

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

**METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME — SOUTH METROPOLITAN REGION — REZONING**

*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion*

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition)** [12.27 pm] — without notice: I move —

That so much of standing orders be suspended so far as to enable the following motion to be moved forthwith —

That this house condemns the McGowan government for its arrogant decision to rezone land under the metropolitan region scheme through legislation, without following due process, without engaging in detailed public consultation and without having a comprehensive plan to address congestion in the south metropolitan region.

*Standing Orders Suspension — Amendment to Motion*

**MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah — Leader of the House)** [12.28 pm]: I move —

To insert after “forthwith” the following —

, subject to the debate being limited to 30 minutes for government members and 30 minutes for non-government members

I highlight to the opposition that the government is assisting the opposition in moving this suspension today. The government is assisting the Liberal Party in having this motion debated. It was very interesting that an absolute majority is required, but the Liberal opposition does not have that in its own right.

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** Otherwise, we would be in government.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** I beg your pardon?

**Mr Z.R.F. Kirkup:** Otherwise, we would be in government.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** The government is assisting the opposition. This is again a demonstration of the opposition’s misunderstanding or incapacity to address issues of importance when the time is appropriate. It is continuing to have a practice of doing this. I point out to members that the government is assisting the Liberal opposition by having the appropriate members present and the National Party—we had very few in the house in the lead-up to the moving of this motion—was unable to even assist the Liberal Party as the second opposition party in this place. We will have the debate, but again it demonstrates that the Liberal Party continues not to have any regard for the conventions of this place. However, we will allow the Liberal opposition to have the debate.

Several members interjected.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** But Liberal Party members will not have a chance. They demonstrate again how inept they are —

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** Four ministers missing.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** A whole party was missing earlier. The Leader of the Opposition did not know where they were. He could not get hold of them. He did not know where they were. His face was going ashen.

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not really think that is appropriate, from either side. Can we please just restrict the debate to the topic.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition’s face was going ashen because he knew that his tactic was dissolving in front of him. But we will allow the debate to continue, as I have moved an amendment to this. I highlight to the Leader of the Opposition that ministers in this place have already made arrangements and they will have a press conference, as is required and has been organised. But we will listen to the opposition’s debate. It demonstrates again how members opposite still cannot realise that they lost the election in March last year. They still cannot take it and accept that they were defeated because they have no —

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, you do not.

**Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN:** They have no capacity to understand it. We will support this suspension of standing orders, help the opposition get this motion debated and we will debate it vigorously. A number of members from the opposition are very keen to have their say, do not worry about that. That will match the say that the people in the south western corridor had during the election campaign leading up to the March election of 2017. Bring on the debate. Bring it on! But it is embarrassing that we have to help the opposition bring on its own debate.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

**MR S.K. L'ESTRANGE (Churchlands)** [12.31 pm]: I am speaking to the amendment. First of all, as the manager of opposition business, I would like to thank the Leader of the House for enabling us to suspend standing orders on this incredibly important issue. I remind the Leader of the House that if we had an absolute majority, we would be on the opposite side of the chamber and would not require its support. The functioning of this Parliament requires an absolute majority to debate a suspension of standing orders. That is an absolute given and when the Leader of the House was in opposition, he relied heavily on the government of the day to enable him to suspend standing orders because he needed us to give the opposition the absolute majority. It is a function of Parliament to ensure that topics such as this are brought forward and debated as a matter of urgency if they appear in the public interest at the point at which they arrive. We simply do not have an absolute majority and we will never have an absolute majority during this term of government until we go to another election. Although I thank the Leader of the House for enabling a suspension of standing orders to occur, which is a proper due process of the Parliament of Western Australia, I remind the Leader of the House not to display arrogance with his victory from March 2017 and not to decide that having a majority in this place gives him the right to decide when something should or should not be debated as a matter of urgency under a suspension of standing orders. But, as I said, I thank the Leader of the House for enabling this debate to proceed.

The Leader of the House attached comments to his amendment about ministers not being present because they have other duties. Can I remind the Leader of the House, and he knows this, that their number one duty is to the people of Western Australia and to represent those people in this chamber.

Several members interjected.

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** They can do their press and media releases and anything else they want to do —

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Churchlands, sorry to interrupt while you are in full flight, but I am having trouble hearing what you are saying, so I suspect that Hansard cannot hear anything. Could you please stop yelling and we can finish the amendment.

**Mr F.M. Logan** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister!

**Mr S.K. L'ESTRANGE:** I remind the Leader of the House that the duty of all members of Parliament is to be in Parliament when Parliament sits. That is their duty. I ask that he not use that as a rationale for making out that he is being so accommodating today, but I thank the Leader of the House for being here to join us in this debate.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, the question is the amendment be agreed to. All those in favour, say aye.

Members: Aye.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** All those against, no.

A government member: No.

*Point of Order*

**Mr V.A. CATANIA:** The member for Pilbara is clearly in the wrong seat and he is yelling out in the chamber. Could you please direct him to his seat?

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Churchlands, please do not yell while we are addressing a point of order, or you will be called. Member for Pilbara, he is quite right.

*Debate Resumed*

Amendment put and passed.

*Standing Orders Suspension — Motion, as Amended*

**The DEPUTY 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*

**DR M.D. NAHAN (Riverton — Leader of the Opposition)** [12.36 pm]: I move the motion. Let me put this quite clearly: the minister who just read in the bill is not in Parliament.

**Mr W.J. Johnston:** Yes she is.

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 7 November 2018]

p7930b-7942a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** Where is she?

