting Church in Coolbellup, said that the north site of Bibra Lake was a place of initiation. In a 2017 interview, he said —

“The boys went over to camp up at Hope Road, near Progress Drive, and from there they marched them to Forrest Road, which was a corroboree ground where they were sung to and smoked out. Then they went back to camp as men,” ...

Noongar woman Cathy Coomer was born among the paperbarks at Beeliar. The wetlands are now a place where a member of the stolen generation, Sharyn Egan, takes her children and grandchildren to walk, teaching them about their strong lineage. In 2017, Sharyn Egan said —

“I tell [them] stories like, ‘Your great grandmother lived here, they were eating turtles and swans and some of the plant foods. They had fires and this is where’. It's very spiritual,” ...

The settler stories in that area are long and rich, such as those of the Dixon family, who set up a dairy farm on the shores of Bibra Lake, or those of Chinese market gardeners.

The McGowan government has twice promised the people of Western Australia that it would protect the Beeliar wetlands, and it has made significant progress to deliver on that promise. Last year, the government created an A-class conservation reserve of 610 hectares. Today, it is ready to finish the job. The bill will enable us to honour our commitment to the people of WA in a timely manner, as the traditional process of amending the MRS would likely take over two years to complete. It would also still be tabled in Parliament and subject to a disallowance within Parliament. Using a bill to amend the MRS will significantly reduce the time to progress the protection of the Beeliar wetlands. We know that signalling the end of this ill-fated road to nowhere is part of the story. Our government is committed to continuing to deliver our freight strategy plan for the future. In the short term, we will continue to increase the amount of freight on rail.

Under the McGowan government, the percentage of freight on rail has increased significantly. At the moment, it is about 20 per cent. About two years ago, it was over 23 per cent—a significant increase. It was at its lowest point under the previous Liberal–National government, at just over 10 per cent. It was at a low of 10.9 per cent in 2009–10. We have been able to more than double that. Obviously, as a percentage, that represents a significant number of trucks off the road. As the amount of freight since 2019 has increased, the percentage has obviously increased as well.

The Minister for Planning mentioned in her second reading speech that that was done through a simple mechanism of increasing the subsidy paid to the transport companies to increase the amount of freight on rail. It has delivered. The record number of 20 per cent translates to 110 000 trucks off roads in WA, including around Fremantle. The intermodal plan requires working with industry to provide additional train lines for container freight. Facilitating the development of intermodal terminals will provide new and existing precincts to transfer freight efficiently from road to rail, further improving rail's competitiveness.

As the member for Fremantle, I know how important it is that we move freight safely and efficiently around the state to our ports. This priority ensures that we are best placed to facilitate strong trade growth into the future, and the best way to do that is by delivering Westport. Last year, our government endorsed the Westport Taskforce's recommended design and location for a future container port at Kwinana. It is the only way we can meet increasing freight needs and take container trucks off suburban roads. The final report recommended a land-backed port to be built within the Kwinana industrial area, connected by an uninterrupted freight corridor via Anketell Road and Tonkin Highway.

Even the Stephenson plan—a plan older than me—acknowledged that an outer harbour would form a fundamental part of the Fremantle port over time. As my colleague the Minister for Planning has noted, the Stephenson plan contains reference to the expansion of Fremantle port to Cockburn Sound.

Ms R. Saffioti: I have it here!

Ms S.F. McGURK: The minister has the dusty original report —

Ms R. Saffioti: It's from the Parliamentary Library!

Ms S.F. McGURK: — to prove her point.

Page 17 of the plan notes —

The port will continue to grow, with increasing emphasis on the Outer Harbour in Cockburn Sound.

On page 136, the plan states —

There exists in the south-eastern part of the Cockburn Sound area a vast hinterland capable of accommodating all the uses associated with a major port and industrial area without any of the restrictions on space, becoming more and more apparent, in the vicinity of the Inner Harbour.

Mr R.R. Whitby: That would have been David Brand as Premier back then, wouldn't it?

Ms S.F. McGURK: Yes. It is interesting. I have just had an interjection from the Minister for Emergency Services about David Brand. In fact, there is a very good article by a constituent of mine, David Whish-Wilson, who is an author. When he is not writing crime novels based in around Fremantle—which I would recommend to everyone—he writes in magazines and the like. He wrote a story about Roe 8 in March 2017, and it was published in *The Monthly*. He makes the point that the purpose of the Stephenson–Hepburn plan in 1955 was to develop Perth into a city for the car. He says also that the only blip in the Stephenson plan being implemented at that time by David Brand in 1960, with the mantra “highways are good”, was —

... when Premier Brand implemented one particular stage in the Stephenson–Hepburn plan, leading to the tearing down of the convict-built Pensioner Barracks at the head of St Georges Terrace, on the edge of the central business district, to make way for the Mitchell Freeway. When Brand took his plan to destroy the remaining Barracks Arch to cabinet, members of his own party, under the weight of community pressure, crossed the floor and voted with the Opposition.

Brand's political “bloody nose” still seems remarkable from the distance of some 50 years, particularly in the context of the Barnett government seeking now —

That was in 2017 —

to implement another stage in the Stephenson–Hepburn plan ...

I think that Colin Barnett received his own bloody nose, if you like, in the campaign in 2017 that saw a coming together of what I have described as spitefulness in the clearing of the Beeliar wetlands, even though the outcome of the election was by no means certain. In fact, the then Liberal–National government had not taken that particular Roe 8 plan to the 2013 state election. Premier Barnett continued to have those wetlands cleared, even though there was significant community opposition to that, and, as I said, the outcome of the 2017 election was not known. Of course, Labor won the 2017 election and we were able to stop the clearing of the wetlands immediately and redirect the federal funds that had been allocated to that project to other more constructive projects in and around the state. We were also able to redeploy those workers. I am very grateful for David Whish-Wilson's recollection of the history of the Beeliar wetlands.

The other point I want to make about the flawed transport links is that we are getting on with Westport and understanding that that sort of development needs comprehensive planning, not only from a business case point of view, but also to make sure that we link the road and logistics networks, and consider the future of Fremantle. The Minister for Transport; Planning; Ports has announced a committee to overlook the future of Fremantle so that we can properly plan for all the issues, not just the area south of the port at Victoria Quay, but also the future of those industries that are connected to the port and how they will transition at the next stage of Westport's development.

We have the upgrade at the intersection of High Street–Stirling Highway. That is a significant road project that is expected to be finished in September. The scale of that project now makes me shudder at what the size of the proposed freight link might have been. It would have been a significantly larger project than the road upgrade now. People who live around that area see the scale of a four-lane highway upgrade that will make traversing that intersection much more seamless by taking out the traffic lights and the stop–start nature of the previous configuration. They can also see, as I said, what the scale of the freight link would have meant for the local community. It would have been disastrous.

We also have the Swan River crossings project, which will see the replacement of the Fremantle Traffic Bridge and the construction of a new rail bridge with dedicated pedestrian and cyclist facilities. I know there has been

some concern from the community. Often people's concerns about the replacement bridge come from different perspectives. We are in a fantastic position, thanks to the negotiations of my ministerial colleague to secure \$115 million of federal money, and state money, to make \$230 million available for that project.

[Member's time extended.]

Ms S.F. McGURK: That project is motivated largely by the ageing nature of the existing traffic bridge. As romantic as it may be, and as attached to that old wooden bridge as locals are, we are also attached to the provision of good, safe transport routes, including bridges, so that bridge has to go and it has to be replaced. I am grateful to the minister for holding up the design process so that we could have extended consultation with the Fremantle community. Nicole Lockwood was able to facilitate that, which we are grateful for.

Essentially, in my mind, the issues around Westport and the future of Fremantle port do not come down to the capacity of the laydown area in Fremantle. At the moment, we are coming up to about 780 000 or 800 000 twenty-foot equivalent units in and out of Fremantle. A quite significant laydown area is available in Fremantle to enable that amount of freight to be increased. The pinch point is getting the freight in and out of Fremantle. Although I have seen some estimates from various quarters, including from the Liberal Party, that we could go up to over three million containers in and out Fremantle port because of the size of the laydown area, essentially we are looking at four times the number of containers from what we are experiencing currently. Even with efficiencies, the constraints of rail around the Roundhouse and some of the heritage areas in Fremantle mean that will be a completely untenable future for Fremantle and the whole urban area around not just Fremantle but also all the southern suburbs, including some of the western suburbs to which freight would be pushed. It is just not a responsible way to manage freight in the twenty-first century. The McGowan government is tackling that issue. It will be a difficult issue for the Fremantle community, which feels very attached to the container port and to living close to a working port, but it is not a plan for the future. I am prepared to provide leadership and take that discussion to my community, as I have done in my last eight years as the member for Fremantle.

Back to the Beeliar wetlands, the protection of this important biological and ecological heritage in our Perth region is significant. The Beeliar wetlands do not belong to any government. They do not belong to the former Liberal government, which tried to bulldoze them. They are precious and we have an obligation to protect these few remaining wetlands in our Perth basin for future generations.

The fight over the Beeliar wetlands in the summer of 2017 was a flashpoint. It spurred people from all walks of life into protest and action. Contrary to the Liberal Party's claims, these were not professional protesters. They were mums, dads, older people, kids—just people who cared about a place rich in biodiversity being bulldozed for a road project that was deeply and very obviously flawed. Since that battle in March 2017, the rehabilitation of the Roe 8 project is now in its third year. The program is part of a 10-year implementation plan under the City of Cockburn under an agreement between the Commissioner of Main Roads and the City of Cockburn and is managed by a governance committee. It is a testament to the power of the people. There are many members of the community who I could name and I will not—I think other members may be going to do that—but I am very indebted to a number of people in the community, not just my constituents but also people who over many years, and in some cases decades, have been committed to this fight and have put countless hours of dedication, skill and passion into this project. I just briefly mention my Bicton colleague Lisa O'Malley for her efforts and the member for Willagee, Peter Tinley, for his efforts as well.

Those same community people who fought so hard to save the wetlands have worked just as hard in the last few years in the rehabilitation project. They have dedicated nearly 4 000 volunteer hours to plant over 123 000 native tubestocks and weed over 22 hectares. It is remarkable. There has been completion of an Aboriginal heritage survey and an engagement with traditional owners to develop signage and trails. There have been citizen science projects, local school projects, partnerships with Murdoch University and completion of fauna and vegetation surveys.

It is time to draw a line in the sand and protect and preserve the Beeliar wetlands for future generations. Those pine trees planted over 120 years ago by John Dixon may be gone, but the stumps stand as a testament to the reckless environmental vandalism of the Liberal Party. I commend the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2021 to the house.

MR P.C. TINLEY (Willagee) [7.52 pm]: It is with great pride that I stand tonight to speak to the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2021 for not only myself but also, more importantly, my community, and place a marker in the sand, as the member for Fremantle said, on an issue that defines much of my time so far in this place. For over 10 years I have been the member for Willagee, which sits astride the Beeliar wetlands, and have been aware of all the attendant issues that have swirled around it. I am proud because the community urged me to act on its behalf and to take up the fight along with my colleagues, particularly the members for Fremantle and Bicton.

This is a divisive issue; everybody knows it. It has been in this place before in the last Parliament, and here it is again, this time for the last time. This issue has typically divided opinions between those who are concerned about road infrastructure and traffic management and/or freight management, and those who are concerned about protection of the environment. It is the last issue that I came to understand, as a newly minted member in 2009, when I took

over from Alan Carpenter in the seat of Willagee, and it drove me to really be very clear about the ambitions for opposing the Roe plan—Roe 8, Roe 9, Roe 10 and all the other variations that happened in between. One part of it was understanding where the wetlands sit as a piece of natural infrastructure within the Swan coastal plain. Quite often, we talk about the Beeliar wetlands and it has been trivialised throughout the debate as a single road between two lakes. How hard could it be? The reality is that the Beeliar reserve is about six to eight kilometres long and incorporates Beeliar Regional Park. About 19 lakes make up the wetlands. It is important to note this and record here that on a couple of different surveys, when we look at the Swan coastal plain, the aqualung, if you like, is all the wetlands that stretch right through the Swan coastal plain, and that we as European settlers since the time of settlement have infilled up to as much as 80 per cent of the wetlands and/or disturbed the natural ecosystem around them. Think of Lake Monger and Hyde Park—all those sorts of places that we take for granted that are former wetlands that have been filled in and overtaken. From an environmental point of view, it was very easy to stand alongside the community to preserve it.

It has been a fantastic fight. It is a very, very good example of how the community voice that once had an outlet through the WA Labor Party could voice its concern and get change, and it has happened in great spades. As the member for Fremantle said, when we were protesting and doing marches along the intended route, thousands of people turned out even on rainy days. I was walking alongside very normal people—suburban mums and dads. I walked past a couple. One was a lecturer, the other was an office administrator. They had never activated on an issue in their entire life—they were in their early 60s—but they were motivated by this issue.

The fundamental issue on the roadside infrastructure that is worth mentioning here is the fact that the Liberal Party has wedded itself to a failed old infrastructure plan. To have a single port entry with a road to it that would hopefully satisfy the inbound and outbound freight requirements of a growing state like Western Australia inside a highly developed urbanised area like Fremantle and the surrounding suburbs was a complete fantasy. Quite often, the numbers quoted identified the future port capacity on the basis of how many ships could get in, unload boxes and turn around, but never contemplated the concept of enabling infrastructure to support it. Very clearly, Roe 8 and Roe 9 were a road to nowhere, because there was no plan to cross the river and do the last kilometre. That involved things such as a duplication of the Stirling Bridge and/or going through five sets of lights in a single loop to a single entry port. There was no way it was ever going to meet the international standards of ports. Cities around the world have identified the need to have a highly productive and efficient port as part of the future economic prosperity of their jurisdictions, and Western Australia is no different. That is why this government has taken the longstanding plan to develop an outer harbour to make sure that we will be internationally competitive for as long as we can be across many, many generations.

From the environmental perspective, it was easy to support this, with the 19 lakes that we are trying to preserve, all the attendant uses around it and the change in land use to make sure that the wetlands are preserved for future generations. The road history is chequered. I think everybody knows it and has reported on it. We forget that the Gordon Stephenson plan started the fight in the early 2000s, or even the 1990s, around the eastern bypass. The eastern bypass was successfully deleted by a Labor government. It was excised by the then Minister for Planning in 1992, reinstated in 1994 after the change of government and once more deleted in 2004 after another change of government in 2001. It has that history. There was, if you like, an understanding about how to take things off the metropolitan region scheme that are inconsistent with the land use around them, and this was one of those occasions.

I have struggled hard to give voice to the community support from my electorate to this action, if you like. I struggled to decide whether I should use my time here to record in *Hansard* forever some of the people and organisations that were instrumental in creating the sort of horsepower that we as local members needed, and we as a government or government in waiting needed to actually make the hard decision to delete Roe 8. As always with these things, when we start naming names, people are invariably missed out. But I want to name a list of groups that are active in this issue, to identify not only those individual groups but also the depth and breadth that the community felt for the wetlands and the antipathy towards this proposed road infrastructure.

I thank these groups and record in *Hansard* that the true community resistance came from groups such as Save Beeliar Wetlands Inc; Rethink the Link; roads to railways; BirdLife Australia; Urban Bushland Council WA; Doctors for the Environment Australia; the Beeliar Group; the Leeuwin Group; the National Trust of Western Australia; the Metropolitan Commission of Elders; the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council; Musos against Roe 8; Coolbellup Community Association; Hamilton Hill Community Group; families of the Beeliar wetlands; Roe 8 Watch; City of Melville residents against Roe 8/Perth Freight Link; Moody Glen residents, from across the freeway; Wetland Media Response Group; the Rethink the Link media team; Murdoch Chase Residents Association; Photographers for the Wetlands; Cooby Concerned Residents; the Rethink the Link social media group; Friends of Clontarf Hill; the Cockburn Aboriginal Reference Group; the Environmental Defenders Office WA; the WA Forest Alliance; South East Regional Centre for Urban Landcare, Murdoch Environmental Restoration Group; Sustainable Transport Coalition of Western Australia; Baba Lala; Hilton Precinct; Friends of Wireless Hill; Friends of Ken Hurst Park; Friends of Brixton Street Wetlands; Waterbird Conservation Group; White Gum Valley Precinct; the Socialist Alliance—God bless 'em; Fremantle Men's Shed; Perth Waldorf School; Blue Gum Montessori School; White Gum Valley Action Group; the Town of Mosman Park; the Town of East Fremantle; the City of Fremantle;

the City of Cockburn; Wetland Defenders; Wetland Protectors; Wetland Watchers; Randwick Stables Community Garden; the Pinakarra Community; Friends of Malvolio Bushland; Royal Woody Pear Society; Apace Nursery WA and Community Education; the Organic Collective; Sustainable Tradies; Freo Farmers Market; Hilton Harvest Community Garden; Gondwana Link; Tibetan Buddhist Society of Western Australia; Cape Peron coastal park; Kanyana Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre; Environment House; Western Australian Seabird Rescue; White Gum Valley Orchard; White Gum Valley Primary School Parents and Friends Association; Australian Conservation Foundation; WA Wildflower Association; the Wetlands Centre at Cockburn; WA Wildlife, ex-Native ARC; Cockburn Community Wildlife Corridor; the Cottesloe Residents and Ratepayers Association; the Wetlands Conservation Society; World Wildlife Fund; Cockatoo Coalition; Bibra Lake Residents' Association; North Lake Residents Association; the Conservation Council of WA; the Wilderness Society; and the Australian Labor Party. All those community-based organisations gave their voice, their resources and their effort over many, many years, long before I was even the member for Willagee, to this very, very important cause.

Behind those groups and their contribution to this fight was good strong local leadership. I want to name several people in those groups. I listed nearly 83 groups that are from far and wide, as members heard, that all came to the fight. I will miss people here and I apologise, but it is emblematic of the sort of community spirit that is created. Many of these people live in my electorate and they have lived their entire lives there and raised families there and now enjoy the spoils of their great resistance. I thank Phil Jennings from the Wetlands Conservation Society and Joe Branco of the North Lake Residents Association, who first introduced me to the issue when I became elected. All these people are from Save Beeliar Wetlands: Tony Weeks; Nandi Chinna; Suzanne Smith; Pam Nairn; Felicity Bairstow; Rex Sallur, who was always there with his ute helping out doing what he needed to do at a very practical level; Leah Knapp; Kate Kelly; Danielle Brady; Mal Christison; Peter Rattigan; Clayton Ellis; and Carole de Barre. I also thank Kim Dravnieks, Grainne O'Donovan, Maureen Flynn, Matt Grimbley, Robyn Williams, Ellen McCarthy, Ewan Buckley, the late Sealin Garlett, and many, many others beyond.

I also thank the elected members in the area who had to articulate the concerns in detail and in broad terms and the passion that came from the community. I thank Scott Ludlam, now retired; Lynn MacLaren, also retired; Hon Alannah MacTiernan, who had been a long-time warrior right from the Fremantle eastern bypass days; Simone McGurk, member for Fremantle; Lisa O'Malley, member for Bicton; Melissa Parke, former member for Fremantle; Chris Tallentire, now member for Thornlie; and, of course, Josh Wilson, to name a few. I would like to reserve one comment and one heartfelt thankyou for someone who is not in the chamber, but Hansard will record it. A very brave decision was made by the then McGowan Labor opposition in 2016, 2017, as we came towards that election, and that was to come out before the election and say that we would delete Roe 8. That came in very large part because of the advocacy of now Minister for Transport Rita Saffioti, and she deserves the wholehearted thanks of not only my electorate and all the affected electorates, but also the people of Western Australia. At the minister's hand and courage, future generations will enjoy the benefits of the Beeliar wetlands long after we are gone. On behalf of my community and all those people, we say our very heartfelt thanks to the minister for what she has done for the community.

We are the Labor Party and we are always talking about the future, a future that we try to describe and a future that we endeavour to deliver. Beeliar wetlands and the cessation of Roe 8 and its excision from the metropolitan region scheme are really just the continuation of a fight. The work still goes on and, as the member for Fremantle said, the regeneration of the bush around it has seen the community come out. Schoolkids, community groups, nature lovers and people who were not previously activated by the wetlands and the bush surrounding it have come out now and helped with replanting and looking after the environment. A particular strategy from the City of Cockburn and those involved is access matters. The enduring survival of the wetlands and other native bushland, for example, is about getting people in there to understand and experience it. No-one would contemplate any sort of development in Kings Park, principally because of its location but also because so many people have a living memory of their time or some part of their time in Kings Park. Nobody would dare contemplate touching it. The 19 lakes of Beeliar Regional Park are the Kings Park of the south and it is a really important institution. I thank the City of Cockburn and everyone involved to make sure that the walking trails and the access arrangements around the lake and through the bushland are available to everyone with enduring information that allows people to find some connection to that very, very important part of the land.

Also, I am happy to see the City of Cockburn and the state government supporting an Aboriginal cultural centre that will sit on the banks of one of the main lakes at the Beeliar wetlands. It is a \$6.5 million investment to make sure that we have a living opportunity to access the thousands and thousands of years of continuous occupation of First Nation Australians and their connection to the land, and to interpret that for us and future generations. It will be a tremendous facility, once finished, to allow all people to come together and understand the significance of our lived natural environment and our constructed life around it.

Those who wanted to prosecute the argument on this issue of the Perth Freight Link around traffic or around road transport often cited the idea that this was a necessary piece of infrastructure to make sure that we maximised the leveraged infrastructure of the existing port. I said in my opening remarks that that is out of step with the reality of what we are finding on the ground there today. The port is, quite frankly, well past its use-by date. It is not consistent

with having an internationally competitive port that an economy like Western Australia absolutely has to rely upon. It is vitally important that we understand that the land use around it and the enabling infrastructure that supports access to it is inconsistent with its use. There is one place in this state that we said we would use as our heavy industrial area, where we would undertake these sorts of activities, and that is the Kwinana strip. All the relevant councils have been very keen to embrace the idea of what is being done to investigate the case for an outer harbour.

[Member's time extended.]

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Those who are pro-Roe 8 were often quite mischievously misled by the Liberal Party that it would somehow solve all their daily traffic issues. The Liberal Party floated the idea that traffic management issues were somehow related to Roe 8, that traffic problems would all be washed away and that people would be able to freely travel to and from wherever they wanted to go.

Ms R. Saffioti: Snake oil salesmen.

Mr P.C. TINLEY: Yes, it was just shonky.

I say to all my residents now: nothing will ease your traffic burden faster and better than an internationally competitive port in the industrial zone of this state. Nothing will make it easier for you to go about your business and have quiet enjoyment of the roads, such as they are, particularly around Leach Highway, which forms the northern boundary of my electorate. That is an important message. We must never lose sight of the fact that the Perth Freight Link, as it was known, would not have solved traffic problems. There would still be trucks going into the Fremantle area, and it was inconsistent with changed land use. The best thing we can do to ensure a good, solid traffic management plan that eases people's daily lives is to build the outer harbour at the appropriate time and in the appropriate way.