*Point of Order*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** There is a tradition in the chamber —

Several members interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Enough! Member for Darling Range, I do not need you calling across the chamber while someone is on their feet.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The tradition in the chamber is that when somebody is —

**Mr V.A. Catania:** Under what section?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for North West Central, I call you for the first time.

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** There is a tradition in the chamber that people do not speculate on what members are doing when they are not here. If the members opposite want to change that practice, I am very happy to see that occur.

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

*Debate Resumed*

**Mr V.A. Catania** interjected.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Would you sit down, member for North West Central, or you will be called for the second time in about two minutes.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** We have suspended standing orders to have a debate about a bill that was just read in by the Minister for Planning. I note that she is not in the chamber to hear the suspension and debate it. As the member for Churchlands indicated, a minister's top priority when addressing a bill under their responsibility is to be in the chamber to address the concerns of that bill. She is not here. The reason we are suspending standing orders now is that the bill just got read in for the first and second time, and that same minister is leaving Parliament early, later today.

**Mr F.M. Logan:** So?

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** So, this is an opportune time. Note that she is not here to respond to this very important issue. One of the most contentious issues —

*Point of Order*

**Mr W.J. JOHNSTON:** The member is discussing a bill that is before the chamber, but the bill is not referred to in the motion moved. I am not quite sure, because the member continually refers to the bill and the minister but neither of those things are dealt with by the motion, so it seems to be outside the matter being debated in the chamber.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. Leader of the Opposition, please get back to the topic and I ask you to continue, with relevance, please.

*Debate Resumed*

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** The member for Cannington is stalling for time, in the hope that the minister will come back into the chamber. He does this regularly, and it is a nonsense.

This bill is one of the worst cases of planning vandalism we have ever seen. It is an act of pure bastardry by the minister. This is not the first time this has happened. In 2000, a former Minister for Transport excised the Fremantle eastern bypass from the road reserve and sold that land. The people to whom the government sold that land made a motza out of it. They became very wealthy by purchasing that land. That led to disaster after disaster in reducing congestion in the south metropolitan area and in providing access to the port, and required a huge level of additional expenditure. What the minister is proposing in this bill will continue that process.

The Minister for Planning said that the reason she has introduced this bill to override the Metropolitan Region Scheme is that if she had to go through the standard planning process, she would have to discuss it with the impacted communities, and she would have to assess the impact, and it would take too much time. I have read to members that the metropolitan region scheme states —

Perth has a reputation as one of the world's cleanest and greenest cities. This is largely due to good planning. It is a city anticipated to grow. As it grows, change must be well planned and well managed.

Over the decades, we have set up a very comprehensive metropolitan regional planning system that provides the processes by which things can be changed. The minister is throwing that out the window. The minister is dictating what will happen. The minister has said that she was given a mandate at the last election, and she can throw out the whole planning process, without a plan for an alternative. The Liberal Party will fight this to the hilt in both

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 7 November 2018]

p7930b-7942a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

this place and the other place, and in the community. When people have to deal with congestion along Leach Highway and South Street, and at Fiona Stanley Hospital, and when accidents are caused by trucks on Leach Highway, it will be on this government's head! We have gone through this process. Roe 8 was put there for a reason. It had environmental clearances. The minister is undermining that. Thousands of schoolchildren in my electorate are exposed on a daily basis to heavy truck traffic along Leach Highway. Roe 8 was the solution to that congestion. This government is proposing to continue that congestion into the future. When people get hurt, this government will be held responsible. This is pure vandalism. It is not necessary. The reason the government is trying to ram this bill through is that it knows that if it went to the community through the metropolitan region planning process, it would not be able to do this.

The government thinks it won the election and it can do whatever it wants. This government has broken more promises than any government in history. It said there would be no new taxes, but here is a new tax. It said there would be no increases in taxes, but here is a huge increase in tax. This government is now breaking another promise. The government could implement its promise through the metropolitan region planning system. Why not do that? The minister's excuse is that it would take too much time. The real question is: what has the government done to replace Roe? The government is proposing a link to the Murdoch precinct. The current member for Jandakot will find out in two and half years what a disaster that will be, because he will not be re-elected. The government did not do the right planning for that. It overrode Main Roads and came up with another junk road. That will cause congestion through Leeming and all the way to the Murdoch precinct, at a cost of \$100 million. That will not solve the problem of truck access to the port. The government is planning to build a giant roundabout at Stirling Highway–High Street, at a cost of \$100 million. Wait until that is built. The congestion at that roundabout will be phenomenal. That will not address the increasing congestion along Leach Highway and South Street that the people of that area are confronted with on a daily basis. It will increase the number of number of accidents, which is already high, and the amount of pollution that is poured into that area. The problem is also that the government has put forward no alternative. A roundabout is not an alternative; people can drive around and around it, but it is not an alternative.

The minister has said that the port of Fremantle will continue. That is good. The minister is in the process of excising land from Roe, before it has an alternative. It says the alternative is Westport. The government has presented no case for Westport. It has presented no information that Westport will be built. The Premier announced the other day that he will allow a second channel to be built through Cockburn Sound for military purposes. We know from work done by a former Labor minister that building a large port in Cockburn Sound will be very difficult on environmental grounds, if not next to impossible. The government may allow a second channel to be built for ships, but it will not be done. The government is now proposing to excise land from Roe. That will be absolutely essential if the government does not have Westport. How will that deal with the increased volume of truck and passenger traffic along Leach Highway and South Street through to Fremantle? The government has no plan. The government is saying, "We're going to ram this change through, because we can't wait for time to plan an alternative. We think the planning system should be ripped up. We bought a bunch of green votes in the area at the election, and we have to adhere to those green votes. Therefore, we're going to be vandals." That is what the government is doing. The government will pay for this, because it is pure bastardry. The people who live in this area and use those roads on a daily basis know that this is needed. It has been needed for some time. The government has given them no alternative.

I add that we will protest about all that Bush Forever land that the government is going to plough a Metronet line through. We will protest about every bush along the way. For the Yanchep line, the government will have to dig a great big tunnel —

**Mr F.M. Logan:** Trench.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** —trench—through Bush Forever land. That Bush Forever land is as essential as the Beeliar wetlands.

Several members interjected.

**Dr M.D. NAHAN:** It is true. The government should look at its own maps.

The minister is overriding the planning process and ramming through a change, without no consultation, and with no alternative of its own. This alternative has been planned since 1963. The government is going to pay for this politically. Our concern is not for the government. It is for the people the government is overlooking and whose livelihoods, health and safety the government is not taking into consideration.

**MR D.C. NALDER (Bateman)** [12.48 pm]: I support the comment of the Leader of the Opposition that this is pure planning vandalism. We saw that happen once before with the Fremantle eastern bypass. The former Minister for Planning during the Carpenter and Gallop governments did the same thing with the Fremantle eastern bypass and put that land over to housing. That forced trucks that come through Cockburn to go along Hampton Road and other streets in South Fremantle. A lot of houses back onto those streets and are impacted by those heavy vehicle

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 7 November 2018]

p7930b-7942a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

movements. What the minister is proposing in this bill is outright silly. I want to talk about this a little bit more in my limited time, because what has been argued over and over again by the government is that there was not a business case and there was not proper planning, and I have to reiterate over and over again that there was. A lot of economic work was undertaken for this project. Let me remind people that this would have been the first infrastructure project in Western Australia that was fully self-funded. Two years of work had been undertaken with the transport industry to look at it doing a profit share on the productivity gains of this infrastructure piece going in. Utilising less than 50 cents in the dollar would have paid off this infrastructure in around 10 years' time. It is the first piece of infrastructure. From an economic perspective, this had the support of Infrastructure Australia, which rated it the number one infrastructure project yet to commence in Australia. If we talk about this from an economic standpoint, it has huge economic gains for Western Australia. This government has walked away from them and I just cannot understand that. It has walked away from that without coming up with a valid alternative, as the Leader of the Opposition said. The government claims that it is looking at an expanded road to rail project and that there will be this improvement from—what?—13 to 15 per cent. There are still 85 per cent of containers coming out of Fremantle port going by truck. World's best practice would not get above 30 per cent, which would mean that 70 per cent of container traffic coming out of Fremantle port would go by truck. We will see the growth of container traffic coming out of Fremantle port. Currently, just over 100 000 containers a year—20-foot equivalent units or TEUs—are coming out of Fremantle each year. That can go to two million containers a year. If the government all of a sudden talks about 70 per cent as world's best practice going by truck, it will mean 1.4 million containers a year, or 600 000 more than go there today. The Premier has walked away from closing down Fremantle port. He wants to keep growing it, because he knows that the cost of the outer harbour is \$5 billion to \$6 billion, to shift three million containers, when for around \$300 million Fremantle port could be expanded to carry that many containers. The economics do not add up to close Fremantle port and the economics do not add up to not create freight movement for container traffic heading into and out of Fremantle port.

Looking at it from an environmental perspective, we are talking about six hectares of Beelihar wetlands. In fact, the Environmental Protection Authority report said that there was no issue with the Beelihar wetlands. The area being impacted accounts for less than 0.5 per cent of the Beelihar wetlands. In fact, the proposed route was not about digging it up; it was going over the top of it. It was being bridged over. The area impacted was 0.5 per cent. The issue from the environmental perspective had more to do with the bush. There was 30 hectares of virgin bush and 60 hectares of degraded bush. There was 100 hectares of absolute sand plain—nothing grows on it. What was the requirement on the government to get an appropriate environmental offset for that 30 hectares of virgin bush? There was 600 hectares of environmental offset established. A farm that backs onto a national park behind White Cliffs was purchased by the government for \$12 million. There was 1 000 hectares, of which 600 hectares was being used as a permanent offset for the 30 hectares of virgin bush and the six hectares of wetlands, if we wanted that added in. From an environmental perspective, steps were taken to ensure that Western Australia was environmentally better off. If I take that another step further, over 10 years, creating a freeway system for these trucks would have removed 450 000 tonnes of diesel pollutants coming out of trucks that have to stop at traffic lights. From an environmental perspective, we know this would have been a good decision.

I turn now to road to rail. The issue with rail is that the containers coming out of the port have to be double-handled to get onto the rail. They come off a ship, go onto a truck and then onto the train. When they go onto the train, they then have to get them off the train at Kenwick and put them onto a truck, and they then they go out to all the different areas. The inefficiency of that is just ridiculous; it does not work. Go to Singapore and sit down with the port authority in Singapore, which I did. In Singapore they removed all the rail. There are 34 million containers a year going through Singapore port—five million of them go into Singapore and to surrounding Malaysia. The others are for all the transfers to other ships. Guess what? They transfer to ship by road—by truck. The reason that is done is that it is the most efficient means by which it can be done. It is economically driven; it is the most efficient way to do it. Ways of doing ship to ship are being explored so that it can be done on the water, but at the moment everything is going by truck—34 million containers a year in the area of Singapore, and we are talking about 800 000 containers here at the moment.