That does not mean that the government has been idle. The construction of the Armadale Road dual carriageway between Anstey Road and Tapper Road is a \$145 million commitment in the forward estimates. It will create a vibrant, very active public transport corridor that is very needed. There is also the \$166 million Armadale Road bridge, linking North Lake Road and Armadale Road over the Kwinana Freeway. These are examples of identifying where the challenges are and providing infrastructure solutions that are meaningful and that allow people to transit around the city.

As a local member, I have advocated to the Minister for Transport and others for the grade separation and upgrade of North Lake Road. When we dig into the traffic management arrangements, the issue is about people's access to the freeway—the east–west traverse, which is so important. North Lake Road is the next best opportunity to do that, and upgrading the intersections and roundabouts on North Lake Road will be important.

I got a lolly! Cash for comment, right there!

The grade separation of North Lake Road and the rail link are very important. Like so many level crossings in this city, it causes enormous disruption, particularly in peak hours. The members for Cannington and Victoria Park, and others, understand the issues around that in denser areas than the ones I am talking about. Although it is a big number for a single dual-carriage road and a single rail line, it will still be the cheapest grade separation that can be done. I think that is a vital piece, and I will continue to advocate for it so that we can make sure that people can actually traverse east–west to the freeway in good order.

The final point I will make is about the great opportunity I identified when I was Minister for Housing and discussed with the Minister for Transport: where do we go after Roe 8? Of course, we go to Roe 9. There is no reason why we cannot see, during the term of this government, the transition of Roe 9 into a lovely, activated corridor for multiple uses, including traffic, to create greater amenity. It is 46 hectares of space, mostly vacant, and all in the road reserve. It is 46 hectares of what I call a greenfield site in a brownfield zone. It could be activated around the intersections on Carrington Street down to Rockingham Road and around the Randwick Stables and so on. It is a great opportunity to bring multiple uses to that area—yes, some residential, some traffic and some natural bushland—so that we will have something of a wildlife corridor from the wetlands to the sea, as they say.

These are great opportunities that we can, should and must embrace as a Labor government looking to create what we are really here to create, which is a greater quality of life for our people. It is with great pride that I stand here with my Labor colleagues in this Labor chamber doing Labor things. I really do commend this bill to the house, for the last time.

DR J. KRISHNAN (Riverton) [8.15 pm]: When I started my campaign to get elected to this house, I was asked by a couple of Riverton residents about Roe 8 and 9. I quickly realised that they did not know the whole truth about Roe 8 and 9. They did not realise that it was a road to nowhere. The Liberal Party had no plan to take the road all the way to the port. This would be like me wanting to go to Shelley after Parliament tonight, and the Liberal Party telling me, "I will take you to Bull Creek; after that, I don't care what happens to you." The Liberal Party also had this idea about a tunnel, but 30 per cent of the trucks travelling on Leach Highway carry explosives, so even if the Liberal Party had spent billions of dollars on this tunnel, 30 per cent of trucks could not have gone through it because they would be prohibited from doing so.

The Liberal Party will not tell this truth to the people. After I discussed this with the people in my electorate, they clearly understood why Roe 8 and 9 is a road to nowhere. It is un-Australian to push your problems onto someone else. How can I tell my people, or the member for Bateman tell her people, “We will build Roe 8 and 9. We’ll solve our problem, but we’ll pass the problem on to the member for Bicton and the member for Fremantle”? The people of Riverton and the people of Bateman are not willing to accept that. It is not a permanent solution. We, with true Australian values, care about the next generation. How comfortable are we going to be leaving the next generation with a limitation on the size of ships that can come into Fremantle port? Is that an Australian way of doing it? We need to provide a port with unlimited capacity so that the next generation can import and export without any limitations. That is what Westport will deliver.

I had a huge smear campaign run against me when I ran for election. There was a cartoon published with my face and a parachute and the caption, “This guy lives locally in Mosman Park”. That leaflet was dropped at every house in my electorate. Today I am glad to say that I am now a local in Riverton. I made a promise during my campaign that I would move to the electorate within six to eight weeks if I won the election, but within two weeks I moved to Shelley.

I bring this up because I have a personal understanding. For a long time, I travelled from Mosman Park to Riverton, west to east on Leach Highway. Now, after moving to Shelley, I also travel east to west on Leach Highway, so I understand the traffic on both sides and I understand the difficulties that people are going through, but Roe 8 and Roe 9 is not the solution for the next generation. Roe 8 and Roe 9 is a road to nowhere. Roe 8 and Roe 9 would be pushing our problem onto someone else. Roe 8 and Roe 9 will not be a solution for the next generation, with an unlimited life capacity of the port. Roe 8 and Roe 9 will not preserve the environment. I commend this bill for the Beelihar wetlands. Thanks for the opportunity, Madam Acting Speaker.

MS K.E. GIDDENS (Bateman) [8.19 pm]: I am pleased to rise today to contribute to the second reading debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2021. The member for Riverton has made the most sense that I have heard on this topic in a long time. He shares with me the experience of campaigning on this issue in Bateman and Riverton. The Liberals went hard at it to make this divisive in our community. Information that was presented was blatantly incorrect in many instances. I have points to make about the environment because, of course, they are fundamental to the Beelihar wetlands bill and critical to our urban environment to protect the remnant wetlands in Perth and Western Australia. That is very important, but that point has been well made so I will speak about what the Liberals said they would do during the 2021 election campaign if they won the election. I will labour this point—excuse the pun—because Hon Ben Morton, MP, the federal member for Tangney, still has something to say about Roe 8 and 9. He has not finished with this topic, Minister for Transport. He said that the McGowan Labor government’s decision to delete the Roe 8 and 9 reserves is an act of planning vandalism. I will unpack that shortly. I will go back to what the state Liberals said during the campaign. This letter was not the only one that came through my letterbox as a local candidate. I probably received a copy of it six times over during the campaign. It was repeatedly dropped in my letterbox and those of others in my electorate.

Mr D.R. Michael: They only had one volunteer!

Ms K.E. GIDDENS: Perhaps. One day I was given a copy of it three times. I think they did it all in one day to save time.

This is what the Liberals had to say. They said that Labor would rip away the \$1.2 billion of federal funding. Yes, because we are not going to build Roe 8 and 9 so we do not need it, but we will use it on other infrastructure projects. The Liberals said that not building Roe 8 and 9 would axe thousands of local WA jobs—thousands. The Labor government has created thousands of jobs; I think we have created 88 000 jobs. We have the strongest economy in the nation and one of the strongest in the world. We have the lowest unemployment rate and the highest consumer confidence. Every day, the Minister for Transport gets up in this house and talks about another project that is being “disruptive” because we are delivering. We are building things and we are getting things done. No, we are not going to axe thousands of local WA jobs; rather, we have created them. Another claim was that WA Labor would keep dangerous trucks on local roads. We have removed more than 83 000 trucks from local roads with the McGowan Labor government’s commitment in 2017 to increase the freight on rail subsidy. We have already removed trucks from the road. We are making our local roads safer and we are investing in infrastructure to improve roads and streets, particularly those in Bateman. The Liberals also said that we were going to close Fremantle port and destroy Cockburn Sound with an automated industrial port. As has already been noted today, we are a trading state. Western Australia’s exports contribute to over 50 per cent of Australia’s exports. We are the powerhouse of this nation in exports and if we want to continue our economy strong into the future for the next generations of Western Australia, we have to deliver not only an effective and efficient port, but also the infrastructure that supports it; that is, the roads that go in and out because that corridor, that east–west link, is critical to the future needs of Perth and Western Australia and our future economy.

If I flip the election pamphlet over, I can see what the Liberals said they were going to do. It states —

The Morrison Government is backing WA with \$1.2 billion available right now ...

I will come back to that point shortly. The pamphlet also states that the Liberals would create thousands of WA jobs—I have addressed that—and take 74 000 cars and 7 000 trucks off our roads. We have already taken 84 000 trucks off our roads. They also said that they would bypass 15 sets of traffic lights—to get where? Where were they going? Bypassing what? Colin Barnett was quoted in a 2017 article —

“There is no Roe 10,” Mr Barnett said.

“We are not tunnelling under the [Swan] River, we are not building super bridges over the river.”

I am not sure where they were going.

Another Liberal claim is that Roe 8 and 9 would have had only a 0.49 per cent impact on Beeliar Regional Park. How cute to think that we can measure the footprint of the infrastructure and claim that as the impact and not think that building a freight link through a wetland, with diesel exhaust fumes, noise and all those things, was not going to affect the rest of the wetlands. The results of the 2017 and 2021 elections stand. The Liberals made this an issue in my community and in those of the members for Riverton, Willagee and Fremantle—it goes on—and twice now the people have said no.

I go back to this election material, which states that “The Morrison Government is backing WA with \$1.2 billion.” That is great news, but who was not backing WA? The WA Liberals were not backing WA because if we deduct the \$1.2 billion that the federal government was going to put into the \$1.9 billion project—math is not my strong point and people who know me well know that—there is a shortfall of \$700 million. Two days before the election, the Liberals’ excellent policy costings came out. How much did they set aside for this project that was so significant that they put multiple flyers in letterboxes and campaigned on it? They put aside \$135 million out of the \$700 million shortfall that would have been needed to deliver Roe 8 and 9. It is not as if they were talking about planning to do it; they committed to commencing it within the first 100 days of office. A WAtoday article headed “Liberals’ ‘shambolic’ election promise cost reveal lacking underlying analysis” states —

Shadow treasurer Sean L’Estrange also defended spending just \$125 million over the forward estimates on the Roe 8 and 9 project, despite the opposition saying it would start construction on the road extension within the first 100 days of being elected.

“Obviously we’ve allocated money in the budget based on the planned rollout of Roe 8”, he said.

“It is not my responsibility to actually guess beyond the forward estimates.”

Mr L’Estrange did not say when the road extensions could be completed by.

That is not much of a plan and the people in my community who thought that these letterbox flyers offered them something were deceived. Like the member for Riverton, when I have direct conversations with those people and listen to their concerns and the things that matter to them, they understand that it is not fair to push a problem in other areas. They understand that we have a responsibility as a state government to deliver the infrastructure that will support the whole of Western Australia and the future economy of our state. There is a plan and I am pleased that there is. Hon Ben Morton asked —

So if WA Labor won’t build Roe 8 & 9, then what is their plan for their congestion in the southern suburbs?

Our plan is to protect the environment, put more freight on rail, upgrade local roads, invest in public transport, such as delivering Metronet and capping fares at two zones. It is also our plan to build the transport infrastructure, including the outer harbour, that will support our economy and Western Australia into the future.

MR D.A.E. SCAIFE (Cockburn) [8.29 pm]: I am very pleased to speak to this Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2021, which delivers on a signature commitment of the McGowan Labor government. As previous speakers have noticed, this bill has been taken to elections, and it has been very strongly supported at those elections by my electorate and all electors in the southern suburbs. The southern suburbs of Perth understand the need to balance between development and industry on the one hand and protecting the environment on the other. We are well practised. We do not get the luxury of the people in the leafy western suburbs who simply get to say no to some of the major developments in their areas. I will get to one of those projects, known as the western suburbs highway, later in my speech.

As the members for Bateman and Riverton pointed out, the Liberal Party ran very visible campaigns in the electorates in the southern suburbs—so much so that the member for Vasse was in my electorate on multiple occasions during the campaign. It occurs to me that some of her former colleagues in the Liberal Party might wonder whether the member for Vasse should have spent a bit more time in their electorates trying to save their jobs rather than running a campaign on this absolutely chaotic policy. The Liberal Party now needs to accept that it has lost the argument on Roe 8 and 9. In his second reading contribution, the member for Moore asked why we were amending the metropolitan region scheme through legislation. There is a very simple answer to that question. We are amending the metropolitan region scheme through legislation because this is an election commitment. It has been taken to two elections. It is a very significant amendment to the scheme that is supported by the community, and, quite frankly, it is exactly the same process that the Liberal Party used to reinstate the Fremantle eastern bypass. The important part now is to pass this bill and just get on with the sensible alternatives.

The theme of my contribution tonight will be about the need to end this disastrous period in planning policy under the Liberal Party—to put an end to the Liberals’ chaotic approach to planning in this corridor. Although this bill is about rezoning 34 hectares of the former Roe 8 corridor as parks and recreation reserves, it is also a significant step forward in the government’s planning and transport agenda. It is part of implementing a sensible long-term plan for transport and freight routes through the sudden suburbs and to building the outer harbour. When having this debate, it is necessary to go back to the Stephenson report, which was a blueprint for Perth’s future transport and planning needs that was developed. I see the Minister for Planning has a copy of the Stephenson report that she is engrossed in at this very moment!

Ms M.M. Quirk interjected.

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: It is a long time coming, member for Landsdale, because the Stephenson report was delivered in 1955. It is relied on by the Liberal Party to somehow show that the Perth Freight Link is part of a long-term plan, but as the minister said in her second reading speech, a lot has changed since the Stephenson report.

Ms S.F. McGurk: Not for the Liberal Party!

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: Not for the Liberal Party—quite right! I take that interjection member for Fremantle.

Ms R. Saffioti: The Weld Club is mentioned in here!

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: I am sure members of the Weld Club were involved, and we still have members of the Weld Club involved in this debate today!

Many projects not included in the Stephenson report have come to fruition now, and some were included that do not exist at all. Some of that is because of changes to the assumptions that were around at the time the report was released, but other decisions were made because, frankly, the Liberal government of the day had vested interests and a chaotic approach to planning. As I alluded to earlier, one of those projects in the Stephenson report that has never been delivered is the western suburbs highway. This was a highway that would have run down Davies Road in Claremont, crossed over on a bridge from Point Resolution to Point Walter and then continued down Stock Road. The southern portion of that corridor was known as the Fremantle eastern bypass.

I thought it be worth bringing members’ attention to an article in *Fremantle News* from October 2000. This article addresses the planning for the western suburbs highway in the Stephenson report. The journalist is interviewing a man called Peter Woodward, who is involved in the planning and design of the highway. This is from the article. It states —

I asked Woodward if it caused him some disquiet that the road now went through homes and schools which just did exist then. “Well, building roads in the metropolitan area *does* involve that” he says “So, yeah, I mean, as a traffic engineer, you’ve got problems with homes, and schools, and open space. But what’s the option? You can’t build roads up in the air.

“You know, I’ll tell you a funny thing. It turned out that the road went right through Sir Charles Court’s house, and he got to thinking that it was not such a good idea, and so the result of that was that it was moved to Fremantle. We didn’t think of the environment much in those days. I shouldn’t tell you this, but if you look at all the freeway systems, most of them were planned through wetlands, because that was the way to go. You never worried about open space. God, my head will roll for saying that. I still do some work for the Ministry of Planning, you know.

There are a few matters to take out of that article. The first comment that struck me was that roads cannot be built up in the air, but that message does not seem to have landed with the Liberal Party. I have heard all sorts of weird and wacky proposals for building Roe 8, but I think the best, and this has been my suggestion to the Liberal Party, is the way to fix all its problems is if we could just hang it from the air. If we could just put it up on wires and hang it from the sky, it would fix all the Liberal Party’s problems. But as Mr Woodward says, quite rightly, we all know we cannot build roads up in the air. The other bit of the article that is worth pulling out is that the road would have gone through Dalkeith; it would have gone through Sir Charles Court’s house, and of course the project never happened. The Liberals’ approach to planning policy is about naked vested interests.

The third thing to take out of this is that planning was always based on the idea that roads were built through wetlands, but we have a more mature approach to planning these days. We value our environment. We see some of the destruction that we have caused over the years and we are preserving natural assets like the Beeliar wetlands. The overarching point to take out of all this, of course, is that the Stephenson report was just a plan. Things change. The Fremantle eastern bypass has been deleted from the metropolitan region scheme. The report never envisioned that Tonkin Highway would be extended from Thomas Road to South Western Highway, and it was not developed at a time when we took seriously the protection of our wetlands.

As the member for Fremantle pointed out before, some things do not change, and that is the Liberals’ chaotic approach to planning. The member for Bateman pointed out before that the Liberal Party never had a plan for how it was going to link Roe 8 and Roe 9 to the port. There were lots of thought bubbles—bridges, tunnels. The former Minister for Transport endorsed the tunnel concept in 2015. He said, “We are going to build the tunnel.” As the member for Bateman pointed

out, two years later the Premier said, “There is no Roe 10. We are not tunnelling under the river. We are not building super bridges over the river.” It is completely unequivocal that not only Liberal Party had no plan, but it ruled out any plan. It did not even have a plan for Roe 9 either. The former Premier said to the ABC on 1 November 2015 —

“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 ...

Imagine that: building a road while saying that the essential second stage is too expensive and too complicated, and that there will be no final stage linking it to the port. It is a shame that Roe 8 did not go through the house of the Leader of the Liberal Party because otherwise it would never have happened, it would never have been an issue and we would not be dealing with it today.

The truth is that we should not be dealing with it today because there have always been alternatives to Roe 8. They have existed for a very long time. The development of the outer harbour, as the minister noted in her second reading speech, was contemplated in the Stephenson report. We go back to this engrossing document. About 40 years after the Stephenson report was released, on 18 March 1996 the Liberal state government endorsed Kwinana naval base as the appropriate location for the outer harbour. Of course, it was also supported by former Premier Hon Colin Barnett, who said to ABC news, again on 1 November 2015 —

“We’ve also got one eye firmly on the construction of an outer harbour at Cockburn so the decision will also be influenced by that.”

That was a sensible approach from the former member for Cottesloe because the southern coastal strip has been a site for heavy industry for the better part of a century. The outer harbour imported bulk cargo for years, frankly. The natural next step in the expansion of Perth is the development of the outer harbour. That plan is now backed by the rigorous and independent assessment of the Westport Taskforce.

Going back to those statements I set out earlier, it was a Liberal government that endorsed the location in 1996. In 2015, a Liberal Premier also again endorsed the outer harbour. It is clear that the development of the outer harbour has long been a bipartisan proposition. It was shocking to see the Liberal Party campaigning against it as though it were some new idea that it had only just found out about; perpetrating a fraud on the people of the southern suburbs, pretending that this was not a concept it had supported for many years.

I listened with great interest to the member for Cottesloe’s contribution when he suggested that there was no need for an outer harbour because the inner harbour at Fremantle port is not currently at capacity. Of course, the simple answer to that is that this government’s plan is long term. It is not about capacity today; it is about future capacity. In any event, putting that aside, the truth is that the member for Cottesloe already knows the answer to his question because the Kwinana Industries Council released a report in January 2018 while the member for Cottesloe was the president of the Kwinana Industries Council! I have that report here and it is titled *Trade flows and the development of Westport*. In big capital letters, so we cannot miss it, it says “Why build the Kwinana Outer Harbour when there is still capacity in the inner harbour?” It is literally the question that the member for Cottesloe posed during the second reading. I will read it out because it provides all the answers that the member for Cottesloe needs. It states —

There are many reasons to build the new port in Kwinana, but the main ones are to;

1. **Provide** the scale and international competitiveness needed for exporters.
2. **Stimulate** regional economic development through major construction projects.
3. **Generate** demand for the development of the existing vacant industrial land within the Western Trade Coast,
4. **Improve** the supply chain and address deficiencies that compromise the efficiency of the Fremantle inner harbour,
5. **Underpin** the justification for long term investment in the required infrastructure so that the port and integrated supply chain can improve international competitiveness, and
6. **Provide** an opportunity to integrate an Industrial Park ... into a new and modernised port providing the local industrial environment for increased processing of raw materials thereby diversifying the economy and creating jobs.

It may not have been written by the member for Cottesloe but it was certainly released by the Kwinana Industries Council, on his watch.

There is another fascinating part in the report. I was hoping that maybe the member for Vasse or the member for Cottesloe could take this back to Hon Ben Morton, the member for Tangney, because there is a set of recommendations on page 19. Under the title “Federal Government”, the report states—

Reallocating of the Perth Freightlink funding

Currently, the Federal Government has \$A1.2bil allocated to the terminated Perth Freightlink project. **It is recommended that these funds be reallocated to the freight road construction and upgrades along**

Anketell and Rowley Roads in Kwinana along to the Tonkin Hwy. This would allow direct freight access from Kwinana to Kewdale and north to Muchea. This would be a major step in the development of the outer harbour and it is understood that MainRoads WA has already completed the majority of the planning.

There it is, member for Cottesloe. If the member is looking for answers to his questions, look no further than a report that was released by the council that he was president of at the time!

Another thing that the member for Cottesloe should think about doing is coming clean with his constituents on the impact of not building the outer harbour. The minister has alluded to this before. If we overload the inner harbour, congestion on Curtin Avenue will invariably increase. It will require either upgrading Curtin Avenue to a four-lane highway or putting an additional four-lane road through the area, somewhere nearby. I saw the member for Cottesloe seemingly dismiss this when the minister interjected during the second reading debate. It has been the Liberals' policy for many years that it would have to do this, but it just hid it.

I have brought another prop. This is a beautiful document that I took out of the library. It is titled *Fremantle: Regional strategy* and is dated December 1994. It is another engrossing read. This was released by Hon Richard Lewis, then Liberal Minister for Planning. There is a picture of Hon Richard Lewis' smiling face on the foreword page. He described the document as a comprehensive planning guide for the future development of the Fremantle region. On page 6 of the report, there is a consideration about what would need to happen to Stirling Highway and Curtin Avenue in the future. It says that traffic forecasts suggest that by 2021 the area would require a total of eight traffic lanes on two primary roads through the peninsula. It then goes through several different recommendations before endorsing recommendation 2b. I quote recommendation 2b —

Widen Stirling Highway to four lanes divided, replace Curtin Avenue, Cottesloe with a new four lanes divided road ...

That is what would have to happen for the member for Cottesloe's constituents if the outer harbour did not go ahead. [Member's time extended.]

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: In contrast to the chaotic approach of past Liberal governments, this government is already at work creating the transport corridors that are necessary for the outer harbour. Those are projects such as the extension of Tonkin Highway and the development at Anketell and Thomas Roads. The government allocated \$505 million in the 2019–20 budget to extend Tonkin Highway from Thomas Road to South Western Highway. It also allocated \$366 million in the 2019–20 budget for the Tonkin Highway corridor project from Roe Highway to Kelvin Road. Planning will commence for the works that are needed in respect of Anketell and Thomas Roads. That is a sensible plan for creating an east–west corridor that will actually go to the port! A transport corridor that will actually go to the port is a novel concept for the Liberals.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Mr D.A.E. SCAIFE: It is very unusual, member for Cannington, to consider having a policy that means transport networks go to where they need to. This plan will cater for our future needs and it will connect our freight facilities and our industry in the eastern suburbs to the new port. This bill underscores that Roe 8 and Roe 9 are not the way forward. Plainly, that land will be better used as parks and recreation, and the land west of North Lake Road developed for other purposes. The commitment must be to the outer harbour and the associated corridor being developed by this government.