I have looked at the economic and environmental benefits, and now I look at the social benefits. Let me remind members that the driveways of 180 houses back onto Leach Highway between Stock Road and North Lake Road. The biggest issue occurring, and the biggest issue with trucks on our roads, is the interaction with cars at intersections, whether it be at a driveway or a set of traffic lights. The number of interactions and accidents with trucks on Leach Highway is multiple times the average across the whole metropolitan area. This is because of the issues with driveways and intersections. The North Lake Road–Leach Highway intersection is eleventh on the list of blackspots in Western Australia. That is primarily because of trucks going along there. From a social perspective, Roe 8 would remove up to 30 per cent of the traffic congestion on South Street. The modelling from Main Roads shows that by 2021 the Murdoch Drive–South Street intersection will fail. The long-term planning, along with Roe 8, has been for the development of major tertiary hospitals at that location. They are St John of

God Murdoch and Fiona Stanley Hospital. We need to make sure that those hospitals can be accessed in a safe and efficient manner, especially by emergency vehicles getting in and out. From a social perspective, Roe 8 would deliver a fantastic outcome for the people in the southern suburbs; from an environmental perspective, Roe 8 would deliver a fantastic outcome; and from an economic perspective, it would deliver a fantastic outcome. To be annexing this out without going through due process is totally inappropriate and something that everybody should be standing up and fighting against. This is not right; it has not been thought through and it needs to be reconsidered. We will continue to argue that. This is important. The government must follow due process if it is going to consider these types of things. Just because the government won the election, it does not mean that there should not be due process. It gives the government the right to look at things, but it must follow due process. The government is bypassing proper procedures and that is totally wrong. We will always stand against that.

**MRS L.M. HARVEY (Scarborough — Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** [12.57 pm]: I rise to close the remarks of the opposition on the debate on this motion. I would like to highlight the hypocrisy of this minister in saying that she has a mandate to basically circumvent the planning system because her government won an election. When the Labor Party was in opposition, we recall that it went out to the community promising gold-standard transparency, better governance, better consultation and better accountability than its predecessors, which was our side when we were in government. What have we seen as examples of that so far? We have seen a planning process that ordinarily involves an initiation by the Western Australian Planning Commission for a metropolitan region scheme amendment, followed by a clearly defined series of steps—environmental approvals, a public environmental review, a WAPC submission to the minister, an amendment, and the amendment being advertised, seeking public consultation, consideration of all those submissions, environmental conditions incorporated into whatever the MRS amendment might be, approval by the Governor, and consideration by the Parliament, and the amendment then taking effect. The minister, by her own admission, said that that would take too long. She has said, “We’re not going to engage in a two-year consultation process with the community. We’re not going to do that because we have a mandate. We got elected in a landslide, so we can do whatever the hell we want. We’re going to go straight to legislation and we’ll do the consultation afterwards.” This minister is forgetting that when the people in the south west corridor voted the Barnett government out, they did not believe for one minute that Labor was going to tear up the Roe 8 and Roe 9 contracts. The bewildered constituents of those suburbs are now telling us that they really did not think that the government would do it. They thought Labor would get in and then say that it could not back out of the contract because it would be too expensive. That is what they are telling us. They are also telling us that they think it is unacceptable that Leach Highway has double the metropolitan average for truck and car collisions. They are telling us that they are sick of congestion on Leach Highway and South Street and that they are frightened when they drive alongside trucks on Leach Highway. They are sick of being in congestion on Kwinana Freeway because all the traffic is funnelled into two roads that are at capacity. They wanted Roe 8.

Infrastructure Australia is the independent infrastructure assessment panel in Canberra. Roe 8 was its number one priority because it would have improved freight and commuter efficiencies. In the southern corridor, 80 per cent of commuters have a commute time that is 20 per cent longer than for any other commuter. If it takes an hour to get to work normally for every other commuter, it takes an hour and 20 minutes in the southern corridor. That is time people waste in their cars away from their families, churning up fuel that most people cannot afford because of this government’s cost-of-living increases. That is the problem.

The freight industry wanted Roe 8 and Roe 9 because it knew that would relieve it of the inconvenience of having to power up and power down at 15 sets of traffic lights between the freeway and the port. The industry was prepared to pay for it because it knew that it would be safer, there would be fewer collisions, and trucks would use less fuel and would get to their destinations in a better time frame. In addition, it could have significantly improved its carbon footprint. Freight companies all have to pay carbon offsets against their fuel use. If they could reduce their fuel use by having a seamless transfer along a road that is designed to carry freight more efficiently, they would have lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, which is better for the environment. That has a net benefit to the environment.

The other issue we have with the cancellation and removal of this road reservation is that the issues at Fremantle port still have no solution. This government says that it will protect the Beeliar wetlands, but what about Cockburn Sound? What will happen in Cockburn Sound when an outer harbour expansion occurs there? That is a fish habitat—a fish nursery. I remember the now Premier when he was in opposition standing in this house when I had been here for a only short time. We were debating recreational boat fishing licences. The now Premier talked about the fish stocks in Cockburn Sound back in the day when he was a youngster. He said that big schools of snapper used to jump out of the water. We are back to those days now, but how will that be impacted by an outer harbour proposal? We do not have an answer to that. We do not know when that outer harbour could be constructed. Internationally, most harbours take between 15 and 30 years to get through the approval, planning and funding process. In the

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 7 November 2018]

p7930b-7942a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

interim, Fremantle port will be our main freight port. Truck movements are congested and we are losing efficiency. This government will ensure that that inefficiency will be there in perpetuity.