As I come to the end of my contribution, it is worth reflecting on an issue that has been raised by the members for Riverton and Bateman. That is the fraud that was perpetrated on the people of the southern suburbs by the Liberals when they suggested that somehow all traffic woes for people in the southern suburbs would be fixed—would be magicked away—by this one issue, building Roe 8. There is no doubt that there are traffic management issues in Cockburn. It is a growing area. I am one of those new people who have moved into areas that were once market gardens. I know from living in Yangebup that it is an area that has growing pains. But this is a government that is just getting on with the job. It is not talking and taking a decade to come up with plans that do not do what they are intended to do. This government does not have any need for roads to nowhere, because it is doing practical work. The minister is overseeing practical work to bust congestion in the electorate of Cockburn.

This government has made huge investments in infrastructure to bust congestion and to create local jobs. Consider first the freeway widening between Russell Road and Roe Highway, delivered by this government at an estimated cost of \$49 million and with 340 local jobs supported. Consider the installation of the smart freeway, delivered, with a \$56 million estimated investment and 245 local jobs supported. Minister, I would like to personally thank you for that initiative, as someone who travels up that freeway; it has plainly shaved time off the commute into the CBD. There is also the Armadale Road–North Lake Road Bridge project, which will remove heavy regional traffic flows from local traffic into places like the train station and the shopping centre at Cockburn Gateway. That is more than two-thirds complete and is coming along very nicely, with an estimated investment of \$237 million by this government and 1 400 jobs supported. There is also the upgrade to the Stock Road–Beeliar Drive intersection in my electorate. That is a \$7 million commitment. I know from driving that way that works are getting very close to completion. There is also the Murdoch Drive connection that this government has delivered on and completed,

a \$112.5 million investment and 700 local jobs supported. That is \$461 million of investment in local roads and infrastructure that benefits my local community of Cockburn. That is a real solution. That is not a chaotic road to nowhere. It is a solution that has busted congestion and slashed travel times.

What has to be said is that there is no need for Roe 8. This Labor government has a plan and we need to stick to it. The Liberal Party needs to stop the disingenuous campaign on Roe 8 and the outer harbour. The last election conclusively ended the debate. It is a fool's errand to continue pursuing it. I almost want to invite the Liberal Party. When I saw the campaign material that the member for Bateman held up, I thought some of her best volunteers had put out that material in the electorate. We should be thanking them for their efforts. Please run this again for the Labor Party! But, honestly, for the good of the state of Western Australia, just give it up. This bill is the manifestation of the government's convincing win in both the local area and throughout the state. This bill makes clear that the Beelihar wetlands will be protected, that the Liberals' reckless road to nowhere will not go ahead and that this government is instead focused on projects that are making, and will make, a real difference to my constituents.

I commend the bill to the house.

MR Y. MUBARAKAI (Jandakot — Parliamentary Secretary) [8.53 pm]: I rise this evening to make a brief statement on this splendid Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2021 that has been put forward by the Minister for Planning. I have to say, minister, that this bill pretty much sums up one of the most sensitive issues in my electorate of Jandakot. I hope members of this house will allow me to share my experience and my perceptions and dealings on the issue of Roe 8. I have heard other members on my side make some amazing contributions about their perspective of their communities in pretty much voicing their opinion against the extension and the longstanding issue with Roe 8 and 9.

The Labor government has had a hard-fought victory on this issue. When I say "hard fought", it is because my journey has been in the southern corridor for the last 24 years. In the last 15 years, I have lived in the City of Cockburn, in Success, where I have raised my beautiful family, and my family runs some small businesses there. I was equally fortunate enough to become a councillor at the City of Cockburn in 2011. If members of this house would allow me to indulge in that time frame, I clearly remember that in 2008, the Labor government, when last in government, had introduced the Beelihar wetlands into the metropolitan region scheme. In the very same year, the Barnett government had basically eradicated the Beelihar wetlands from the metropolitan region scheme. I remember as a candidate for council in 2010 that heaps of people who lived in the local area objected, as they would, because such an important piece of our environmental ecosystem was in danger of absolutely being eradicated with heavy infrastructure going through it. In that journey of becoming a councillor and engaging at the grassroots and talking to the community, it was pretty evident that people in the southern corridor did not want an extension of Roe 8 and 9.

Moving forward into the 2016 framework, when the sneaky Liberal Barnett government signed off to destroy some of the wetlands, that was quite disappointing. I have to say that the Labor Party took that to the 2017 election as a promise to stop those works if we were elected. Funnily enough, in the 2017 election, there were candidates who stood up for the extension of Roe 8 and 9, thinking that it was a popular issue in the southern corridor. Members of this house would be surprised to know that some of those candidates received fewer than 1 000 votes. That was the first indication.

Reflecting back on my journey in 2016 as a candidate, Jandakot was a safe Liberal seat. A very strong message of misinformation was coming from the federal member and the local community about how the extension of Roe 8 and 9 was economically important to Western Australia, and in particular about the hazardous issues on Leach Highway, which were causing distress among residents in my electorate about safety and security on their travels along Leach Highway. They failed to understand that Fremantle port is an important asset for Western Australia. They said it was planned decades and decades ago with the foresight of eventually having Roe 8 and 9 connect through the farmlands and market gardens into a port. These decisions, which were being made to score political points and gain popularity, clearly deflected quite badly onto the Liberal campaigns. As we saw in 2017, when I was involved in campaigning in the seat of Jandakot in my local area, it was pretty clear from the indications and the conversations among community members that the Roe 8 and 9 project was an important piece of infrastructure to deal with the dangerous hazards on Leach Highway, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am saying that for the first time, and, by the way, congratulations on your role as Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member.

Mr Y. MUBARAKAI: I find it hard to understand that Western Australia is looked upon as an economic hub and a strong trading partner for Australia and its exports, yet our port is surrounded by urban sprawl. We can look around the world at other growing economies, but our growing state has to rely on a port that, as I said, was planned 40 years ago and is now surrounded by urban housing and communities. That is an absolutely disastrous situation. We know that for the next 40 to 60 years, the economy of this state will continue to prosper and grow. Therefore, I again commend the McGowan government and the Minister for Planning for looking at the outer harbour in Kwinana, which is perfectly suited. It is a perfect piece of economic infrastructure for a port that is surrounded by industry and will be connected via key infrastructure such as roads like the Tonkin Highway and freight lines that will take commercial vehicles to the ports in a way that will be less disruptive to the community.

The importance of this bill is not just the hard-fought victory. It is also about our responsibilities as a government to our community on the environmental impact this will have. I say this with pure sincerity. The Beelihar wetlands is an important ecosystem in our southern corridors. It is recognised not only as a state-based asset, but also internationally for its environmental contributions.

I present a document to the chamber. This is a copy of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. I will read an extract from this document. It is an agreement under which Australia, along with 170 other countries, promised to conserve wetlands. I would like to refer to point 1 of article 3 of this convention. It stipulates —

The Contracting Parties shall formulate and implement their planning so as to promote the conservation of the wetlands included in the List, and as far as possible the wise use of wetlands in their territory.

Thomsons Lake, also known as the Jilbup Lake to the local Whadjuk Noongar people, is one of the lakes that makes up the wetlands. It is also recognised under this convention as a site of national importance.

A number of areas in the Beelihar wetlands are also protected due to the migratory birds that have been identified and sighted. These areas are basically protected because of the significance of and environmental issues around the migratory birds. I present another document, which is titled “Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of Japan for the Protection of Migratory Birds in Danger of Extinction and their Environment”. I quote —

Desiring to co-operate in taking measures for the management and protection of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction and also for the management and protection of their environments ...

Another document refers to a similar agreement between Australia and the People’s Republic of China. It states —

Desiring to co-operate in the protection of migratory birds and their environment ...

These highlights basically show that the Beelihar wetlands are of significance not only locally but also internationally. It is our duty to protect them. The Beelihar wetlands also hold cultural importance for the local Whadjuk Noongar people.

The Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2021 introduced by this government will change the zoning in the metropolitan region scheme so that the area zoned for Roe 8 will be rezoned as parks and recreation. The McGowan government has gone above and beyond what is in this bill. As I said earlier, the Beelihar wetlands area has been designated as an A-class reserve in recognition of its importance to the environment and the community. This will guarantee that the protection of the wetlands and the rehabilitation of the areas that were cleared by the Barnett government is well and truly underway.

The process of moving forward also includes engagement with the local schools, whereby students will have the opportunity to learn about and appreciate our wetlands. The plan also includes a partnership with Murdoch University for research and education. In recognition of the cultural importance of the wetlands, an Aboriginal heritage survey has been conducted, as well as engagement with the local Aboriginal communities in the creation of trails and signage in the area. A new wildlife hospital is being built at Beelihar wetlands alongside the wetlands education centre.

I take this opportunity to thank some of the stakeholders who have made tremendous and important contributions to this bill and its journey to this place, where we can once and for all put an end to a commitment that we took to the 2017 and 2021 elections. I would like to acknowledge the Save Beelihar Wetlands group, Urban Bushland Council WA and the Wetlands Centre Cockburn. I take this opportunity to thank these groups as well as the many volunteers who have engaged with the local community on this issue.

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning) [9.06 pm] — in reply: I would like to thank everyone for their contributions to this debate on the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beelihar Wetlands) Bill 2021. We have heard really strong contributions this evening about the history of this issue and on the future of freight and trade in WA.

I think we can safely say that we have a mandate for this legislation. Let us go through it. This election campaign was fought on many issues, but particularly on Roe 8 and 9. The Liberal Party again made it a core part of its election campaign, and we heard from the members for Bateman, Riverton, Jandakot, Cockburn, Fremantle and Bickton that, at varying levels, this was the biggest campaign they ran in their electorates. Make no mistake: everyone was clear about our position. We have a mandate for this legislation, and it would be great to have one member of the opposition here sitting in this chamber to listen to my response, because I sat and listened to everybody. I had to sit and listen to every contribution that they made.

There can be no denying that we have a mandate for this. I want to get back to 2017, because that was a really tough election. As opposition spokesperson for transport and planning, as we approached that election, I saw the community campaign on this issue. In particular, the members for Fremantle and, of course, the member for Willagee—sorry, member for Willagee—were very strong about this issue. I looked at it and I thought that we needed to be strong and take a very clear position to the election in 2017. We could have not done that. We could have just flown under the radar, but I remember very well standing on that North Lake Road alignment, I think on 3 or 4 January 2017, after grabbing a coffee from the member for Jandakot’s café. We went out, as I said, on the front foot, to make it

very clear that we would not be building that road. This was a major risk. We could have not told the truth, but we did. We told everybody our position, and we won that election. Many of those members were returned after vicious campaigns. We brought legislation to this house and there was somehow this idea that we did not have a mandate. So we took it to another election, the election just past. Look at all the seats along that corridor, starting with Riverton, Bateman, Bicton, Willagee, Jandakot, Fremantle and Cockburn. We won all those seats. Again, they were vicious campaigns. I was with the member for Riverton a couple of times at a polling booth and a vicious and awful campaign was run against the member for Riverton. It was vicious, awful, personal and dirty. I went to a number of polling booths. The intensity was not as great at my polling booth in West Swan, where the Liberal candidate was hiding for most of it. That is where we saw the viciousness of the campaign. We took our opposition to Roe 8 to the people and made it clear. The difference could not have been clearer. We would not do it and we would reintroduce our legislation, and the Liberal Party would do it. It announced it again and again and again. I have the picture in my parliamentary office of “Honk for Roe 8 Day”. There was a clear difference.

I say to this chamber that we have a mandate. As I said, it would be good to have the respect of the Liberal and National Parties and have at least one person sitting in their chair listening to this. I want to go through the Liberal Party’s record on Roe 8 and 9. I have been trying to imagine what Roe 8 and 9 is to the Liberal Party. It is like Xanadu, this magical place. Members opposite cannot really describe or touch it, but somehow it is magical. The definition of “Xanadu” is a dreamlike place of magnificence and luxury. The Liberal Party has pinned two elections on this dream project that is the panacea for everything. You have congestion? This will fix it. You want job creation? This will fix it. You have a headache? This will fix it. It just got to a ridiculous point that somehow Roe 8 and 9 was going to fix every public policy issue.

Let us go through the Liberal Party’s record. Members would know that, along with others in this chamber, I was in opposition for eight and a half years. In eight and a half years, the former Liberal–National government did not build the project. It was so committed to this project that for eight and a half years, after making an election commitment to do it, it could not get the project happening. Why? I mean, if it was such a great project, why did it not do it in eight and a half years? Remember that it was not as though the Liberal–National government cared about the finances. We could say that because the former government’s financial management was so strong that it was careful about how it spent money, but we know that that was not the case. The former government was spending everywhere, but it never delivered what it said was the biggest transport project in this state. It had eight and a half years.

In the lead-up to the most recent election, we saw “Honk for Roe 8 Day”. The Liberal Party claimed that it would start building the project within 100 days, even though it had no existing environmental approval, nothing in place and no tender. Its commitment was to start building it in 100 days. The member for Bateman was right. On costing day, we were sitting there. I was part of the team waiting to see the election costings and I was saying to the team, “Where is the Roe 8 money? How much would the Liberal Party spend on Roe 8 and 9?” I cannot remember its total costs, but it committed billions of dollars. I think it was \$20 billion or \$30 billion. On costing day, it said it would spend \$2 billion or something; I cannot remember. It was so ridiculous. We were saying, “Where is Roe 8 and 9?” The Liberal Party said, “Oh, \$125 million will be spent for the entire project.” In a true accounting sense, that should have picked up the federal government money, too. The Liberal Party’s whole spending was \$125 million after it said it would commence the project in 100 days. It has been a fraud from day one. If it really wanted to build it, it had eight and a half years to do so. It is like me winning and saying, “Oh, I’m going to wait for three months before the 2025 election to start doing any work on the Ellenbrook railway line.” The equivalent would be if we won, we committed to do the Ellenbrook railway line and I waited for seven and a half years before we even started thinking about entering into a contract to build the thing. The Liberal–National government had its chance to not only build it, but also commit to it properly, but it could not do that. It could not build it in eight and a half years and in an election campaign, it could not even commit to it properly. That is how bad it was on this project.

Members have outlined very well that the proposed road would not have reached the port. There is no denying that. The road would not have reached the port and every time we asked the Liberal–National government how it would reach the port, there was a different answer. There would be a tunnel at the bottom of the river or maybe a new bridge. I mean, the answers were everywhere! But the former government never committed to how it would get to the port. Today, the Liberal Party still cannot tell us how it would get to the port. The member for Riverton raised placard loads, which everyone understands as well.

I want to mention another thing, which the member for Cottesloe denies. He says that somehow moving to the outer harbour would not decrease the number of trucks on Curtin Avenue; it is just wrong. If we keep the Fremantle inner harbour operating and expanding, in a never-ending process, Curtin Avenue will, basically, have to be widened to a four-lane highway. The people of the North Fremantle area understand that.

I am going to say another thing because again, to be honest, I explored this whole issue when I was in opposition. I explored all the arguments because I came to, in a sense, a bit of a blank sheet. I listened to the members for Fremantle and Willagee and I started to absorb all the issues, and there was always this question at the back of my mind: would we need Roe 8 and 9 if we went to the outer harbour? That argument was put and I really wanted to discover the answer. It is an argument that is still put. When I studied it, I thought: that is a silly thing. Of course

we would not need Roe 8 and 9 if we go to the outer harbour, because then people would, basically, go through traffic to go down the coast, along Stock Road or Rockingham Road. The amount of work that would be needed on those roads due to their undulating nature and the number of traffic lights required would cost another couple of billion dollars. Of course, we would not need that. We would look to the eastern corridor.

I think many of these members do not know what Tonkin Highway is. That is my view. Some of us who know the eastern suburbs pretty well understand the nature of Tonkin Highway. Tonkin Highway is now the major freight mover north–south, particularly with the link to Muchea and the continued program of removing traffic lights and putting in grade separations, such as those that are funded across the forward estimates at Kelvin Road, Hale Road and Welshpool Road. Of course, part of the plan is to extend Tonkin Highway south to Mundijong. Why would someone go across the suburbs to Stock Road and then south? Why would someone not just continue east and go across with the new Anketell Road–Thomas Road corridor? Of course, that is the answer. The concept that we would need it even with the outer harbour is completely false. Like I said, when I was in opposition, I tried to make sure that I had the right position on all these issues, so I did research and tried to understand it and the arguments that the former government put for projects.

Mr D.A.E. Scaife interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, right. We were in opposition, and that is what we did. We look at the arguments that are put forward and try to say whether they are valid or not. With that one, I very soon realised that you would not bring all the freight through the suburbs; why would you not just use the freight corridor which is, in a sense, Tonkin Highway?

I want to make a point about the politics of this project. The member for Cottesloe stood up to speak when there had been an accident on Leach Highway; it was disgraceful. As I have said in this place before, the Liberal Party committed to building the Ellenbrook rail line. Every time there is an accident between here and Ellenbrook, we could say, “Oh, if they’d built the Ellenbrook rail line, that accident wouldn’t have happened.” That is the same logic. I have never done that, and I never will do that because it is disgraceful gutter politics. The member came in that day with no understanding of the type of accident it was or what vehicles were involved, and somehow blamed the accident on the government for not building Roe 8. It was absolutely disgraceful, but it again shows where the Liberal Party is on this project. It does not deal with facts; it deals with the Stephenson plan.

I have heard so much about the Stephenson plan—the *Plan for the metropolitan region, Perth and Fremantle, Western Australia, 1955: a report prepared for the government of Western Australia*—that I thought I would read from it. It is interesting reading; there are a number of things in it that I find quite ironic. There is one passage that makes reference to Sherwood Court in the city. In the past, if we looked from St Georges Terrace down Sherwood Court, there was grassland at the bottom, where the previous government built Elizabeth Quay. It states —

The Swan River and adjoining open space provided a valuable contrast with the close development of the Central Area.

That is why we should have kept grassland at Elizabeth Quay, according to the Stephenson plan. I do not think we should have built Elizabeth Quay, because Stephenson said in 1955 that we want to look down and see a transition between buildings and the river, with some grassland. That has gone; how dare they modify the Stephenson plan!

Ms S.F. McGurk: Close to the Weld Club!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is around the corner from the Weld Club!

Time and again the Liberal Party talks about Cockburn Sound and growth into the outer harbour. Back in 1955, Stephenson observed that in the longer term, extensions into Cockburn Sound would almost certainly be necessary and that studies and survey work should be commenced at the earliest opportunity. That was in 1955. There was already discussion about the outer harbour and the fact that we would need to grow into the outer harbour because Fremantle would be constrained. If members want to talk about the Stephenson plan, let us talk about the whole Stephenson plan. The Liberal Party destroyed the vision down Sherwood Court by building Elizabeth Quay because the grassland was a transition. Let us go through the whole Stephenson plan, which talks about the outer harbour.

I turn to the road network. Of course, the Stephenson plan was a very, very important document. When we look around Perth, there are many key features that started with the Stephenson plan. It was a very good document. It tried to describe growth in some of the key road corridors, but Perth has changed a lot since 1955. Tonkin Highway was the Beechboro–Gosnells Highway. Everyone knows that Tonkin Highway does not look like that anymore. The nature of Tonkin Highway has changed, the nature of the freeway has changed and the nature of the east–west corridors has changed. A lot has changed over time, so the idea that the Liberal Party would pick out one concept and say, “That is absolutely integral to the future of Western Australia”, and ignore everything else is a false study of history and a false interpretation of the Stephenson plan. It is absolutely dishonest.

Let us talk about the Stephenson plan. As I said, members opposite should all be condemned for not leaving the grassland as page whatever said should be the transition between Sherwood Court and the water! We cannot just pick one component of the Stephenson plan and say it is integral to the movement of freight; we have to look at the entire thing.

I also want to talk about the Kwinana Industries Council, and I am glad the member for Cockburn highlighted it. That was a 2018 position statement, I think. I went back even further to 2015, when the member for Cottesloe was president of the Kwinana Industries Council. I want to refer to a submission it made to the Senate committee that looked at the Perth Freight Link project—the Senate Standing Committees on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport. The submission was from the Kwinana Industries Council, when the member for Cottesloe was president. The submission states —

Over many years there has been bipartisan agreement over successive governments that there needs to be an Outer Harbour built in Cockburn Sound adjacent to the KIA, the State’s premier industrial area. Delays for various reasons have led to the situation where there has been no progress toward a decision to build the Outer Harbour for years now, despite a decision on the “Outer Harbour” port being a key decision catalyst for the economic development of the State.

The Fremantle Inner Harbour can grow within its boundaries, but in the long term, the pressure the gentrification process is placing on the Port continues to make it more difficult for the freight task to and from the Port.

The submission states, further along —

This submission does not set out to question the voracity of the planning for the Perth Freight Link. What it does set out to do is to raise awareness that at some time in the future the Inner Harbour could be closed to freight import and export, and possibly converted to some other activity such as an entertainment and tourism precinct revitalization for Fremantle City, servicing cruise and naval ships, and much new residential development. Further, that if it is understood the Inner Harbour might ultimately be closed to cargo freight, is it not then better to plan for the construction of the Outer Harbour in Kwinana in two stages. And do it soon?

That was a submission from the council of which the member for Cottesloe was president.

I also refer to a 2015 position paper on the west coast trade protection area, again when the member for Cottesloe was president of the Kwinana Industries Council, in which it was observed —

Within the next 10 years, it is likely the Port of Fremantle’s Outer Harbour at Cockburn Sound will be built. This will be a catalytic project, sparking massive industrial development ranging from heavy chemical, refining and manufacturing. The many new support industries required to service them will be located toward the edge of the WTC boundary within the Protection Area.

This was the position of the member for Cottesloe a number of years ago. There was always planning and there was always a bipartisan approach for the outer harbour. Now he has completely abandoned that. This is where the Liberal Party has taken a leap. It wanted to build the Perth Freight Link, but it said, “Oh, we don’t need it for freight; we can use it for everything, even if you build the outer harbour.” It took another leap and said that we did not need the outer harbour. That is where it is now. It has a vacuum of policy development and understanding of freight needs.

The project started as the Perth Freight Link; then the Liberal Party realised that that was not very popular, so it said, “Oh, we don’t need it for freight, we just need it for cars. Even if you build the outer harbour, you need it anyway.” Now it’s position is that we need Perth Freight Link and Roe 8 and 9, but we cannot build the outer harbour. Even though Cockburn Sound has been an operating port and industrial area for many years, even though as president of the Kwinana Industries Council the member for Cottesloe advocated for the outer harbour, and even though the document states how proud all the industrial players were to be operating in Cockburn Sound, the Liberal Party, after arguing for this project for many, many years, now somehow believes that the environment of Cockburn Sound would be severely impacted. I see that as the height of hypocrisy. How can anyone come into this place and argue something completely opposite after being head of a council that wanted and supported a new port?