It is not heeding the bad decisions that it made when it was last in government. We know what those bad decisions were. Governments remove road reservations in built-up urban areas at their peril. Similarly, governments sell off government land in built-up urban areas at their peril. In the western suburbs, only one site is left to redevelop a school—that is, the City Beach high school site—because when this mob was last in government it sold off the Scarborough high school site and the Swanbourne high school site for housing. Now no land is left on which to develop infrastructure. That is where we will be if this road reservation gets removed from the amendment, and that is why the minister has circumvented consultation. The community in the southern corridor will find out that there will be no opportunity for relief from the congestion issues that it deals with on a daily basis and the pollution that it lives in because trucks have to keep powering up and powering down at 15 sets of traffic lights. The community knows it will be stuck with this forever because this government does not have a solution to those problems. All those truckies lose time and the costs are passed on to consumers.

The government talks about having a mandate, and I will tell members opposite what else this government had a mandate for. It had a mandate for mandatory minimum sentencing for meth dealers. That has been abandoned. It had a mandate for no new taxes. That has been abandoned. It had a mandate for no privatisation of public assets except for the TAB. That was completely abandoned. PEXA has been sold and Landgate will be sold. Where is the government's mandate? It had a mandate for a 1.5 per cent pay increase for Western Australian police officers. That has been abandoned. It had a mandate for 50 apprentices a year to be employed at Western Power. That has been abandoned. Members opposite promised better governance, better accountability and gold-standard transparency. It has trashed the process with the removal of this road reservation from the Metropolitan Region Scheme just as it trashed the process for the planning scheme at Scarborough. It approved a building that will be three times bigger than anything else that exists and seven times outside the allowable ratio for the scheme that exists. The government can be arrogant and believe that the electorate elected it on the things it was saying, but it needs to be 100 per cent sure that it is achieving its mandate in all of its other commitments.

The opposition will fight this. We will work with our colleagues and the crossbench in the Legislative Council because we think this is a bad thing for the future of Western Australia. We think it is short-sighted and is an act of planning vandalism. The government will pay the price and we will make sure that the people in the southern corridor know that the government is responsible for their commute times, their wasted time in their cars, the traffic crashes that happen on Leach Highway and every single inconvenience to a motor vehicle or a truck that occurs as a result of the government's complete lack of a solution for the problems that Roe 8 and Roe 9 were going to solve.

**MS R. SAFFIOTI (West Swan — Minister for Planning)** [1.07 pm]: I thank members opposite for moving this motion. I apologise for my throat; it is a little scratchy today. The opposition has a certain view. It wants to build Roe 8. We have a different view. We are not going to build Roe 8. I think that is pretty clear and the debate will be had at the next election.

This issue has two parts—the Beeliar wetlands and the other road reservation. If the Beeliar wetlands did not go to parks and recreation, where would they go? The only rezoning option for the Beeliar wetlands is parks and recreation. The other 81 hectares will go through the formal MRS process because it has a mixture of potential and current land uses—some urban, some environment and some road reservation.

We made an election commitment and we are now implementing it. The member for Scarborough outlined why transparency and accountability is so important, but she is saying that we should break an election commitment. She wants us to break an election commitment! In early January—I remember that the member for Jandakot was there—we announced that we would not go ahead with the Perth Freight Link contract and that we would redirect those funds to other projects. For example, we redirected funds for the widening of Armadale Road, construction of the Armadale Road–North Lake Road bridge, widening of the Mitchell and Kwinana Freeways, and upgrades to Karel Avenue. We outlined a number of projects at that time. We said that we would not implement the Perth Freight Link. As I said, we looked at it. There are two parts to it. One part will go through the normal Metropolitan Region Scheme process. The other part is wetlands. If it was not parks and recreation, what else would it be? The upper house has an opportunity to debate this issue. We gave a commitment and we are implementing that commitment. I am not sure how much clearer I can be. We cancelled the contract for Roe 8; we are not building it. We are going to make that area parks and recreation.

**Mr S.K. L'Estrange:** Do you support your reasons for doing it?

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** I will go through it.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey** interjected.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** There are two different processes: it can come through Parliament or it can go through a typical MRS amendment. We implemented two processes for the whole reservation. One part is very clearly wetlands, and it will not be anything else. For the other part, we will have discussions and go through the normal MRS process. That will happen.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** There's only six hectares of wetlands.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** My colleagues will go through the environmental aspects.

The member for Scarborough said, "I know you said you were not going to build Roe 8 and preserve the wetlands but you should have kept that promise." That is pretty much what she said. Then she spoke about accountability and transparency. We are delivering our commitment. That is what we are doing.

**Mrs L.M. Harvey:** You're being selective about the commitments you're keeping. That's what I said.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** She said that people expected us not to deliver our commitment, just like the former government did not deliver its commitments. Then the member talked about transparency and consulting with the community. Where did the Liberal Party take Perth Freight Link? Who did it communicate and consult with in relation to the PFL?

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** For three years —

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** For three years, you did nothing.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** People in the member for Bicton's electorate received letters. They had no idea what was happening.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, I will call you if you keep going.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Then the member for Scarborough told us how bad the situation with Roe 8 was. The Liberal Party was in government for eight and a half years. It inherited the lowest —

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, I did not hear the minister interjecting on you. Carry on, minister.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The Liberal Party had eight and a half years. If the traffic situation was so bad, why did it not build Roe 8?

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, I call you for the first time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The former government had eight and a half years. The member for Scarborough stood and told us how bad the road situation was.

**Mrs A.K. Hayden** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Darling Range. Thank you, minister.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** In eight and a half years, the former government could not deliver it.

**Dr M.D. Nahan** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition!

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** The former government had eight and a half years and it could not deliver it. Now it is saying it is so bad, but it had eight and a half years to do something. It inherited the lowest debt on record. It inherited massive budget surpluses, it had massive revenue growth and it did not think that this project was a priority in eight and a half years.

**Mrs A.K. Hayden** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Darling Range, I call you for the first time.

**Ms R. SAFFIOTI:** Members opposite are saying that it went through proper processes, but in eight and a half years, they could not deliver a road.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

We made commitments. The commitment was not to build Roe 8, to renegotiate the \$1.2 billion from the commonwealth and also to implement a number of measures. For example, we increased the subsidy for freight on rail. That increased the amount of freight being transported on rail from approximately 15 per cent to about 18 per cent now, and we want to keep growing that. Even though container trade is increasing, we are increasing the percentage, which shows the real effort we are making in transporting freight on rail. We are successfully negotiating for more train paths to again increase those numbers. We are working with intermodal groups to ensure that we have an intermodal network plan. Again, this involves understanding the containers' destinations and the sources and how we can create a network of movement that limits the impact on our roads. We are talking to the distribution centres. We are talking to the Freight and Logistics Council of Western Australia, understanding the entire movement of our containers and seeing what measures we can take to reduce the impact on the roads. So far we have already increased freight on rail but we want to keep going and get those outcomes. As I said, we are working on developing an intermodal strategy. We have seen a lot of activity in that area and we will continue to work with companies. We are working with companies in Fremantle port, in particular, and doing work down there. We are going to incentivise companies to make sure that through the operations at Fremantle port, we put more freight on rail.

In relation to roads, we are implementing a number of measures across the system to reduce congestion in the southern suburbs. I will go through them. The Murdoch Activity Centre connection project is underway. The widening of the freeway is underway. The smart freeways project is underway. The Armadale Road widening is underway. The Armadale Road to North Lake Road bridge is in the planning stages and will be underway next year. Karel Avenue upgrades will also be underway. We have a program involving billions of dollars of expenditure for the entire network in the southern suburbs. It is about looking at the whole system and reducing congestion. The upgrades to High Street is a project that has been difficult to get off the ground. In agreement with the City of Fremantle, we now have a planned route. A number of different measures have been taken. Of course, west port is in the planning stages for the outer harbour. We are looking at not only the container movements, but also other movements into Fremantle port.

We had short-term objectives and longer term objectives at the election. We are implementing what we promised. I know that the opposition likes Roe 8 and that it is obsessed with it. It can be debated in the upper house, and we will see how that goes. We have a clear mandate. We are taking it through the Parliament. We are doing the things that we got elected to do—that is, making decisions and implementing the commitments we made to the public.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I call the Minister for Community Services.

**MS S.F. McGURK (Fremantle — Minister for Community Services)** [1.17 pm]: I am speaking as the member for Fremantle because this is an issue, as members can probably understand, that my community has been passionately interested in and involved in for many, many years. I thank those people who have stood up, not only for the environment and the Beeliar wetlands, but also for the sensible, thought-out planning of our transport, freight and logistics needs in this state. When Labor took to the election a commitment not to proceed with Perth Freight Link, it was a statement not only to save the Beeliar wetlands, but also about careful thought-out planning that would ensure we had a sensible way to proceed with the freight needs of our state, particularly Perth, the metropolitan area and the south of the state, for the twenty-first century, not an immediate short-term fix that we saw with the Perth Freight Link debacle.

Let us go through this. The motion before us today condemns the McGowan government for its decision to rezone land under the metropolitan region scheme without following due process. I am not sure what the opposition considers the March 2017 election to be if it was not a mandate and a thorough discussion of the issues.

**Mr D.C. Nalder:** It's not a process.

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** The member for Bateman's confidence in how this issue would be received by the people of Bicton was such that he abandoned that seat and scurried off to the seat of Bateman. It is true that he was left standing, but how was his colleague, Matt Taylor, received? In fact, there was a clear decision on this issue by the people of Bicton.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, calm down.

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** Also when we talk about due process, this legislation will go through Parliament, so I know that members of the opposition must be feeling a little weary at this time, considering their numbers and their capacity, but do they have such little confidence in their own capacity that they are not able to debate the metropolitan region scheme in the lower house as well as the upper house? As the Minister for Transport said, there can be no other alternative for the Beeliar wetlands than it be rezoned for parks and recreation. That is why

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 7 November 2018]

p7930b-7942a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

this legislation is desperately needed to protect the Beeliar wetlands for their environmental importance and for the communities of the future in perpetuity.

**Mr D.C. Nalder** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member!

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** None of us interjected on the member for Bateman, so I am not calling for his interjections.

The other component of this motion is that the opposition claims that we do not have a comprehensive plan to address congestion. Let us look a little bit more closely at the Liberal–National government’s plan for the Perth Freight Link. The plan was based on the Stephenson–Hepburn plan, which is 55 years old, from 1963.

**Mr D.C. Nalder** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Bateman!

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** I am not seeking or taking interjections, and I seek to have your protection, Acting Speaker.

**Mr D.C. Nalder** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Bateman, I call you to order for the first time.

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** It is a 55-year-old plan that the Liberals committed to accept when it came to Peppermint Grove. When it came to Peppermint Grove and the original Stephenson–Hepburn plan to plough through Peppermint Grove and the Wembley golf course, the Liberal’s commitment to the plan seemed to waver just a little bit. The 55-year-old Stephenson–Hepburn plan captured that area around the Beeliar wetlands as the outer metropolitan area. Of course, we know that the spread of Perth is such that it is not the outer metropolitan area, but very much in the centre of houses and very livable communities. It is therefore inappropriate for a freight highway such as the Perth Freight Link. Again, I doorknocked and spoke to hundreds, if not thousands, of electors who understood only too well that this was not a plan to get to the port; it was a plan to get to the river. It was a \$2 billion plan that did not get over the river and did not get through the challenges of Tydeman Road to get to the port.