As I said, the Liberals advocated for the Perth Freight Link. The Liberal Party had eight and a half years but it stuffed it up. There were battles between the then Minister for Transport, Dean Nalder, and the then Premier, Colin Barnett. They were not talking to each other. They banned each other’s staff from visiting their office. It was a complete farce. They stuffed around and could not deliver it. They tried to get money and had secret meetings with federal politicians. It was the worst way to deliver a project in this state. They signed a contract in the last few days of the Liberal–National government. We won the 2017 election with a clear agenda. We cancelled the contract, saved Beelihar wetlands and revegetated it. A comment was made about shrubs and the member for Bicton and her community groups’ work. Again, it was completely disparaging. I cannot remember how many trees were replanted—millions. The amount of work that has been done to revegetate that area is incredible. Anyone who has seen it will understand that the level of revegetation is incredible.

Ms S.F. McGurk: And community commitment.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, and basically it was done by community volunteers. Those remarks were completely disparaging. The member then said that we ignored congestion in the southern suburbs. Members, let us go through those projects. Roe 8 and 9 was the Liberal Party’s one-trick pony.

Ms S.E. Winton: What about the northern suburbs?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: We could go through the original redirection. There are so many projects. Remember, we went to the 2017 election saying, “We’re not going to build Roe 8 and 9, but we will build other projects.” Do members know what? We have either delivered those projects or they are being delivered—every single project. Sometimes I sit back and reflect on the previous government, which committed to the Metro Area Express and the Ellenbrook line. Sometimes I think about all the work that I am trying to do. There are often challenges and hurdles, but then I sit back and think, “At least I’m delivering them”, as opposed to the Liberals, who went to elections with billion-dollar projects. They stood there again and again. I remember the MAX light rail so well. The Liberals had maps and USB drives done up as little MAX light rail.

Ms S.F. McGurk: They were telling people to buy property.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, to buy property along the route. They had more merchandise for MAX light rail than anyone has seen for any project. They produced the merchandise but they did not deliver the project. Let us go through the projects.

Ms S.E. Winton: Are we sitting late tonight? There’s so much to list!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I know. Obviously, I will concentrate on the southern corridor. I am sorry, member for Wanneroo! Several members interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Okay, I will mention a couple of projects in her electorate. Of course, the Beelie wetlands redirection helped to fund the Wanneroo Road duplication and the two Wanneroo Road overpasses at Joondalup Drive and Ocean Reef Drive. We delivered those projects because we redirected the money from Perth Freight Link. The Liberals have the idea that somehow the southern suburbs did not benefit from any project. Rarely in politics do people come up to members in a positive way—unless you are the Premier—and say, “That project was great.” That is what I get about smart freeways all the time, whether it is from a soccer coach or people I meet in the shops. They come up to me and say, “Smart freeways; that was a bit risky, but you did it and it delivered benefits.” Smart freeway was a great project that we delivered along the corridor. We widened the freeway between Russell Road and Roe Highway, which has been highlighted. We did the Murdoch Drive connection, fast-tracked the Armadale Road duplication and we are building the Armadale Road to North Lake Road bridge, which costs over \$200 million, to reduce congestion around Cockburn. I understand that there is congestion in a lot of areas but when people drove north—it will get better once the Armadale Road to North Lake Road bridge is finished and the Thornlie–Cockburn works are in the middle of the freeway—every time they hit that Cockburn Central area, they had to slam on the brakes because of a massive traffic jam. The widening, the new Armadale–North Lake bridge, the local distributor road and the expansion of the Thornlie–Cockburn network with the Thornlie–Cockburn Link has reduced and will reduce congestion. Karel Avenue is another bottleneck, or pinch point, across that corridor. We have done more than we committed to do to facilitate the new work for the Thornlie–Cockburn Link, plus we have widened that project. I have not mentioned the Ranford Road bridge. It was not in my notes but I will talk about it. It was two lanes each way, but we are expanding it to four lanes each way, including a dedicated busway. That is a big project and that is something that is part of the Thornlie–Cockburn Link.

Mr W.J. Johnston: The Nicholson Road Bridge.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, the Nicholson Road Bridge and other major works across the entire southern corridor.

The member for Cottesloe has this idea that we have not done anything in the southern suburbs. I do not believe the member for Cottesloe goes south of the river because what we have done across the area is transformative.

I turn to the Westport Taskforce plan in which we committed to a number of key aspects. We committed to increasing the amount of freight on rail—the member for Fremantle outlined that clearly—but we want to do more. We have increased freight on rail to 20 per cent. We have stabilised around 20 per cent of freight going through the port on rail, but we want to do more. I think it is equivalent to about 100 000 truck movements a year. As part of that—this is new—we are building the new traffic bridge in Fremantle. That will improve safety and reduce maintenance costs on the existing traffic bridge and it will increase the capacity for more freight on rail. We hope to deliver that very soon.

Mr W.J. Johnston: There are actually less trucks now than there were before we came to government.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I think that is what the modelling shows.

Mr P. Papalia: Fewer.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, fewer.

We increased the freight on rail. We said that we wanted to support the development of intermodals. Forrestfield is operating well and we are looking at continuing to support the Kenwick facility. It is my understanding that that is an aspiration of the Muchea–Bullsbrook area and Mundijong over time. We are doing more modelling on the source and destination of containers because it is about not only Forrestfield and Kenwick, but also the issue of where the distribution centres are and how we can better move containers in and out of those distribution centres. The freight on rail project has been a massive effort. We said that we would improve High Street. That project is pretty big.

I drove to Fremantle recently and that project is well underway. It is a complex project and there had to be negotiations with a number of key associations, including the golf course. All up, it will improve the safety of the vehicles and the local community will be able to cross the road using the two underpasses. This will support safer access to the netball courts, which has been a major issue. I know there is disruption at the moment, but a lot of families were parking on the golf course side and crossing the four lanes on a very busy road with no median. This will support safety in that area.

Of course, there is Westport. We started work. We commissioned the Westport Taskforce, which made a number of recommendations that the government adopted in August last year, and now we are moving to implement those recommendations. The Liberals can ignore the fact that we are an exporting state, but we all understand that the future is in Kwinana. The Liberals' idea that we can continue with Fremantle port for the next 50 to 100 years is false. In their heart of hearts, do they think that Fremantle port can continue for the next 50 to 100 years? It is not possible. We are planning for a new port and, as part of that, it is an incredible opportunity to make sure that we have a port that helps future generations continue the freight and trade challenge. We are looking at the land along the whole Kwinana strip and how we can better coordinate and support development along there. We are looking at the Anketell Road–Thomas Road corridor, a key east–west corridor that will feed freight into the port from the east. We are looking at how we can further support more rail connections and develop the movement of containers throughout that area. As the member for Fremantle said, we are also looking at the future of Fremantle. We understand that people are very keen to engage in what Fremantle should look like in the future. We have already started on the Victoria Quay site, with a commitment for a new brewery to be developed, which is underway, and the new film studio.

As we work our way around the inner harbour, we will be looking at all the possibilities of what we can create in Fremantle, which, again, will be world-class and serve generations to come. People want this long-term planning. We can stick to the 1955 plan or we can create our own vision for the future—a vision that better reflects Western Australia's place in the world as a major exporting state. We also understand that times change. Many people live along the freight corridor to Fremantle. We understand that challenges will continue to grow over time. That is why we had a plan for the outer harbour. People talk about vandalism. The Liberal Party is promoting economic vandalism.

I want to talk about the bill. I think the member for Moore, who unfortunately could not be here tonight, asked why we are doing this and why we do not amend the MRS. This bill will amend the MRS. I think he said, "Why are you doing this? We should be amending the MRS." This bill will amend the MRS. We are amending the MRS through legislation. Comments will be made by members on the other side that it is not the normal process. It has been used in the past, and we are using it for this purpose. The idea that there has been no consultation and no-one is aware of this issue is not plausible. This has been the most widely discussed and debated issue in the community over the past two elections. We had a very clear position. As I said, we took a very bold move in early 2017. We said that we would not continue with the contract to build that project. When we won government, we renegotiated that project and we preserved the corridor. We did everything we said we were going to do. We took it to the election and we took it to the next election. Again, we are seeing an opposition that will not accept the mandate on this legislation. When we come into this place and people talk about mandates, what hope do we have if the Liberal Party and the Nationals WA will not accept our mandate? They do not accept our ability to deliver anything in this place if they do not accept our mandate on this legislation.

The wetlands are a very special place for many people—we saw that through the campaigns and the community action. People like to write off the campaigners as a bunch of activists or people on the extreme side of campaigning, but they were from all walks of life. I have never seen an entire community so activated as it was during this campaign. I am really proud that we have been able to deliver what we told the people in early 2017.

We have already amended the A-class reserve with this project. People understand that. We have already made these wetlands an A-class reserve. It will require an agreement of both houses of Parliament to change that A-class reserve. This legislation is the logical first step to change the MRS. There is no other purpose for the majority of this land but parks and recreation. It is as simple as that. We have made it very clear to the community that we want future generations to enjoy these wetlands. We owe it to the Western Australian public to get on with preserving the wetlands for future generations, and planning and building the outer harbour and the road and rail connections that lead to it. That is what the people want and deserve. I think people are sick of this debate. They want us to be allowed to get on with doing what we told them we were going to do, which is to preserve the wetlands and plan and build the future port. It makes economic sense. It has been a bipartisan approach for many years.

Fuelled by the opposition's keenness to be liked by the federal government and to have some support through Ben Morton, you guys have basically thrown away any economic logic. We heard some of the other claims about the \$1.2 billion. It is a contingent liability. I do not want to go through what \$1.2 billion is to accountants. It means it does not sit on their bottom line. If the feds are so keen to give us another \$1.2 billion, I will take it for other projects. That is what we did this year. We asked for \$1.2 billion worth of projects and we got them, so we will continue to do that. Every time there is \$1.2 billion in the budget, we will say, "Okay, we will take \$1.2 billion of projects",

and we will continue to do that. I know that the federal government is desperate to be seen as Mark McGowan's friend. I saw it in today's paper. Federal government members cannot wait to stand next to Mark McGowan. They are not standing next to the state Liberal Party, but they cannot wait to stand next to Mark McGowan. In a desperate attempt to try to have friends in the federal government, the opposition will do whatever Ben Morton wants it to do. I do not think Ben Morton's heart is in it anymore. He has some money to fund some advertising. Good luck to him.

Ms K.E. Giddens: Very glossy.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, he puts out very good advertising. The leaflets are very high gloss; they use very good, thick paper.

If the feds were serious about it, they would have written it in their actual budget rather than as a contingent liability. As I say, for each budget we do the dance. The federal government comes out and says there is \$1.2 billion for Perth Freight Link and we say that we are not building it, but we will have \$1.2 billion for other projects, thanks. I suspect we will do it again next year because that is what happens with the federal government. I am happy to continue to do that because every time we take it to the public, it is on our side and it understands that delivering congestion-busting projects and infrastructure is not Roe 8 and 9; it is Metronet, regional road safety and some of the massive road projects like the Leach Highway–Welshpool Road interchange we are building now, which was the riskiest and most dangerous road between 2015 and 2019 and the second most-congested intersection. If we look at the facts, we are dealing with those high pressure points, plus we are making —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: That is okay, member for Cannington. I cannot wait to see the elevated rail through Cannington. It was well supported by the member for Cannington and the council.