**Mr D.C. Nalder** interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Member for Bateman.

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** There was no plan. It was a plan to get to the port that did not get to the port. The people of Moody Glen, now ably represented by the member for Bicton, understood that all too well. Their houses were not on the road reserve; they were never on the road reserve. Nevertheless, they got letters to put them on notice that under the original Perth Freight Link scheme, their houses down Leach Highway would have been taken out and they would have all lost their houses and their community. I thank the current member for Bicton for her passionate representation of that community. People like Tania and Damon Smirke live to see their community continue today.

When there was a little bit of political discomfort for the Liberal–National government with taking out Moody Glen and with very effective advocacy by that community, the alternative was a diagonal tunnel. It started at an aged-care village on Stock Road near Carrington Street, and then went diagonally under the suburbs of Hilton and White Gum Valley. It went through the grounds of White Gum Valley Primary School. There was no real plan or real detail about it, but the then government said that it would be pretty straightforward because the tunnelling would be through sand—that is very straightforward and very modern! It said that the houses would not be affected at all. Let us remember the Matusik report. It was from Queensland property developers who never came here at all. It gave a 10 year projection —

**Mr P. Papalia:** They were real estate agents.

**Ms S.F. McGURK:** They were not property developers; they were real estate agents—thank you. They said that the properties would increase in value with the tunnel. Of course, if members had looked closely at their annual projections, they would have seen that they were less than the average increases had been for the preceding 10 years, so it was a flimsy report that never stood up to any sort of scrutiny.

I know that other members here want to speak but let me look at Infrastructure Australia. The former government wanted to sink over \$2 billion into a plan that did not get over the river and did not get to the port. Infrastructure Australia originally pointed out to the government and the community that it had not seen a business case for the project. It pointed out in August 2015 that despite the significant funding that had been committed by the federal government and the state government for this project, it had been “hastily conceived and poorly planned.” Infrastructure Australia also pointed out that by the time of the assignment of the Perth Freight Link in May 2015 —

... the Perth Freight Link is not directly mentioned” in eight key strategic planning documents, the report found.

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

They included the State Planning Strategy 2050, Direction 2031 and Beyond, the WA Regional Freight Transport Network Plan, Draft Perth Freight Transport Network Plan, the Draft State Port Strategy Plan and the Fremantle Port Inner Harbour Port Development Plan.

It is incredible that not one of those plans mentioned the Perth Freight Link. Notwithstanding that, the Liberal–National government came out and said that it wanted to invest, along with the federal government, \$2 billion of public money into this so-called plan. It was a farce. The former government then tried to regroup with Infrastructure Australia. It went back and said, “Actually, we’ve bumped up the project in terms of priorities and it’s now our second highest priority in the country.” That was often quoted by the opposition. An ABC news report on 27 February 2017 states —

**Two weeks from the state election, the Barnett Government has yet to submit its full business case or receive any of the promised Commonwealth funding for its priority road project ...**

That is the sort of planning we saw from members on the other side. That is the sort of transparency we saw from members on the other side when they were in government. It was appalling. That was why we were elected to government in 2017 and that is why the member for Bicton is representing that electorate now.

**MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Thornlie — Parliamentary Secretary)** [1.27 pm]: I oppose this motion. It tries to deny the voices of the thousands and thousands of people who turned out on many occasions to protest against the Barnett Liberal–National government’s Roe 8 project. If ever there was an example of an expression of community view, it was in those many demonstrations that were held over the whole period from 2008 to 2017. Thousands of people came out to those demonstrations. We have heard from members opposite in this debate that they would like to have some sort of an amendment scheme process that would have submissions to it, to perhaps try to capture different views. It would nowhere near rival the strength and clarity of view that was expressed throughout those protests, in the lead-up to the election and in the election commitment we made and have acted upon. The minister presented the legislation to the Parliament this morning to make sure that this is finished once and for all through a scheme amendment. We took that position to the election and we are delivering on that promise. That is what the people of Western Australia expect of us.

I also want to go back a little bit into the history of this project. I recall that, yes, in 2008 Premier Colin Barnett was interested in the idea of Roe 8 but there was no money at all for it. Money became available only when Tony Abbott became Prime Minister and declared himself the “Infrastructure Prime Minister” in that *Hollowmen* way and said that the federal government would only stick to its knitting that was about roads. He was not interested in infrastructure other than roads. That was when, in 2014, the money became available. The then Minister for Environment, Albert Jacob, was in the situation of having to scramble around looking at the various environmental reviews, bearing in mind that Environmental Protection Authority report 1088 had clearly said that there was no way a highway through the Beeliam wetlands could be made environmentally acceptable. The minister was scrambling around to see what sort of reassessment work could be done. Then there was the incredible embarrassment of finding that most of the members of the EPA at the time had conflicts of interest on a range of projects, including Roe 8, and there was a need to reassess a further assessment that was done. That reassessment was very difficult for the government to carry out, because very few scientists of standing wanted to participate. Groups such as the Beeliam group of concerned scientists, Indigenous and community groups were all arguing against Roe 8 going through their community. They were also arguing about the problems the road would cause once it got to Stock Road, bearing in mind that Roe 8 was taking the traffic only as far as Stock Road, and then, as the member for Fremantle said previously, there was all this vagueness about how traffic would eventually get over to Tydemans Road. I am sure that the member for Cottesloe would be well aware that, at the 2017 election, the one booth that the then Premier, Colin Barnett, lost was North Fremantle. People in North Fremantle were overwhelmingly of the view that this massive increase and locking in of traffic volumes and container traffic for many years to come, because of the expenditure of \$2 billion on a freight highway, would not be in the best interests of their amenity at all. I am sure that the member for Cottesloe’s voters would be very pleased to know that this scheme of continuous freight traffic through the area will not go ahead.