When it comes to regional road safety, we are committed to all these projects. As I said, we will go through with this. We hope that the Liberal Party supports our mandate to deliver this project because we have given a clear commitment to stop Roe 8 and 9 and preserve the Beeliar wetlands.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

[Leave denied to proceed forthwith to third reading.]

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1: Short title —

Dr D.J. HONEY: One of the enablers for this bill going through is the construction of the outer harbour. I have heard various reports on the schedule for the outer harbour. Could the minister enlighten me about her best estimate at the moment on the schedule for the outer harbour?

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cannington.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: Minister for Mines and Petroleum, if you like.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Mines and Petroleum—you choose.

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: This is the short title. The debate needs to relate to the bill before the house, not any other matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you, minister. The minister is correct, Leader of the Liberal Party: we are talking about the short title of the bill. If you have further questions related to other aspects of the bill, now is —

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you, chair. I might say that this is usually —

A government member: No; it's a question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that clause 1 be agreed to.

Dr D.J. HONEY: If you are just going to jam it through, well done!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, no.

Dr D.J. HONEY: You are.

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: This is when we ask general questions, and you know that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, it is not.

Mr W.J. Johnston: Not in this chamber; that is in the other chamber.

Dr D.J. HONEY: No; that is here. We do it every time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party, thank you very much.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 put and passed.

Clause 4: Metropolitan Region Scheme amended —

Dr D.J. HONEY: I have been fascinated by this debate and the hubris shown by all members opposite. We are seeing it in spades here from the Minister for Energy, so well done!

Ms S.E. Winton: Do you have a question?

Dr D.J. HONEY: I do have a question, interestingly, and that is —

Ms S.E. Winton: Good!

Dr D.J. HONEY: That question is: a plan shown at the end of this document has a shaded area. In terms of the affected area between Hope Road and the powerline easement, what is the approximate area that is in that shaded area? Just to clarify, the minister spoke about a total area. There is that area between Hope Road and the powerline easement—what does that correspond to in hectares, approximately? I do not need an exact figure.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I do not have that information. We are not going to hazard a guess either. We do not have that information about the amount of land between Hope Road and the powerline easement.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Would the minister be able to provide that information because it will be useful to my colleagues in the other place?

Mr W.J. Johnston: Put in a question on notice!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I can prepare that information for when the bill goes to the other place.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much, minister; I appreciate that.

Can the minister confirm that in this plan Hope Road will continue to exist and also that the powerline easement will continue once this bill is passed?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, I can confirm that, and I can also confirm that we are not going to build a new massive freeway through wetlands. I can confirm that too.

Dr D.J. HONEY: In relation to the powerline easement, what sort of vegetation will be within that? I have been to that location several times and it has been cleared underneath the powerline; I assume it is because they do not want bushfires affecting the powerline. Will that continue to be the case; that is, it will be cleared in that area and no trees will be planted there?

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: As I understand, yes, it is maintained under the powerlines; there is an obligation to maintain it so there are not branches overhanging the powerlines. Whether it is totally cleared as would be required for a major highway I think is quite different. There are a lot of powerlines across the area. I have got feedback that Western Power is happy with vegetation under powerlines. Basically, there is vegetation under powerlines. Of course it is maintained so it does not create a hazard, but as through the entire metropolitan area and regional WA there is vegetation that occurs under powerlines. There is an obligation or keenness to —

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: Yes, through national parks and through state forests, but there is also a keenness to try to maintain it, where they can, to stop it becoming a hazard or creating potential power outages with trees falling or branches falling on the powerlines.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5 put and passed.

Schedule 1 put and passed.

Title put and passed.

[Leave granted to proceed forthwith to third reading.]

Third Reading

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning) [9.56 pm]: I move —

That the bill be now read a third time.

DR D.J. HONEY (Cottesloe — Leader of the Liberal Party) [9.56 pm]: It has been a fascinating evening. Despite the comments by the minister, other than a brief time when I had to get some sustenance, I sat in the chamber and listened to an interesting series of debates. A few thoughts came to my mind: one is the level of arrogance that I experience around the chamber. Can I say that arrogance comes before a fall!

Point of Order

Mr W.J. JOHNSTON: It appears that the member is canvassing issues that were raised during the second reading debate—he must be confused. As this is the third reading debate, he is obliged to talk about matters that were raised during consideration in detail. If he could just keep his comments to that, it would make the evening go faster.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. There is no point of order.

Leader of the Liberal Party, please do not introduce any new material. Thank you.

Debate Resumed

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. Can I say they were fascinating comments from the Minister for Energy, given that I have heard—how many government members was it?—six or eight filibuster on their own bill. Well done!

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: We do oppose this bill and for the reasons I have outlined before.

Ms S.E. Winton: We?

Dr D.J. HONEY: We—the alliance. We oppose this bill.

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: What I have heard a lot of tonight is —

Mr W.J. Johnston: You supported the second reading, you supported every clause, and you say you oppose the bill!

Dr D.J. HONEY: What I have —

Ms R. Saffioti: You care about this so much that you can't have more than one member on your side!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members! The Leader of the Liberal Party has the call.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. As always, I appreciate your support from this aggressive and unpleasant behaviour from the other side.

What I have heard a lot of tonight, members, is a lot of confirmation bias; that is, you all sit here and encourage each other. You think you are doing the right thing, but in fact this is an active —

Several members interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members!

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: You have clearly got more time than I have.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Carry on, please, member.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo! Leader of the Liberal Party.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. Clearly, people have time on their hands.

What we are seeing is confirmation bias amongst the group here. This is planning vandalism. We have a minister who is progressing with this bill when, in fact, she knows that there is no requirement for this harbour for the foreseeable future. She knows that the existing harbour is at only one-third capacity, but she is committing to spending over \$5 billion of taxpayers' money on a project that will not be required for the foreseeable future. There is nothing in this bill that will deal with the traffic congestion in the southern corridor or the horrendous accidents on that road, as we saw in the data about the number of car and truck accidents on that road. There is nothing that will solve that problem.

We heard discussion tonight about environmental concern, and I am indebted to the member for Cockburn, who clearly has at least some concern about Cockburn Sound and environmental matters. I heard the minister for Fremantle talk in heartfelt —

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: Sorry; the member for Fremantle. “Minister for Cottesloe” was the best title I was ever given, but it was wrong, unfortunately. I heard the member for Fremantle talk in passionate terms about the loss of two Norfolk Island pine trees, yet the Minister for Planning knows that, through the High Street project, she destroyed 70 mature tuart trees. The member for Willagee read out all those environmental movements and the names of the people who were going to save those trees forever. They were missing in action when this minister destroyed those 70 mature tuart trees.

What do we hear? We know that this outer harbour project is going to destroy over 400 hectares of the benthic primary producer habitat.

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: That is what this project is going to do. It is going to destroy a critical fishery in the outer harbour. For some pyrrhic, egotistical reason this government is going to cause that enormous environmental harm. We have already heard that mussel capacity in that fishery has been reduced from 700 tonnes a year to 200 tonnes a year. We have already heard that the blue manna crab harvest has been cancelled since 2014, yet members sitting in this place are all very pleased with themselves and are looking very smug. They are going to bring forward this project that is not required for the foreseeable future but will destroy 400 hectares of the benthic primary producer habitat in Cockburn Sound. That is what this minister is going to do. That is what the Minister for Energy is going to do as well.

Mr W.J. Johnston interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: They do not care. Furthermore, this government is going to spend \$5 billion, yet it has a hospital system and a housing system in chaos. We are now hearing that schools are moving into chaos, yet it is going to spend \$5 billion on this project. The minister says that it will cost \$5 billion—let us wait and see how that goes, because this minister said that Metronet was going to cost \$2 billion. What is it up to now, minister? It is \$7 billion. It is the largest cost blowout of any project in the history of this state. That is this minister’s record. Let us see.

Several members interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The minister is going to do all that.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

Dr D.J. HONEY: The member is like Nostradamus compared with this minister. It is three and a half times the estimated budget and rising—and rising considerably I have heard on the wire.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Dr D.J. HONEY: That is what it is going to be—five times the amount or \$10 billion.

The government is going to use its numbers to force legislation through this place and it is going to use its numbers to cut debating time in the upper house so that it can force stuff through up there. The fact is that this is a shoddy bill. It should not be going through this Parliament. This bill will result in actions that will be to the detriment of the people of Western Australia.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning) [10.04 pm] — in reply: I want to put on the record again that the Liberal Party cannot take this Roe 8 project seriously. It could not deliver it in its eight and a half years. It could not commit to it properly at the election. It is not late, members; it has just gone 10 o’clock. It is a normal Tuesday sitting time and there is only one member of the opposition—one out of six —

Mr D.A.E. Scaife: They’re not the opposition.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: I am referring to the Liberal and National Parties, because we know that the member for North West Central believes that Roe 8 and 9 is far more important than any other project, even in regional WA. They believe that the Metropolitan Region Scheme (Beeliar Wetlands) Bill 2021 is so bad that they cannot get enough people to even call a proper division! It is a shambles. I know there are not many opposition members —

Ms S.E. Winton: Sixteen per cent tonight.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: They have 16 per cent. I was trying to do the maths. Thanks, member for Wanneroo. If members believe in something, they should sit here and do the work. They could not deliver in eight and a half years. They could not even commit to it properly in an election campaign. All you guys have ever been good at is putting glossy pamphlets with a scare campaign in letterboxes. It has just gone 10 o’clock on a Tuesday night and, for the past hour and a half or two hours, there has been no-one from the Liberal or National Parties in this chamber apart from the member for Cottesloe, who was outside for most of it and then read the paper for the other bit.

Dr D.J. Honey: That's just not true and you know it.

Ms S. Winton interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Wanneroo!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: It is absolutely true. The member is saying that we are ramming the bill through, yet he cannot get another person to stick around. Where is the Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party? She was the face of Roe 8 and 9 during the election campaign. She is too gutless to come into this place and deal with the bill. Members of the National Party, who are massive advocates for Roe 8 and 9 —

Mr P. Papalia: At the expense of the regions.

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: — at the expense of the regions, are too gutless to be here. There are not enough people to even call a division, yet they want us to take them seriously. They cannot take themselves seriously. They cannot take this chamber seriously. They cannot take this debate seriously. They could not deliver this project when they were in government. They could not even cost it properly in opposition. Now, during the debate, which has not gone on for that long—it is 10 o'clock on Tuesday—there is one person in this place and they could not even call a division. They are a disgrace!

This is a bill that we have a mandate for. The member for Cottesloe talks about arrogance, but he is ignoring the will of the people.

Dr D.J. Honey: Your costings are a disgrace.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Liberal Party!

Ms R. SAFFIOTI: You are ignoring the will of the people—talk about arrogance! We won an election. We took this to the election. Your arrogance in ignoring the people in the southern suburbs, even though we won two elections on this issue, clearly shows that you are out of touch and arrogant. You cannot even get one other person to sit in here for what you believe is such a significant piece of legislation. You should be embarrassed. I know you are embarrassed. I know you are shouting out because you are uncomfortable and embarrassed, and you should be, because you cannot even get your deputy leader, the face of the Roe 8 and 9 campaign, who spent every day on a corner somewhere asking people to honk for Roe 8 and 9, to be in the chamber.

Members, this is the modern Liberal Party. It cannot deliver anything when it is in government, it cannot run a proper election campaign, it cannot cost a project, and it cannot even muster more than one person to sit in this chamber and listen to the debate on this significant bill that these people have rallied against and then call a division.

Dr D.J. Honey interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. I was just reflecting on the Leader of the Liberal Party taking credit for the Liberal Party having over half its members here yet we have not.

The question is that the bill be now read a third time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 10.07 pm