I have heard some conjecture about the size of the area. The environmental review documents indicate that an area of 79 hectares, including the area around the wetlands, was going to be lost. Then we saw, in the months leading up to the election, the Barnett government insisting on the bulldozers going in. It was an act of bloody-mindedness. We have seen reports that Norman Moore, a leading figure in the Liberal Party, said that the party knew it was going to lose the election. In fact, 12 months out the Liberals knew that they were going to lose. To proceed with a decision to bulldoze massive areas of bushland showed an attitude of, “We’ll show them.” That was the attitude. It was a terrible way of abusing community confidence. Fortunately, we won, and we were able to stop the project. Much work is to be done around Westport, but that is the future—to get an alternative freight route for the south west and the Perth metropolitan area. An alternative to Fremantle is absolutely essential. This government is

**Extract from Hansard**

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 7 November 2018]

p7930b-7942a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

sticking to its promises. We have a massive mandate to do so, and we will honour the commitments we made to the people of Western Australia.

**MRS L.M. O'MALLEY (Bicton)** [1.33 pm]: One word in the motion before us today jumps out at me—arrogance. I heard that word over and over again during the many long months of campaigning.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Members, can we hear out the member for Bicton in silence, please?

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** It is a word that I heard over and over during the many months of campaigning in the seat of Bicton. I heard the word in Moody Glen, from the mouths of my friends in Moody Glen, Tania and Damon Smirke, and their neighbours. They looked with absolute bewilderment at a letter that they received saying that their home would be resumed. Their home was never part of a plan. It was never part of a road reserve. They often commented to me about how arrogant it was that the government could come in and deliver a letter to their doorstep, ruining the years they spent building the life of their community. I have seen that letter myself, so if there is any denial, I am sure that I can find it and pass it on to members opposite.

I heard that word at the many community rallies that I attended where I spoke on issues not unlike those raised earlier by the member for Scarborough on the pollution aspects. Unlike carbon dioxide, diesel particulates, which are constant in the environment, have the ability to get right down into the lungs, particularly those of the vulnerable, and they are considered a class 1 carcinogen by the World Health Organization. Those particulates are constant throughout the environment, so keeping trucks on our local road networks will continue to create those issues, which is why I commend the minister —

Several members interjected.

*Point of Order*

**Ms J.J. SHAW:** I am sitting behind the member for Bicton, and I cannot hear her over the rabble rousing from members opposite.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr I.C. Blayney):** Members, I said that I would like to hear the member out in silence.

**Dr M.D. Nahan:** We are supporting her.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Yes, but the trouble is that you supporting her is making her hard to hear.

*Debate Resumed*

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** I heard the word “arrogant” often at community rallies, in relation to continued pollutants in the atmosphere, which is why I commend the minister for her broad approach to transport throughout the south east corridor. I heard the word “arrogant” many times on the protest lines, in particular in the weeks leading up to the election, when it was clear that the Barnett government was facing certain defeat, but it went ahead with the destruction, annihilation and sheer environmental vandalism of the Beeliar wetlands. I also heard the word “arrogant” many times as I knocked on doors throughout the electorate of Bicton. It was the arrogance of a tired government that had lost its way, was not listening and was not prepared to admit it was wrong.

Several members interjected.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I will have to start calling people soon, if you get too loud for me to hear, and it is going to make it very hard for Hansard as well.

**Mrs L.M. O'MALLEY:** As for planning, there is a very clear plan and a very clear mandate. To disrupt the commitment that we took to the election is again nothing short of vandalism. The opposition will be held responsible if that is what it chooses to do.

Collaboration is clearly not a feature of this motion. Collaboration, as chair of the Rehabilitating Roe 8 working group for the nine months following the election, was something I saw every day when we sat at that table. It was a genuine collaboration between the community and the government to begin the work to heal the land and the people. We came to this government with a clear mandate. Members opposite continue to deny this, and continue to pointlessly attempt to refute it. We will go to debate, and there will be many speakers on this side of the house who will speak of the truth of what was seen in March 2017. That was a commitment to save the wetlands, and to work towards a long-term sustainable future for transport, not just within the south east corridor. I will finish off with some words from my first speech —

I also want to acknowledge and pay tribute to the thousands of people who came together in the fight to save Beeliar wetlands and stop the disaster that was known as the Perth Freight Link.

*Division*

**Extract from Hansard**  
[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 7 November 2018]  
p7930b-7942a

Dr Mike Nahan; Mr David Templeman; Mr Sean L'Estrange; Mr Bill Johnston; Mr Dean Nalder; Mrs Liza Harvey; Ms Rita Saffioti; Ms Simone McGurk; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mrs Lisa O'Malley; Ms Jessica Shaw

---

Question put and a division taken, the Acting Speaker (Mr I.C. Blayney) casting his vote with the ayes, with the following result —

Ayes (18)

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

Noes (35)

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

---

Pair

Mr P.J. Rundle

Mr P.C. Tinley

Question thus negatived.